

E09003

A HAND-BOOK
OF
THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE,

FOR
THE USE OF STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITIES
AND
HIGHER CLASSES OF SCHOOLS.

BY
R. G. LATHAM, M.D., F.R.S.,
LATE FELLOW OF KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; AND LATE PROFESSOR OF
ENGLISH, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, LONDON.

LONDON:
WALTON AND MABERLY,
UPPER GOWER STREET, AND IVY LANE, PATERNOSTER BOW.

1855.

**LONDON: PRINTED BY WOODFALL AND KINDER
ANGEL COURT, SKINNER STREET.**

CONTENTS.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—LATEST AND EARLIEST DATES FOR ITS INTRODUCTION.—RATE AND MANNER OF ITS DIFFUSION.

SECT.	PAGE
1. German origin of the English language	1
2. The year 600 (597)	2
3. The <i>Notitia</i> , &c.	3
4. Direction and rate of diffusion	4
5. Extract from Beda	5

CHAPTER II.

CRITICISM OF THE CURRENT NOTIONS RESPECTING THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE FROM GERMANY.

6. Difficulties of investigation	6
7. The current statements	7
8. Inferences, &c.	9
9. Objections	11
10. Chief authorities, Beda	11
11. Anglo-Saxon Chronicle	13
— Suspicious elements	14
12. <i>Eponymic Names</i>	15
13. <i>Port and Wiktgar</i>	16
14. The metrical character of the early pedigrees	18
15. Conclusion	19

CHAPTER III.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—THE PARTS OF GERMANY FROM WHICH IT WAS INTRODUCED.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—THE CARLOVINGIAN ANNALISTS.—THE SLAVES.—THE DANES.—THE FRI-SIANS.—THE SAXONS.

SECT.	PAGE
16. Notices of early Germany	21
— „ Carlovingian writers	22
17. The Slave country	22
18. The Danish country	22
19. <i>Frisia</i> (Friesland)	23
20. Saxony	23
— „ Nordalbingian	23
21. „ Cisalbingian	24
22. The Hessian frontier	25
23. Import of word <i>Saxon</i>	26
24. Frank <i>Saxonia</i>	26

CHAPTER IV.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—CLASSICAL AUTHORS.—TACITUS.—FRISII, ETC.—THE ANGRIVARII.—THE CHERUSCI.—THE ANGLI.

25. Classical authorities	27
26. The <i>Frisii</i> and <i>Chauci</i>	28
27. The <i>Angrivarii</i> , &c.	28
28. The <i>Fosi</i> and <i>Cherusci</i>	29
29. The <i>Angli</i> , <i>Eudoses</i> , &c.	30
30. The <i>Reudigni</i>	30
31. The <i>Varini</i>	32
32. Extract from Ptolemy	33

CHAPTER V.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—CLASSICAL AUTHORS.—PTOLEMY.—THE SAXONS.

33. Saxons of Ptolemy	35
34. Where situated	36

CHAPTER VI.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—CONSIDERATION OF
CHANGES WHICH MAY HAVE TAKEN PLACE BETWEEN THE CLASSICAL
AND THE CARLOVINGIAN PERIODS.

SECT.	PAGE
35. The <i>Frisia</i> and <i>Saxonia</i> of the Carlovingsians	37
36. Changes	38
37. „ explained	39
38. „ <i>real</i> and <i>nominal</i>	40

CHAPTER VII.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—
LANGUAGE.—PRELIMINARY REMARKS.—THE OLD SAXON.

39-40. Stages and dialects	41-43
41-42. <i>Old Saxon</i> and <i>Anglo-Saxon</i>	43-45
43. Old Saxon compositions	45
— Extract from <i>Heliand</i>	46
— „ Carolinian Psalms	48
— The <i>Abrenuntiatio</i>	49

CHAPTER VIII.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.
—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LANGUAGE.—THE FRISIAN.

44. Frisian and Dutch of Holland	51
— Specimens	51-53
45. Stages of the Frisian	54
— Specimens	54-57
46. The Middle-Frisian	57
— Specimen	57
47. Frisian and A. S. compared	58
— Glossarial affinities	65

CHAPTER IX.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS, ETC.—POINTS OF INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—
LOCAL NAMES.

SECT.	PAGE
48. Local geographical names—compound	65
49. List of compounds—affixes	66
50. " prefixes	70
51. Differences of power and form	70
52. Forms in <i>-hám, -heim, -um</i>	71

CHAPTER X.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—POINTS OF INTERNAL
EVIDENCE.—PERSONAL NAMES.

53. Personal names—compound	71
54. Initial and final male and female elements	73
55. Repetition of same initial	74
56. Forms in <i>-ing</i> and <i>-sunu</i>	75
57. Criticism—Danish theory	76
58. Value of Personal and Local names compared	77
59. Laws, customs, &c.	80

CHAPTER XI.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS, ETC.—AGREEMENT BETWEEN EXTERNAL
AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—ORIGINAL SAXON AND FRISIAN AREAS.—
THE SPECIALLY ANGLE PARTS THEREOF.

60. Retrospect	81
61. Comparison of maps	82
62. The <i>-horsts</i> of the Weser	83
63. Holstein	84
64. Lüneburg	84
65. Altmark	85
66. The Hartz	86
67. Western division, &c.	87
68. Forms in <i>-beck</i>	88
69. Hesse-Cassel	88

CONTENTS.

vii

SECT.	PAGE
70. Forms in <i>-um</i>	89
71. How far exclusively Frisian	92
72. The boundary	94
73. Recapitulation	97

CHAPTER XII.

SPECIAL AND DIRECT EVIDENCE OF BEDA.—JUTES OF ISLE OF WIGHT—
HANTS—KENT—WERE THERE ANY?—THE SAXONS.—ANGLN.—
GOTHIC AND FRANK HYPOTHESES.

74. Extract from Beda	98
— „ the A. S. Chronicle	99
75. Criticism on the <i>Wiltwære</i>	99-103
76. The <i>Jutnacyn</i> and <i>Cantuarii</i>	103
77. The Saxons (so-called)	103
78. The district of Anglen	104
79. Frank and Gothic hypotheses	104
80. Hampshire, Gothic; Kent, Frank	106

CHAPTER XIII.

AFFINITIES OF THE ENGLISH WITH THE OTHER LANGUAGES OF GERMANY,
AND WITH THOSE OF SCANDINAVIA.

81. High and Low German	108
82. Mæso-Gothic	109
83. The Scandinavian languages	109
84. The Gothic Group	109

CHAPTER XIV.

THE LANGUAGES ANTERIOR TO—THE LANGUAGES SUBSEQUENT TO—THE
ANGLE (OR ANGLO-SAXON).

85. Analysis	111
86. Keltic group	111
87. Classical group	111
88. Norman French	112

CHAPTER XV.

HISTORICAL AND LOGICAL ELEMENTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

SECT.	PAGE
89. Keltic elements	113
90. Latin of first period	115
91. Danish or Norse	115
92. Latin of second period	116
93. Anglo-Norman elements	116
— Indirect Scandinavian elements	117
94. Latin of third period	118
— „ fourth period	118
95. Greek	118
96. Tables	118-122
97. Miscellaneous elements	122-125
98. Hybrid and new words	125
99. Historical and logical analysis	127

CHAPTER XVI.

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH TO THE ANGLO-SAXON, AND THE STAGES
OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

100. Ancient and modern languages	129
101-103. Stages of English	130-133

CHAPTER XVII.

THE DIALECTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

104. Nothing <i>Saxon</i>	133
105. Danish characteristics	134
QUESTIONS	135

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

CERTAIN PROPERTIES OF THE MORE REMARKABLE ARTICULATE SOUNDS
OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

SECT.	PAGE
106. Spelling and speaking	139
107. Sounds and Syllables	140
108. Vowels	141
109. Divisions	141
110. Sharp and flat sounds	141
111. Continuous and explosive	142
112. General statements	142
113. The sound of <i>h</i>	142
114. System of mutes	142
— Lenex and aspirates	143
— Fourfold character of mutes	144
115. <i>Y</i> and <i>w</i>	144
116. Diphthongs	144
117. Compound sounds	144
118. <i>Ng</i>	144
119. System of Consonants	145
120. Unpronounceable combinations	145
121. Unstable combinations	145
122. Effect of <i>y</i> , &c.	146
123. Double consonants rare	146
124. True aspirates rare	147

CHAPTER II.

ON QUANTITY AND ACCENT.

125. Quantity	148
126–127. Length of vowels and of syllables	148–150
128. Accent	150
129. Distinctive accents	150
130. Emphasis	150

CHAPTER III.

ORTHOEPY AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

SECT.	PAGE
131. Orthœpy and Orthography	151
132. Principles of a perfect orthography	152
133. Violations of them	152
134. Elementary articulations of English	155
135. Insufficiency	156
136. Inconsistency	156
137. Erroneousness	157
138. Redundancy	157
139. Unsteadiness	157
140. Other defects	158
141. The historical propriety, &c.	159
142. Conventional modes of spelling	160
143-147. Historical sketch of English Alphabet	162-165

PART III.

PROSODY.

148. Meaning of word	166
149. Notation of accents	166
150. Measures	167
151. Trisyllabic measures	167
152. Rhyme	168
153. Single rhymes	170
154. Blank metres	171
155. Chief English metres	171-176
QUESTIONS	176

PART IV.
ETYMOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE PROVINCE OF ETYMOLOGY.

SECT.	PAGE
156. Double meaning of the word	177

CHAPTER II.

COMPOSITION.

157-158. Elements of compound words	179-181
159. Definition	181
160. Influence of accent	182
161. On certain obscure compounds	184
162. <i>Peacock, peahen, &c.</i>	185
163. The connective element in compounds	186
164. Improper compounds	186
165. Decomposites	187
166. <i>Time and tide, &c.</i>	187
167. Combinations	187

CHAPTER III.

ON DERIVATION AND INFLECTION.

168. Double meaning of the word	190
169. Derivation proper	191
170. <i>Tip and top, &c.</i>	192
171. Details of derivation	193-200
172. Current and obsolete processes	200

CHAPTER IV.

DIMINUTIVES AND AUGMENTATIVES.

CT.	PAGE
73. Diminutives	201
74. Augmentatives	204

CHAPTER V.

PATRONYMICS.

75. Patronymics	205
---------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VI.

GENTILE FORMS.

76. The word <i>Wales</i>	206
-------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VII.

ON GENDER.

77-179. Forms like <i>domina</i>	207-210
180. <i>The sun in his glory; the moon in her wane</i>	211
181-182. Miscellaneous forms	212-215

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NUMBERS.

183. Numbers in English	215
184. Rule	217
185. Addition of <i>-es</i>	218
186. Words in <i>f</i>	218
187. <i>Pence</i>	220
188. <i>Alms, &c.</i>	220
189. <i>Children</i>	223
190. Form in <i>-en</i>	224
191. <i>Men, feet, &c.</i>	224

CONTENTS.

xiii

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE CASES.

SECT.	PAGE
192-193. Nature of cases	226-231
<i>All the better</i>	231
194. Determination of cases	231
195. Analysis of cases	232
196. Form in <i>-s</i>	233

CHAPTER X.

ON CERTAIN FORMS IN *-ER*.

197. <i>Whether, over, wiser, &c.</i>	233
---	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE COMPARATIVE DEGREE.

198. Degrees	235
199. Comparison of adverbs	236
200. Change of vowel	236
201. Excess of expression	237
202. Sequence in logic, &c.	237
203. Form in <i>-s, &c.</i>	238

CHAPTER XII.

THE SUPERLATIVE DEGREE.

204. Origin	241
205. Forms in <i>m-ost</i>	243

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

206. <i>I, we, us, thou, ye</i>	244
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

THE TRUE REFLECTIVE PRONOUN IN THE GOTHIC LANGUAGES, AND ON ITS ABSENCE IN ENGLISH.

CT.	PAGE
7. How far found in English	246

CHAPTER XV.

THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS, ETC.

8. <i>He, she, it</i>	247
9. <i>She, &c.</i>	249
10. <i>These</i>	250
11. <i>Those</i>	252

CHAPTER XVI.

THE RELATIVE, INTERROGATIVE, AND CERTAIN OTHER PRONOUNS.

12. <i>Who, what, &c.</i>	253
13. <i>Same, &c.</i>	253
14. <i>Whit, &c.</i>	254
15. Derived pronouns	254
16. Compound pronouns	255

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ARTICLES.

17. <i>An, a, the</i>	256
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CARDINAL NUMBERS.

18. How far undeclined	258
----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ORDINAL NUMBERS.

19. <i>Seven, nine, ten</i>	259
<i>Thirteen, thirty</i>	260

CHAPTER XX.

ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE NOUN AND VERB, AND ON THE
INFLECTION OF THE INFINITIVE MOOD.

SECT.	PAGE
220. The verb, how far a noun	260
221. Its declension	262

CHAPTER XXI.

ON DERIVED VERBS.

222. Derivation of verbs	263
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

ON THE PERSONS.

223. Persons in English	265
224-225. Historical view	266-268
226. Form in <i>-t</i>	268
227. <i>Thou spakest, &c.</i>	269

CHAPTER XXIII.

ON THE NUMBER OF VERBS.

228. Numbers in English	270
— <i>Ran, run, &c.</i>	271

CHAPTER XXIV.

ON MOODS.

229. Moods in English	271
---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXV.

ON TENSES IN GENERAL.

230. <i>Ἔρρησα, &c.</i>	272
231. Reduplication	273
232. <i>Weak or strong</i>	274

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SO-CALLED STRONG PRÆTERITES.

ECT.	PAGE
233. Tables	275-279

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE SO-CALLED WEAK PRÆTERITES.

234. <i>Stabbed, &c.</i>	279
235-236. Divisions	280-283
237. <i>Made, had, would, yode</i>	283

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

238. Forms in <i>-ing</i>	284
239. Forms in <i>-ung</i>	285

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE PAST PARTICIPLE.

240. Forms in <i>-en</i>	286
241. <i>Forlorn</i>	287
242. Forms in <i>-d, -t, or -ed</i>	288
243. <i>Y-clept</i>	288

CHAPTER XXX.

DEFECT AND IRREGULARITY.

244-245. Irregularity	290-292
246. Vital and obsolete processes	292
— Processes of necessity, &c.	293
— Ordinary processes	293
— Positive, &c.	294
— Normal, &c.	294
247. Approximate example of Irregularity	295
248. Example of Defect	295

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE VERB-SUBSTANTIVE.

SUCC.		PAGE
249.	Not irregular	296
—	<i>Was</i>	297
—	<i>Be</i>	297
—	<i>Am</i>	298
—	<i>Worth</i>	299

CHAPTER XXXII.

ON THE WORDS *DID* (PROPERLY USED) AND *HIGHT*.

250.	<i>Did</i>	299
251.	<i>Hight</i>	299

CHAPTER XXXIII.

ON THE WORDS *DID* AND *BECAME*, CATACHRESTIC.

252.	<i>Did</i> , catachrestic	300
253.	<i>Became</i> , catachrestic	301

CHAPTER XXXIV.

ON CERTAIN APPARENTLY IRREGULAR PRESENTS.

254.	Præterite presents	301
255.	<i>Dare, durst</i>	303
256.	<i>Own</i> , concedentis	304
257.	<i>Can</i>	306
258.	<i>Shall</i> and <i>should</i>	307
259.	<i>Might</i> from <i>may</i>	307
260.	<i>Minded, mun</i>	308
261.	<i>Wot</i>	309
262.	<i>Ought</i>	309
263.	<i>Must</i>	311
264.	Class natural	311

CHAPTER XXXV.

ON CONJUGATION.

SECT.		PAGE
265.	The <i>Strong</i> conjugation natural	313
266.	Objection to term <i>conjugation</i>	314

CHAPTER XXXVI.

ADVERBS.

267.	Adverbs	318
268.	„ of deflection	319
269.	<i>Darkling</i> , &c.	320
270.	<i>Brightly</i> , &c.	320

CHAPTER XXXVII.

ON CERTAIN ADVERBS OF PLACE.

271.	<i>Here, hither, hence</i> , &c.	321
272.	<i>Yonder, anon</i>	322

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

ON WHEN, THEN, AND THAN.

273.	<i>When, then</i> , &c.	323
------	---------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXXIX.

PREPOSITIONS AND CONJUNCTIONS.

274.	Prepositions	324
275.	Conjunctions	324
276.	<i>Yes, no</i>	325
277.	Particles	325
	QUESTIONS	325

PART V.
SYNTAX.

CHAPTER I.

ON SYNTAX IN GENERAL.

SECT.	PAGE
278. Syntax	328
279. Figures of speech	328
280. Apposition	330
281. Collectiveness as opposed to plurality	330
282. Reduction of complex forms	331
283. True notion of part of speech	331
284. Convertibility	332

CHAPTER II.

SYNTAX OF SUBSTANTIVES.

285. <i>Ellipsis, &c.</i>	333
286. Proper names	334
287. Collocation	334

CHAPTER III.

SYNTAX OF ADJECTIVES.

288. <i>Pleonasm</i>	335
289. Collocation	335
290. Government	335
291. Use of comparative forms	336

CHAPTER IV.

THE TRUE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

292. Personal pronouns	337
293. <i>Dativus Ethicus</i>	337
294. The reflected personal pronoun	337
295. Equivocal reflectives	338

CHAPTER V.

ON THE SYNTAX OF THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS, AND THE PRONOUNS
OF THE THIRD PERSON.

SECT.	PAGE
296. <i>His</i> and <i>her</i>	339

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORD *SELF*.

297. <i>Myself</i> , <i>himself</i> , &c.	340
---	-----

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

298. <i>My</i> and <i>mine</i>	341
--	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RELATIVE PRONOUNS.

299. Relative and antecedent	344
300. <i>The books I want are here</i>	345
301. <i>Solomon the son of David</i> , &c.	346

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN.

302. Direct and oblique questions	346
---	-----

CHAPTER X.

THE RECIPROCAL CONSTRUCTION.

303. The reciprocal construction	347
304. <i>Each other</i> and <i>one another</i>	348

CHAPTER XI.

THE INDETERMINATE PRONOUNS.

SECT.	PAGE
305. <i>They say—on dit—man sagt</i>	349
306. <i>It and there</i>	350

CHAPTER XII.

THE ARTICLES.

307. The articles (<i>a</i> and <i>the</i>)	351
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

THE NUMERALS.

308. Not always of one number	351
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

ON VERBS IN GENERAL.

309. Verbs <i>transitive</i> , &c.	352
--	-----

CHAPTER XV.

THE CONCORD OF VERBS.

310. Rules	354
311. <i>It is I your master who command (commands) you</i>	354
312. Concord of number	357
313. Subject and predicate of different numbers	358

CHAPTER XVI.

ON THE GOVERNMENT OF VERBS.

314. Of two kinds— <i>objective</i> and <i>modal</i>	358
--	-----

CHAPTER XVII.

THE IMPERSONAL VERBS.

315. <i>Me seems</i> , &c.	360
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVIII.

ON THE PARTICIPLES.

SECT.		PAGE
316.	<i>Dying-day</i>	361
317.	<i>I am beaten</i>	361

CHAPTER XIX.

ON THE MOODS.

318.	The infinitive	362
319.	The imperative	363

CHAPTER XX.

ON THE TENSES.

320.	Present	363
321.	Præterite	363

CHAPTER XXI.

SYNTAX OF THE PERSONS OF VERBS.

322.	Their concord	364
------	-------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XXII.

THE AUXILIARY VERBS.

323.	Their classification	366
324.	<i>I have ridden</i>	367
325.	<i>I am to speak</i>	369
326.	<i>I am to blame</i>	369
327.	<i>I am beaten</i>	369

CHAPTER XXIII.

ADVERBS.

328.	Their syntax simple	370
329.	Termination <i>-ly</i>	370

CONTENTS.

xxiii

SECT.	PAGE
330. <i>To walk and ride</i>	371
331. <i>From whence, &c.</i>	371

CHAPTER XXIV.

ON PREPOSITIONS.

332. <i>Climb up a tree</i>	372
333. <i>Part of the body</i>	372

CHAPTER XXV.

CONJUNCTIONS.

334. Conjunctions	372
335. <i>All fled but John</i>	373
336. <i>Because, if</i>	374
337. Conjunctions and moods	375
338. Conditional conjunctions of two sorts	377
339. Use of <i>that</i> —succession of tenses	378
340. Disjunctives	379

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SYNTAX OF THE NEGATIVE.

341. Place of the word <i>not</i>	380
342. Double negative	380
343. Questions of appeal	381

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE CASE ABSOLUTE.

344. <i>He made the best proverbs, him (he) alone excepted</i>	381
--	-----

QUESTIONS	382
---------------------	-----

AN
INTRODUCTION
TO
THE STUDY
OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

PART I.

CHAPTER I.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—LATEST AND EARLIEST DATES FOR ITS INTRODUCTION.—RATE AND MANNER OF ITS DIFFUSION.

§ 1. THE English language came from Germany, having been native and indigenous to no part of any of the British Islands.

The chief population by which the English language was introduced into England from Germany was that of the *Angles*; and the name by which it was first known was that of the *Angle tongue*—*lingua*, or *sermo Anglorum*, in the Latin, *Englisc spræc* in the native language.

The *Angle* language was also called *sermo*, or *lingua Saxonum*; and out of these two synonyms has grown the com-

pound term *Anglo-Saxon*. Hence the Anglo-Saxon is the English in its oldest known form.

The English language stands to the Anglo-Saxon in the relation of a derived language to a mother tongue, or (changing the expression) the English may be called the Anglo-Saxon in its *most modern* form. The Anglo-Saxon, on the other hand, may, with equal propriety, be called the English in its *most ancient* form.

§ 2. The English language came from Germany.

When? No later than A.D. 597; no later, if not earlier. It was in 597 that, sent by Pope Gregory, with Frank interpreters, Augustine first preached to Æthelbert, king of Kent.—

“Erat eo tempore (A.D. 597) rex Ædilberct in Cantia potentissimus, qui ad confinium usque Humbræ, fluminis maximi, quo Meridiani et Septentrionales Anglorum populi dirimuntur, fines imperii tetenderat—Acceperant (*i. e.* the missionaries with Augustine) autem—de *gente Francorum* interpretes.”—*Beda, Hist. Ecclesiast.*, lib. i. c. 25.

Such being the case, we find that there was a population in Britain, A.D. 597, sufficiently considerable to require, on the part of the missionaries who would convert them, a fresh language; a language neither British nor Roman, but German. Hence, A.D. 600 is the latest date that can be assigned to the German settlements in Britain.

That the Germans to whom Augustine preached, and over whom Æthelbert reigned, were, *to a great extent*, the ancestors of the present English, and that they were Germans belonging to the Angle branch of the German stock, is nearly certain. It is, however, by no means certain that they were *exclusively* so. Some may have been Angle. The majority, indeed, may have been so: but some portion may have been Frank, Lombard, Goth, or aught else.

§ 3. The English language came from Germany. When? Not later than A.D. 597; or say, for the sake of round numbers, A.D. 600. Before A.D. 600. How much? The *latest*

possible date of its introduction has been examined. We now examine the *earliest*.

The *earliest* notice of a well-known German population, with a well-known German name,—a population likely to have introduced into England the mother-tongue of the present English,—is in the *Notitia Utriusque Imperii*, the date of which lies between A.D. 369 and A.D. 408.

The *Notitia Utriusque Imperii* contains the following extracts.

A.—PROCONSUL AFRICÆ CUJUS VICARII SEX.

Britanniarum.

COMITES REI MILITARIS SEX.

Britanniarum.

Littoris Saxonici per Britannias. (Cap. i.)

B.—SUB DISPOSITIONE VIRI SPECTABILIS COMITIS LIMITIS SAXONICI PER BRITANNIAM.

Præpositus numeri Fortensium, Othonæ.

Præpositus militum Tungricanorum, Dubris.

Præpositus numeri Turnacensium, Lemanis.

Præpositus equitum Dalmatarum, Branodunensis, Branoduno.

Præpositus equitum Stablesianorum Garionnonensis, Garianono.

Tribunus cohortis primæ Vetasiorum, Regulbio.

Præpositus Legionis II. Aug, Rutupis.

Præpositus numeri Abulcorum, Anderidæ.

Præpositus numeri Exploratorum, Portu Adurni. (Cap. lxxi.)

C.—SUB DISPOSITIONE VIRI ILLUSTRIS MAGISTRI PEDITUM PRÆSENTIALIS, COMITES MILITUM INFRASCRIPTORUM.

Britanniarum.

Littoris Saxonici per Britannias. (Cap. xix.)

These give us a *Littus Saxonicum* in *Britain*, the following one in *Gaul*.

A.—SUB DISPOSITIONE VIRI SPECTABILIS DUCIS TRACTUS ARMORICANI ET NERVICANI.

Tribunus cohortis Primæ Novæ Armoricæ, Grannona in Littore Saxonico. (Cap. xxxvi. § 1.)

B.—SUB DISPOSITIONE VIRI SPECTABILIS DUCIS BELGICÆ SECUNDÆ.

Equites Dalmatæ Marcis in Littore Saxonico. (Cap. xxxvii. § 1.)

In the second and most important of these notices:—

Dubris	= Dover	in Kent.
Lemanis	= Lympne	„ do.
Branodunum	= Brancaster	„ Norfolk.
Gariannonum	= Burgh Castle	„ do.
Regulbium	= Reculvers	„ Kent.
Rutupis	= Richborough	„ do.
Anderida	= Pevensey	„ Sussex.
Portus Adurni	= R. Adur	„ do.

This extends the jurisdiction of the *Comes Littoris Saxonici per Britanniam* from the Wash to the Southampton Water,—there, or thereabouts.

The date, then, of the earliest notice of a well-known German population, with a well-known German name—a population likely to have introduced the mother-tongue of the present English,—is the earliest possible date of the *Notitia*, viz. A.D. 369.

§ 4. The English language came from Germany.

It probably spread from east to west, rather than from west to east.

It spread, too, at the expense and to the obliteration of the previously-existing tongues of Britain.

This means that it wholly and absolutely displaced and superseded them, and that it did *not* mix itself with them, fuse, or amalgamate. Hence, the present English is the genuine descendant of the Angle, and by no means a language intermedi-

ate to, and formed out of, any other—Angle and British, Angle and Latin, Angle and Latino-Britannic. There are a few Latin and a few British words in it, but the tongue itself is originally and essentially Angle.

§ 5. The *rate* at which the Angle spread is uncertain; inasmuch as we do not know the exact date and details of its introduction. When Beda, however, wrote his *Ecclesiastical History* the philological condition of Britain was as follows.

The number of languages spoken within the four seas was five.

“Hæc in præsentī, juxta numerum librorum quibus lex divina scripta est, quinque gentium linguis unam eandemque summæ veritatis et veræ sublimitatis scientiam scrutatur et confitetur, Anglorum videlicet, Brittonum, Scottorum, Pictorum, et Latinorum, quæ meditatione scripturarum, cæteris omnibus est facta communis.”—*Hist. Eccl.*, lib. i. c. 1.

Of these—

a. The Angle was the mother-tongue of the present English; and it should be remembered that this is the earliest notice of it on the part of any Angle writer; for such Beda was, though his History was written in Latin. It should be observed, too, that the language is called *Angle*—not *Saxon*.

b. The British was either the mother-tongue of the present Welsh, or a closely-allied dialect.

c. The Scottish bore the same relation to the present Gaelic.

d. The relations of the Pict have given rise to whole volumes of controversy. They have yet to be determined.

e. The Latin was the ecclesiastical Latin of ecclesiastical Rome.

CHAPTER II.

CRITICISM OF THE CURRENT NOTIONS RESPECTING THE INTRODUCTION OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE FROM GERMANY.

§ 6. The English language came from Germany.

From what part of Germany? From the part where the language called Anglo-Saxon was spoken. Where was this?

If Britain had been peopled from Germany as America and Australia have been peopled from Britain, within either the memory of man, or under the full light of clear, authentic, contemporary and trustworthy history, such a question as this last would have been superfluous, for a moderate amount of information would have supplied the answer. But it was not during a literary period that Keltic Britain became transformed into German England; on the contrary, it was during a time of darkness and disturbance, when the classical literature had died out, and before the literature of Christianity had been developed. The evidence of this will soon be laid before the reader.

Again, if the Anglo-Saxon language had still kept its ground in Germany, even in an altered form, the reply would have been easy; and a reference to the map would have been sufficient. But this is not the case. Throughout the whole length and breadth of Germany there is not one village, hamlet, or family which can show definite signs of descent from the continental ancestors of the Angles of England. There is not a man, woman, or child who can say, *I have pure Angle blood in my veins, and my language is the English.* In no nook or

corner can dialect or sub-dialect of the most provincial form of the German speech be found, which shall have a similar pedigree with the English. The Angles of the Continent are either exterminated or undistinguishably mixed up with the other Germans in proportions more or less large, and in combinations more or less heterogeneous.

Friesland, indeed, if we look to the present condition of the languages allied to the English, and spoken in Germany, gives us the nearest approximation to the mother-country of the mother-tongue of the English. Nevertheless, it is not exactly from *Friesland* that the Anglo-Saxon was derived; so that *Friesland* is only an approximation.

Hence, the *place* from which our language was derived, as well as the *time* at which it was introduced, forms a subject of investigation.

§ 7. This may also seem superfluous. It cannot be denied that the current historians treat the matter differently; that they dispose of it briefly. They give us a definite date—time and place as well. They tell us from what parts of Germany each division of our German invaders came. They tell us who led them. They tell us what parts of the country of the Britons they severally invaded. They give us other details besides. For—

The current histories run as follows—There were more settlements than one, and the details were thus:—

First settlement of invaders from Germany.—In the year 449 A.D. certain invaders from Northern Germany made the first permanent settlement in Britain. Ebbsfleet, in the Isle of Thanet, was the spot where they landed; and the particular name that these tribes gave themselves was that of *Jutes*. Their leaders were Hengist and Horsa. Six years after their landing they had established the Kingdom of Kent; so that the County of Kent was the first district where the original British was superseded by the mother-tongue of the present English, introduced from Germany.

Second settlement of invaders from Germany.—In the year 477 A.D. invaders from Northern Germany made the

second permanent settlement in Britain. The coast of Sussex was the spot whereon they landed. The particular name that these tribes gave themselves was that of *Saxons*. Their leader was Ælla. They established the kingdom of the South Saxons (Sussex); so that the county of Sussex was the second district where the original British was superseded by the mother-tongue of the present English, introduced from Northern Germany.

Third settlement of invaders from Germany.—In the year 495 A.D. invaders from Northern Germany made the third permanent settlement in Britain. The coast of Hampshire was the spot whereon they landed. Like the invaders last mentioned, these tribes were *Saxons*. Their leader was Cerdic. They established the kingdom of the West Saxons (Wessex); so that the county of Hants was the third district where the original British was superseded by the mother-tongue of the present English introduced from Northern Germany.

Fourth settlement of invaders from Germany.—A.D. 530, certain *Saxons* landed in Essex; so that the county of Essex was the fourth district where the original British was superseded by the mother-tongue of the present English, introduced from Northern Germany.

Fifth settlement of invaders from Germany.—These were *Angles* in Norfolk and Suffolk. This settlement, of which the precise date is not known, took place during the reign of Cerdic in Wessex. The fifth district where the original British was superseded by the mother-tongue of the present English was the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk; the particular dialect introduced being that of the *Angles*.

Sixth settlement of invaders from Germany.—In the year 547 A.D. invaders from Northern Germany made the sixth permanent settlement in Britain. The south-western counties of Scotland, between the rivers Tweed and Forth, were the districts where they landed. They were of the tribe of the *Angles*, and their leader was Ida. The south-western parts of Scotland constituted the sixth district where the original British was

superseded by the mother-tongue of the present English, introduced from Northern Germany.

§ 8. Such are the details of the Anglo-Saxon settlements as taken from the fullest work upon the subject, Sharon Turner's *History of the Anglo-Saxons*; and it may be added, that they rest upon *data* which ninety-nine-hundredths of the investigators of the period to which they refer acquiesce in.

Supposing them, then, to be accurate, they only require a few additional facts to make them sufficient for the purposes of criticism. They only require a notice of the different parts of Germany which these three nations came from respectively.

Now, the current doctrines upon these points are as follows:—

That the geographical locality of the Jutes was the Peninsula of Jutland; and—

That that of the Angles was the present Duchy of Sleswick; so that they were the southern neighbours of the Jutes; and—

That that of the Saxons was a small tract north of the Elbe, and some district—more or less extensive—between the Elbe and Rhine.

The correctness of all this being assumed, the further question as to the relation which the different immigrant tribes bore to each other finds place; and it would only be taking up the different problems under investigation in their due order and sequence, if we asked about the extent to which the Jute differed from (or agreed with) the Angle or the Saxon, and the relations of the Angle and the Saxon to each other. Did they speak different languages?—different dialects of a common tongue?—or dialects absolutely identical? Did they belong to the same or to different confederations? Was one polity common to all? Were the civilisations similar?

Questions like these being answered, and a certain amount of mutual difference being ascertained, it would then stand over to inquire whether any traces of this original difference were still to be found in the modern English. Have any provincial dialects characteristics which are Jute rather than Angle? or Angle rather than Saxon? Are (or are not) certain local cus-

toms Saxon rather than Angle, certain points of dialect Angle rather than Saxon, and *vice versâ*? Supposing all this to be accurate, we know where to look for the answers.

In Kent the original British was superseded by the dialect of the Jutes—there being also Jutes in parts of Hants, and in the Isle of Wight; and—

In Sussex the original British was superseded by the Saxon of Ælla's followers; and—

In the following counties it was the Saxon of Cerdic that displaced the British—Hants, Dorset, Wilts, Somerset, Surrey, Gloster, Buckinghamshire; these counties constituting the important kingdom of the West Saxons (Wessex); and—

It was by the extension of the Saxon introduced by the invaders of A.D. 530 that the original British of Essex, Middlesex, and part of Hertfordshire was superseded; and—

It was by the extension of the language introduced by the Angle invaders of Norfolk and Suffolk that the original British of Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely, and of parts of Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire, was superseded; and lastly—

It was by the extension of the language introduced by the Angles of the south of Scotland that the original British was superseded in the following counties—Northumberland, Westmoreland, Cumberland, Cheshire, Lancashire, Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, and the North Midland counties.

Hence, all, as aforesaid, being accurate, we should seek—

For the characteristic *differentiæ* of the Jutes, in Kent, part of Sussex, and the Isle of Wight;

For those of Saxons in Sussex, Essex, Hants (Wessex), and Middlesex;

For those of the Angles in Norfolk, Suffolk, Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland, &c.

Or, changing the expression:—

The *differentiæ* of the people of Kent, part of Sussex, and the Isle of Wight (if any) would be explained by the *differentiæ* of the original Jute immigrants;

Those of the rest of Sussex, Wessex, Essex, and Middlesex, by those of the Saxons ;

Those of the people of Norfolk, &c., by those of the Angles.

As to the *Saxon* portion of England, everything would be transparently clear, inasmuch as three English counties, at the present moment, take their name from the word *Seaxe* (*Saxons*), and preserve the denomination of three *Saxon* kingdoms—*viz.* *Es-sex*, *Sus-sex*, and *Middle-sex*. There is no doubt as to the analysis and import of these compounds. *Essex* is a slightly-modified form of East Seaxe (East Saxons), *Middlesex* of Middle Seaxe, and *Sussex* of Suð-Seaxe (South Saxons); indeed when we find them in the pages of a Latin writer, their equivalents are *Orientalis Saxones*, *Australis Saxones*, and *Mediterranei Saxones*. Besides these, there is a fourth compound of *-seaxe* (*-sex*) which is now obsolete. The counties of Hants, Wilts, Berks, Gloster, Dorset, with parts of the counties adjacent, originally constituted the kingdom of the *West Saxons*, or *Wes-sex*.

§ 9. Such are the usual details. But, it must be added, that, in order to give them the value of true and authentic history, a great many objections have to be removed. In other words, the sufficiency of the materials for the early part of the Anglo-Saxon period must be taken for granted. But these the present writer by no means admits. Neither is he the first who has demurred to them. He and others have hesitated to adopt either the date of A.D. 449, or the triple division into Angles, Saxons, and Jutes. Still less have the several districts of Germany, whence these three supposed populations respectively proceeded to Britain, been considered as finally determined. On the contrary, the *date* of the migration has made one subject for criticism, whilst the locality whence it originated will make another.

§ 10. The chief authorities for the usual details respecting the earlier Anglo-Saxons are—

a. The Ecclesiastical History of Beda—the *Venerable Bede*, as he is generally called.

b. The so-called Saxon Chronicle.

Beda is the most important. His work is dedicated to Ceolwulf, king of Northumberland, who reigned from A.D. 729 to A.D. 737.

No previous history of the kind existed, so that it was by special applications to his contemporary ecclesiastics that *Beda* got his facts, each application being made for the history of some particular diocese or district. Thus—

For *Kent*, *Albinus*, abbot of Canterbury, was the chief authority. He forwarded to *Beda*, by a priest of the Church of London named *Nothelm*, such statements as “vel monumentis literarum vel seniorum traditione cognoverat.”

Nothelm, too, visited Rome, and brought thence those papal letters of *Gregory* and others, which have already been noticed.

Albinus, also, gave some notices of some of the districts around the kingdom of *Kent*—“diligenter omnia quæ in ipsa Cantuariorum provincia vel etiam in contiguis eidem regionibus—cognoverat.”

For the *West-Saxons* (*Wessex*), *Sussex*, *Isle of Wight*, *Danihel*, bishop of *Wessex*, alive when *Beda* wrote, “nonnulla de historia ecclesiastica provinciæ ipsius simul et proximæ illi Australium Saxonum nec non et Vectæ Insulæ litteris mandata declaravit.” To this we may add certain notices from the Abbot *Albinus*.

East Anglia—Norfolk and Suffolk—“Porro in provincia Orientalium Anglorum quæ fuerint gesta ecclesiastica, partim ex scriptis vel traditione priorum, partim reverentissimi abbatis *Esi* relatione comperimus.”

Notices also were supplied by the Abbot *Albinus*, the authority for *Kent*.

Mercia.—The details here were from the monks of *Lestingham*:—“Diligenter a fratribus monasterii quod ab ipsis conditum *Læstingæu* (*sic*) cognominatur agnovimus.”

Some of these notices extended to the history of *Essex*.

For the province of *Lincoln* the evidence was separate:—“At

vero in provincia Lindissi quæ sint gesta erga fidem Christi, quæve successio sacerdotalis extiterit, vel literis reverentissimi antistitis Cynibercti, vel aliorum fidelium vivorum viva voce didicimus."

Northumberland.—Beda himself worked at the history here:—"Quæ autem in Nordanhymbrorum provincia ex quo tempore fidem Christi perceperunt usque ad præsens per diversas regiones in ecclesia sint acta, non uno quolibet auctore, sed fideli innumerorum testium qui hæc scire vel meminisse poterant adsertione cognovi, exceptis his quæ per meipsum nosse poteram. Inter quæ notandum, quod ea quæ de sanctissimo patre et antistite Cudbercto vel in hoc volumine vel in libello gestorum ipsius conscripsi, partim ex eis quæ de illo prius a fratribus ecclesiæ Lindisfarnensis scripta reperi, adsumpsi simpliciter fidem historiæ quam legebam accommodans, partim vero ea quæ certissima fidelium virorum adtestatione per me ipse cognoscere potui sollerter adjicere curavi. Lectoremque suppliciter obsecro, ut si qua in his quæ scripsimus aliter quam se veritas habet posita reperit, non hoc nobis imputet, qui, quod vera lex historiæ est, simpliciter ea quæ fama vulgante collegimus ad instructionem posteritatis literis mandare studuimus."

Add to these a life of St. Germanus, Gildas, and such of the later classical writers who (like Orosius) are as accessible to us as they were to Beda, and we have the authorities for the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Whatever may have been the learning of the author, and however much he may have been the luminary of his age, his materials are neither better nor worse than this. Indeed, it is only for Northumberland that Beda is, himself, answerable. The real evidence is that of Albinus, Daniel, the monks of Lestingham, &c.

§ 11. The so-called *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* has always commanded the attention of historians more than any other similar work; and this on good grounds. For the later years of the Anglo-Saxon period, it is our only full and satisfactory

document; so that its simple historical value is high. But, besides this, it is written in the Anglo-Saxon language—so that it has a philological value as well. Nevertheless, it cannot be taken as an *historical* authority for the *pagan* period, or the period anterior to A.D. 597.

For this, and it may be added for a much later period, the work presents several very suspicious elements.

For the first of these the notice is due to Lappenberg, who remarks that, in the early history of the kingdom of Kent the chief events occur at a regular period either of 8 years or some multiple of 8. Thus:—

Hengist lands	A.D. 449.
The Battle of Creganford. . .	457.
„ Wippedsfleet . . .	465.
The Third battle	473.

Just twenty-four years (8×3) after Hengist, dies Æsc, his son.

The proper names are not less suspicious than the dates. The names of the Anglo-Saxons who appear subsequent to the introduction of Christianity, the names that are found in the Anglo-Saxon charters, the names on the Anglo-Saxon coins, the names of undoubtedly real individuals, living under the light of history, are eminently well-marked in character. They are chiefly compounds, and their elements (though not always capable of a satisfactory interpretation) are evidently referable to the Anglo-Saxon language. I open a volume of the Codex Diplomaticus, hap-hazard (vol. ii. p. 173), and find the following list, as an illustration:—Ælfwine, Eadulf, Cunan, Ælfheh, Sigelm, Cenwald, Beornstan, Oda, Wynsige, Wulfhun, Deoðerd, Cyneferð, Tidelm, Cynsige, Eadward, Æsberht, Wired, Ælfwald, Osferð, Aldred, Uhtred, Æsberht, Ælfstan, &c.

I find the same in the list of kings from Egberht downwards:—Ecerht, Æthelwulf, Æthelbald, Æthelbert, Æthelred,

Ælfred, Eadwerd, Æthelstan, Eadmund, Eadred, Eadwig, Eadgar, &c.

I will not say that *no* such names occur anterior to A.D. 600. A *few* such are to be found. But, as a general rule, the names that occur anterior to the introduction of Christianity are names which do not occur subsequently; and (*vice versâ*) the names which appear in the truly historical times are not found in the doubtful period.

But Christianity may have effected the change. This explanation would be valid if the later names were like John, James, &c.,—scriptural designations. But they are not. More than this. Some of them, such as Edwin, Elfwine, are found amongst the allied German populations of the Continent, and that during the Pagan period.

It must be remembered, then, that there are no Hengists, Horsas, Æscs, Cissas, Stufs, Ports, &c., when we come to the times of the Alfreds, and Edwards, and no Alfreds and Edwards when we are amongst the Ports and Stufs, &c.

§ 12. *The eponymic character of certain pre-historic names.*—It has been seen what certain names belonging to the Pagan portion of the so-called Anglo-Saxon history are *not*. They are not of the same character as those that belong to the historic era.

Let us now ask what they *are*.

They are, in some cases, what is called *eponymies* (ἐπωνύμια); or, if we prefer the adjective, we may say that they are *eponymic*, *i. e.* names never borne by individuals at all, but coined by certain speculators in history, archæology, or genealogy, under the hypothesis that the names of certain facts or places are accounted for by the supposition that certain individuals, identically or similarly named, originated them. In this way *Hellen* is the eponymus of the *Hellenes* (or Greeks); not that such a progenitor ever existed, but that some early speculator on the origin of the Greek nation conceived that he did, and accounted for a name and nation (the nation being, in his eyes, but a large family) accordingly.

Our illustrations, however, may be taken from nearer home, from the facts of the question before us.

A locality, with certain traces of some action that took place in its neighbourhood, gives origin to a name—a name of an individual who may never have existed. A memorial of unknown import has to be accounted for, and a hero, accordingly, does or suffers something on the spot in question, and thereby gives his name to it. Thus, from the marks of a burial, and the name *Horsted*, we get the individual *Horsa*. The chronicler says, that the place was called from the man, the critic that the presence of the man was imagined to suit the place.

Beda's wording of Nothelm's or Albinus' report, is as follows:—"Duces fuisse perhibentur eorum primi duo fratres Hengist et Horsa; *e quibus Horsa postea occisus in bello a Brittonibus, hactenus in Orientalibus Cantie partibus monumentum habet suo nomine insigne.* Erant autem filii Victgilsii, cujus pater Vitta, cujus pater Vecta, cujus pater Voden, de cujus stirpe multarum provinciarum regium genus originem duxit."—*Hist. Eccl.* i. 15.

The words beginning with *v* are put in italics for a reason which will soon appear.

§ 13. Horsa's name is less suspicious than another; that of *Port*, as it appears in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle:—

A.D. 501.—Hér cóm *Port* on Bretene, and his ii suna Bieda and Mægla mid ii scipum, on þære stowe þe is gecueden *Portesmuða* [and sona land namon] and [þær] ofslogon anne giongne Brettisse monnan, swiðe æðelne monnan.

A.D. 501.—This year *Port* and his two sons, Bieda and Mægla, came to Britain with two ships, at a place which is called Portsmouth, and they soon effected a landing, and they there slew a young British man of high nobility.

Now *Portus* must have been the name of *Portsmouth* long anterior to A.D. 501; inasmuch as it was a Latin, and not an Angle word.

But the landing of a man named *Port* at a place called *Portus* is no impossibility. Granted. It is only highly improbable—the improbability being heightened by the strangeness of the name itself.

The improbability is also heightened by the following fact:—

Just as a man named *Port*, hits (out of all the landing-places in England) upon a spot with a name like his own, a man named *Wihlgar* does the same.

A.D. 530.—Her Cerdic and Cýnric genamon *Wihle* Ealand, and ofslogon feala men on *Wihlgarasbyrg*.

A.D. 530.—This year Cerdic and Cynric conquered the island of *Wight*, and slew many men at *Wihlgaras-byrg*.

A.D. 534.—Her Cerdic [se forma West-Sexana cyng] forðferðe, and Cýnric his sunu [feng to rice, and] ricsode forð xxvi wintra, and hie saldon hiera tuæm nefum Stufe and *Wihlgare* [eall] *Wihle*-Ealand.

A.D. 534.—This year Cerdic, the first king of the West-Saxons, died, and Cynric, his son, succeeded to the kingdom, and reigned from that time twenty-six years; and they gave the whole island of *Wight* to their two nephews, Stuf and *Wihlgar*.

A.D. 544.—Her *Wihlgar* forðferðe, and hiene mon bebyrgde on Wyht-gara-burg.

A.D. 544.—This year *Wihlgar* died, and they buried him in *Wihlgara-byrg*.

Now *Wihle* is the Anglo-Saxon form of the name of *Vectis* = Isle of *Wight*, a name found in the Latin writers long anterior to A.D. 530.

And *gar* is a form of the word *wære*, (or *wæras*) = *inhabitants*.

Hence, just as *Kent* = the *County Kent*, and, *Cantware* = the inhabitants of that county (or *Canticolæ*) so does *Wihle* = *Vectis*, and *Wihlgare* = *Vecticolæ*.

Yet the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle makes it a man's name.

The names of Port and Wihtgar give us the strongest facts in favour of the suggested hypothesis, viz :—the *ex post facto* evolution of personal names out of local ones.

The following instances are less conclusive.

A.D. 477.—Her côm Ælla to Bretten-lond and his iiii suna, *Cymen*, and Wlencing, and *Cissa* mid iiii scipum, on þa stowe þe is neunned *Cymenesora*, and þær ofslogon monige Walas, and sume on fleame bedrifon on þone wudu þe is genemned *Andredes-leage*.

A.D. 477.—This year Ælla, and his three sons, *Cymen*, and Wlencing, and *Cissa*, came to the land of Britain with three ships, at a place which is named *Cymenes-ora*, and there slew many Welsh, and some they drove in flight into the wood that is named *Andreds-lea*.

A.D. 495.—Her cuomon twegeu aldormen on Bretene, *Cerdic* and *Cynric* his sunu mid v. scipum in þone stede þe is gecueden *Cerdices-ora*, and þy ilcan dæge gefuhtun wid Walum.

A.D. 495.—This year two ealdormen came to Britain, *Cerdic*, and *Cynric* his son, with five ships, at a place which is called *Cerdics-ora*, and the same day they fought against the Welsh.

The names of two out of three of the sons of Ælla are the names of geographical localities. Thus, the sons are Wlencing, *Cymen*, and *Cissa*, and the names are *Cymenes-ora*, and *Cissan-ceaster*, the old forms of the present *Keynsor*, and *Chichester*. This is suspicious.

It becomes more so when we find that the second elements are Latin, *e. g.* *-ora* in *Cymenes-ora*, and *-ceaster* in *Cissan-ceaster*.

§ 14. *The metrical character of the early pedigrees.*—In the extract about Horsa and his burial-place, the names of his ancestors all began with V—*Victgils*, *Vitta*, *Vecta*, &c.

How come the alliterations? Because the pedigrees are pieces of poetry rather than history; it being the rule in Anglo-Saxon prosody that, in every two lines, two words should begin with the same letter.

But Horsa's pedigree was no more alliterative than many others. *E. g.* :—

1.

Ida wæs Flopping,
Eoppa Esing,
Esa wæs Ingwing,
Ingwi Angenwitting,
Angenwit Alocing,
Aloc Benocing,
Benoc Branding,
Brand Bældæging,
Bældag Wodening,
Woden Freoðolafing,
Freoðolaf Freoðowulfing,
Freoðowulf Finning,
Finn Godulfing,
Godulf Geating.

A. S. Chronicle, A.D. 547.

2.

Cerdic wæs Cynrices foder,
Cerdic Elesing,
Elesa Esling,
Esla Giwising,

Giwis Wiging,
Wig Freawining,
Freawine Freoðogaring,
Freoðogar Branding,
Brand Bældæging,
Bældag Wodening.

A. S. Chronicle, A.D. 552.

3.

Ælla wæs Yffing,
Yffe Uxfreaing,
Uxfrea Wilgiling,
Wilgils Westerfalcning,
Westerfalena Sæfugling,
Sæfulg Sæbalding,
Sæbald Sigegating,
Sigegat Swæbdæging,
Swæbdæg Sigegaring,
Sigegar Wægðæging,
Wægðag Wodening,
Woden Friðowulfing.

A. S. Chronicle, A.D. 560

Ceolwulf's genealogy, to be found under A.D. 597, is equally alliterational; so is Penda's, A.D. 626; so are many others.

§ 15. It is not a history of Great Britain that I am writing, but one of the English language. Hence the *whole* question as to the literary and historical value of the early writers is too wide. The extent to which they are sufficient or insufficient to prove certain specific facts is all that need be investigated; and the character of such facts is the measure of the amount of criticism necessary to invalidate their authority. One of these facts (real or supposed) is the date of A.D. 449, for the *first* landing of the first ancestors of the present English. It is

only in appearance that this is a simple one. That certain Germans landed on a certain part of the coast of Kent is the simple, straightforward part of it. That they were the *first* who did so is quite a different matter, involving the fact that no one else had ever done so before, and also involving the notoriously difficult proof of a *negative*.

a. Now it is submitted that the current accounts are not sufficiently early for the proofs of a *negative* assertion.

b. It is also submitted that they are not sufficient for the proof of an improbability.

c. It is also submitted that they are not valid when opposed by any conflicting fact. Still less—

d. Are they valid against any combination of the previous elements of doubt—*e. g.* the proof of a negative, with evidence on the other side.

The special application of these doctrines, as far as it has hitherto gone, is to ignore the date, A.D. 449, for that of the landing of the *first* invaders from Germany. More than this is unnecessary; and the arguments which have gone further in the invalidation of our early accounts are arguments *ex abundanti*. Of these early accounts I think meanly, but the present chapter impugns them only to the extent indicated.

CHAPTER III.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—THE PARTS OF GERMANY FROM WHICH IT WAS INTRODUCED.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—THE CARLOVINGIAN ANNALISTS.—THE SLAVES.—THE DANES.—THE FRISIANS.—THE SAXONS.

§ 16. THERE is no such thing as a definite and undeniable chronology for the details of the Anglo Saxon conquest of Britain; *i. e.* there is no account so authentic as to preclude criticism.

Neither is there such a thing as an ethnological map of Germany for that period; nor yet is there any accurate geographical description.

A sketch of the evidence of this has just been given; and, if the writer have made out his case, the whole early history of the English Language—and we may add, of the English People—has to be got at by circuitous and indirect methods, by criticism, by inference.

Our evidence is of two sorts:—

The testimony of writers, and the comparison of language, manners, customs, laws, &c. In other words, there is *external* evidence and *internal* evidence.

I begin with the former.

On the subject of *date* we have had two extreme points—the earliest probable time, and the latest. From which shall we reckon? From both.

If we lay out of consideration a few isolated notices, we shall find that the external testimony to the history, geography, and topography of Germany for the nearest times *subsequent*

to the Angle occupation of England, begins with the beginning of the Carlovingian dynasty, and lies in the writings of those authors who have been most employed on the acts of Charlemagne. They consist, for the most part, in chronicles, under the titles of *Annales Laurissenses*, *Annales Einhardi*, *Annales Mettenses*, *Annales Fuldenses*, *Chronicon Moissiacense*, *Annales Petaviani*, *Alamannici*, *Guelfyrbytanii*, *Nazarii*, copying more or less from either each other or from some common source, and consequently relating nearly the same events. I do not say that these give no good light. I only say that it is the best we can get. They are to be found in Pertz's *Monumenta Historica Germanica*. They all (or nearly all) emanate from Frank writers—from Christian Franks.

The latter half of the seventh century is the time, and Northern Germany the place, under consideration. Christianity, and the influence of Roman civilisation, have extended no further in the direction of the Elbe than the northern boundary of the empire of the Franks; and this is why our information comes through Frank sources. This, too, is why our nomenclature is Frank—an important point to bear in mind. There is Paganism, which has few or no records, on one side, and there is a Christian empire, with a nascent literature, on the other. The notices of the former come through the latter. We must look, then, on ancient Northern Germany—the part which contains the Angles—as the Franks looked at it.

Those parts of modern Germany which lay to the north of their own frontier, parts which the Franks eventually succeeded in reducing, but which at first they only knew as the country of enemies and Pagans, were four: 1. The country of the Slavi. 2. Dania. 3. Frisia. 4. Saxonia.

§ 17. *The country of the Slavi*.—Roughly speaking, this extended as far westward as the Lower Elbe and Saale; a fact that should always be before the eyes of the German archæologist and ethnologist.

§ 18. *Dania*.—This, in the ninth century, was the Kingdom of Godofrid, bounded on the side of Germany by the

Eyder (there or thereabouts). Hence, its most southern part was the present Duchy of Sleswick. Saxony began in Holstein, but Holstein was Saxon only in its western half. The eastern was Slavonic.

§ 19. *Frisia*.—Roughly speaking, the present districts of Dutch Friesland, Groningen, and East Friesland with part of Oldenburg, give us the Frisia of the Carolingian writers. Meppen on the Ems, when it first gets mentioned, is in *Saxony*:—"Oppidum est in Saxoniam notum quam plurimis, *Meppen* nominatum, in cujus vicinia dum antistes sanctus Frisiam pergens, devenerat," &c.—*Vitá Sancti Ludgeri*, Pertz, vol. ii. p. 419.

§ 20. *Saxonia*.—Saxonia fell into four parts; or, if we prefer a different classification, into two *main*, and six *subdivisions*. There was the Saxony *beyond the Elbe*, and there was the Saxony *on this side of the Elbe*. The former will be noticed first.

The Nordalbingians.—This is a compound of the word *Nord* (= *North*), and *Albis* (= *Elbe*), and the termination *ing* is a gentile form. It means the certain populations *north of the Elbe*. This we get from the elements of the word itself; but it does not mean all the tribes beyond that river; on the contrary, it is restricted to those between the Elbe and the Eyder,—those north of the former and south of the latter. Again, it means those between the *Lower Elbe* and the *Lower Eyder*; in other words, the occupants of the *western* side of the present Duchy of Holstein.

I think that this gives us the *Germans* of Western, as opposed to the Slavonians of Eastern Holstein, and as opposed to the Scandinavians (Danes or Jutes) of Sleswick.

An unknown poet of the ninth (tenth?) century, who is on good reasons considered to have been a Saxon, and who is quoted as *Poeta Saxo*, writes:—

"Saxonum (*sic*) populus quidam, quos claudit ab Austro
Albis sejunctim positos Aquilonis ad axem :
Hos *Nordalbinges* patrio sermone vocamus."

The Nordalbingians fell into three divisions:—

1. The *Thiedmarsii Thiatmarsgi*, or *Ditmarshers*, whose capital was Meldorp—“*primi ad Oceanum Thiatmarsgi, et eorum ecclesia Mildindorp.*”

2. The *Holsati, Holtzati*, or *Holtsetan*, from whom the present Duchy of Holstein takes its name, “*dicti a sylvis quas incolunt.*” The river Sturia separated the Holsatians from—

3. The *Stormarii*, or people of *Stormar*; of whom Hamburg was the capital.—*Adam Bremens., Hist. Eccles. c. 61.*

Another name for these Nord-albingian Saxons is, *Transalbingian = Saxons beyond the Elbe.*

The author just quoted, Adam of Bremen, is somewhat later than the times under notice; nevertheless, his text may serve as a commentary upon the lines of the *Poeta Saxo*.

§ 21. *The Saxons on this side of the Elbe.*—These are the Saxons between the Elbe, the Frisian frontier, and the Frank frontier. Concerning them the *Poeta Saxo* writes:—

“*Generalis habet populos divisio ternos ;
Insignita quibus Saxonia floruit olim ;
Nomina nunc remanent virtus antiqua recessit.
Denique Westfulos vocitant in parte manentes
Occidua ; quorum non longe terminus amne
A Rheno distat ? regionem solis ad ortum
Inhabitaut Osterleudi, quos nomine quidam
Ostvalos alii vocitant, confinia quorum
Infestant conjuncta suis gens perfida Sclavi.
Inter predictos media regione morantur
Angarii, populus Saxonum tertius ; horum
Patria Francorum terris sociatur ab Austro,
Oceanoque eadem conjungitur ex Aquilone.*”

Hence, the Cis-albian Saxony of the ninth century falls into three divisions, two of which are denoted by geographical or political designations, and one by the name of a native population.

The present district of *West-phalia* was Saxon; its occupants being called *West-falahi, West-falai, West-fali*. Contrasted with these, the *East-phalians (Ost-falai, Ost-falahi,*

Ost-fali, Oster-leudi, Austre-leudi, Aust-rasii), stretched towards the Elbe.

Between the two, descendants of the *Angri-varii* of Tacitus and ancestors of the present Germans of the parts about *Engern*, lay the *Ang-arii*, or *Angr-arii*.

The notices of this Cis-albingian Saxony are numerous, but uniform. They generally tell us of a warlike visitation on the part of Charlemagne, Padersborn being an important locality.

“In hoc anno domnus (*sic*) rex Karolus collecto exercitu venit in Saxoniam in loco qui dicitur *Patresbrunnas*, ibi castrametatus; inde etiam mittens Karolum filium suum trans fluvium Wiseram, ut quotquot isdem partibus de infidelibus suis invenissent, suæ servituti subjugaret; quod et idem gloriosus, subjugatis his omnibus, cum triumpho rediens perpetravit.”

§ 22. *The Hessian Frontier*.—Paderborn has been seen to be a sort of frontier town. This gives us one approximation to the Franco-Saxon frontier. The valley of the Diemel supplies another. Hesse, although other than Frank in respect to its dialects, was Frank in its political relations; but not wholly. The valley of the Diemel was half Saxon.

In the language of the times, there were two *pagi*; one on the Upper Diemel, which was Frank, and the other on the Lower Diemel, which was Saxon.

The former was—

“ ——— Francorum pagus qui dicitur Hassi.”—*Poeta Saxo*.

It was also pagus Hessi *Franconicus*. The latter was pagus Hessi *Saxonicus*.

The town of Wolfsanger was both Frank and Saxon:—“ ad villam cujus est vocabulum Vulvisangar quam tunc temporis *Franci et Saxones pariter habitare* videbantur.”—*Dipl. Carol. Magn. apud Falke*, p. 377. See Zeuss in voce *Hessi*.

Without, at present, going further into the attempt to ascertain the exact boundaries of the *Saxonia* of the ninth century, we may say that Hanover, Westphalia, and Holstein

were the chief districts which it comprised—Hanover, Westphalia, and Holstein, as opposed to Friesland, Sleswick, and the Middle Rhine, these being Frisian, Danish, and Frank, respectively.

§ 23. This gives us an approximation to a boundary; but it does not determine the import of the word Saxon.

It was a *political*, rather than an ethnological term; Nordalbingian being *geographical* rather than either political or ethnological.

It comprised the country of the Angles; yet (a point to be remembered) the name Angle occurs rarely (very rarely) in the Carolingian literature. The following is, perhaps, the most important extract that contains it:—"A.D. 786. Cum et hiemis tempus expletum, et sanctum pascha in Astiniaco villa fuisset a rege celebratum, exercitum in *Britanniam cis-marinam* mittere constituit. Nam cum ab *Anglis* et Saxonibus Britannia insula fuisset invasa, magna pars incolarum ejus mare trajiciens, in ultimis Gallie finibus Venetorum et Coriosolarum regiones occupavit."—*Einhard, Annales*.

§ 24. As to the subordinate divisions the boundaries between the Westphalians, Angrarii, and Eastphalians, they are uncertain. Probably the lines of frontier were the *natural* ones formed by the two portions of the Teutobergerwald which contain the head-waters of the Lippe.

Neither is the frontier between Eastphalia and the Slavonians certain. It is generally considered to have been the Elbe. It is certain, however, that at one time there were Slavonians to the *west*, and that at another there were Germans *east* of that river. The details are not very important, and will be reverted to hereafter.

More important is the determination of the Franco-Saxon boundary. On the west was the River Ysel, and the parts about Deventer; Guelderland being Frank, and Overyssel, probably, a Debateable Land between the Franks, Saxons, and Frisians. At any rate the line of demarcation lay here, or hereabouts.

Further to the east lay Herisburg (Eresburg), a frontier town, or, at least, a town not far from the frontier, and (more famous than Eresberg) Paderborn. The valley of the Diemel was divided between the Saxons and Hessians.

I repeat, that the divisions now under notice are political rather than ethnological.

CHAPTER IV.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY FROM WHICH IT WAS INTRODUCED.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—CLASSICAL AUTHORS—TACITUS—FRISII, ETC.—THE ANGRIVARIJ.—THE CHERUSCI.—THE ANGLI.

§ 25. FOR the greater part of the external evidence to the history, geography, and topography of Germany, for the nearest times *anterior* to the Angle occupation of England, we begin with Ptolemy, and end with Strabo, going backwards.

The later and earlier writers are of minor importance. They will be noticed as occasion requires; but the real lights come from the works belonging to the period just indicated. Hence, the texts for present consideration are almost exclusively those of Strabo, Velleius, Paterculus, Tacitus, and Ptolemy. From Cæsar, as an earlier writer, and from Ammianus Marcellinus, as a later one (as well as from some others) we get occasional notices; notices sometimes of great value. The main texts, however, are those of the writers just named; and of these Tacitus and Ptolemy most especially.

What was that part of Germany, in the time of Strabo, Tacitus, and Ptolemy, which, in the Carlovingian period, was named, by the Franks, Saxoniam, or rather *Saxonia + Frisia*

—the land of the Saxons and the Frisians—the land of the blood and language nearest to that of the Anglo-Saxon invaders of Britain?

In this question one fact must stand prominent and transparently clear;—*viz.* that in the eyes of Tacitus, Strabo, and all the writers anterior to Ptolemy, *no part of it was what the whole was afterwards, i. e. no part was Saxon—so called.*

Ptolemy is the first author who gives us that name, and he gives it only a partial—very partial—application.

§ 26. With this preliminary we may take the Frank or Carolingian divisions in detail, and ask how they were occupied in the first and second centuries. Doing this, it is convenient to begin with that tract of land and that population which has retained its name in the most permanent and unaltered form. This gives us—

The *Frisii* of Tacitus who lay in front of the Angrivarii and Chamavi:—"Angrivarios et Chamavos a tergo Dulgibini et Chasuari cludunt, aliæque gentes haud perinde memoratæ. A fronte Frisii excipiunt. 'Majoribus minoribusque Frisiis' vocabulum est, ex modo virium: utræque nationes usque ad Oceanum Rheno prætexuntur, ambiuntque immensos insuper lacus, et Romanis classibus navigatos."

The Chauci.—Contiguous to the Frisians, and (like the Frisians) extended along the coast, though dipping further inland, came the *Chauci*:—"Chaucorum gens, quamquam incipiat a Frisiis, ac partem litoris occupet, omnium, quas exposui, gentium lateribus obtenditur, donec in Chattos usque sinuetur. Tam immensum terrarum spatium non tenent tantùm Chauci, sed et implent: populus inter Germanos nobilissimus."

The Frisians reached to the Ems, the Chauci to the Elbe.—*Ptolemy*, ii. 11.

§ 27. The two divisions, which the Carolingian Franks called Westphalia and Eastphalia, were divided by the country of the Angarii. This in Tacitus is found in the fuller form—*Angrivarii*.

Name for name, they are the Germans of the parts about Engern : the Angarii of the "mid-region."

"Inter prædictos media regione morantur
Angarii, populus Saxonum (sic) tertius."

West of this "mid-region" lay—

The *Chamavi*, *Dulgubini*, *Chasuarii*.—These were, in the time of Tacitus, the occupants of what was, in the time of the Carolingians, *West-phalia* ; but, as it is *not* the Westphalian part of the *Saxonia* of the Franks which has the best claim to be considered the mother country of the Anglo-Saxons, the Chamavi, Dulgubini, and Chasuarii are merely mentioned by name. As *Old-Saxons* they are of interest, but not as *Anglo-Saxons*.

§ 28. If we now ask what names are found in that part of Germany which the Carolinian Franks called Eastphalia, we may say that for the parts that lay on each side of a line drawn from Minden to Brunswick, the parts truly and duly east of the Angarii—for the parts which were undoubtedly called the lands of the Ostphali—the occupancy in the time of Tacitus was in the hands of the—

a. Fosi, and the—

b. Cherusci.—Respecting these, Tacitus writes:—"In latere Chaucorum Chattorumque, Cherusci nimiam ac marcentem diu pacem illacessiti nutrierunt: idque jucundius, quàm tutius fuit; quia inter impotentes et validos falsò quiescas: ubi manu agitur, modestia ac probitas nomina superioris sunt. Ita qui olim 'boni æquique Cherusci,' nunc 'Inertes ac stulti' vocantur: Chattis victoribus fortuna in sapientiam cessit. Tracti ruinâ Cheruscorum et Fosi, contermina gens, adversarum rerum ex æquo socii, cùm in secundis minores fuissent."

§ 29. But that part of the Eastphalia of the Carolingian Franks which is cut by a line drawn from Minden to Brunswick, and which passed through the country of the Cherusci and Fosi, although the country of a population closely allied to the population which invaded Britain, is not exactly the

country of the actual invaders. For this we must look to a line drawn from Verden to Luneberg.

Of this the occupancy, in the time of Tacitus, is a matter of comparative certainty for one population only; but that is an all-important one—the Angli.

The Angli are not mentioned alone in Tacitus, whose list runs thus,—Angli, Varini, Reudigni, Aviones, Eudoses, Suardones, Nuithones. Hence, what applies to the Angli applies to the *Eudoses*, *Aviones*, *Reudigni*, *Suardones*, and *Nuithones* as well:—"Contra Langobardos paucitas nobilitat: plurimis ac valentissimis nationibus cincti non per obsequium sed præliis et periclitando tuti sunt. Reudigni, deinde, et Aviones, et Angli, et Varini, et Suardones, et Nuithones fluminibus aut sylvis muniuntur; neque quidquam notabile in singulis nisi quod in commune Hertham, id est, Terram Matrem colunt, eamque intervenire rebus hominum, inveni populis arbitrantur. Est in insula Oceani castum nemus, dicatum in eo vehiculum, veste contactum, attingere uni sacerdoti concessum. Is adesse penetrali deam intelligit, vectamque bobus feminis multa cum veneratione prosequitur. Læti tunc dies, festa loca, quæcunque adventu hospitioque dignatur. Non bella ineunt, non arma sumunt, clausum omne ferrum; pax et quies tunc tantum nota, tunc tantum amata, donec idem sacerdos satiatam conversatione mortalium deam templo reddat: mox vehiculum et vestes, et si credere velis, numen ipsum secreto lacu abluitur. Servi ministrant, quos statim idem lacus haurit. Arcanus hinc terror, sanctaque ignorantia, quid sit id, quod perituri tantum vident."

That the Nuithones, Suardones, Eudoses, and Aviones lay beyond the Elbe, and to the *east* of it, and that they were Slavonic, is probable.

§ 30. *Reudigni*.—The last two syllables are inflectional; the root being *R-d*. This occurs as the element of a compound in more Icelandic and Anglo-Saxon passages than one. Whoever the Goths of Scandinavia may have been, they fell into more than one class. There were, for instance, the simple

Goths of Goth-land, the island Goths of Ey-gota-land, and, thirdly, the Goths of Reidh-gota-land. Reidhgotaland was an old name of *Jutland*. Reidhgotaland was also the name of a country *east of Poland*. Zeuss* well suggests that these conflicting facts may be reconciled by considering the prefix *Reidh*, to denote the Goths of the *Continent* in opposition to the word *Ey*, denoting the Goths of the *Islands*; both being formidable and important nations, both being in political and military relations to the Danes, Swedes, and Norwegians, and both being other than Germanic.

In the Traveller's Song we find a *Hreth*-king:—

“ He with Ealhild,
Faithful peace-weaver,
For the first time,
Of the *Hreth*-king
Sought the home,
East of Ongle,
Of Eormenic,
The fierce faith-breaker.”

The relation between the *Hreths* and *Ongle* is that between the *Reudigni* and *Angli*.

But in the same poem we meet with the name in the simple form *Hræd*:—

“ Eadwine I sought and Elsa,
Ægelmund and Hungar,
And the proud host
Of the With-Myrgings;
Wulphere I sought and Wyrnhere;
Full oft war ceas'd not there,
When the *Hræds'* army,
With hard swords,
About *Vistula's* wood
Had to defend
Their ancient native seat
Against the folk of *Ætla*.”

Such light as we get from these passages induces us to place

* In v. *Juta*.

the *Reudigni* on the eastern side of the Elbe. If so, they lay beyond the limits of the Carlovingian *Saxonia*. The same was the case with the—

§ 31. *Varini*, whose relations to the Angli were remarkable and full of complexities. The two populations are mentioned (as we see) by Tacitus. Procopius, more than four centuries later, joins them. In the heading of a code of laws, of the Carlovingian period, we find the following text—“*Incipit Lex Anglorum et Werinorum hoc est Thuringorum*,” a text which has never been satisfactorily explained. Lastly, we find in the tenth century that the locality of the *Warnavi*, *Warnahi*, or *Warnabi*, was Mecklenburg, and that they were *Slavonians*—not Germans.

This was, probably, the case with the *Reudigni* as well; as it also was (as aforesaid) with the Nuithones, Suardones, Aviones, and Eudoses.

A *political* connection with the Angli these populations may have had; ethnologically, however, and philologically, I hold them to have been different.

The geography of the Holy Island, with its *castum nemus*, is as doubtful as the relations between the Angli and the tribes with which Tacitus associates them. And this is because there are two localities which its notice suits—*Heligoland*, in the German Ocean, and *Rugen*, off the coast of Pomerania. Both were islands. Both were Holy Islands.

Heligoland suits the Angli best; Rugen the *Varini*.

Heligoland is German in respect to its old mythology—Angle or Frisian.

Rugen, however, is not German. It is Obotrite, which is Slavonic.

If *Hertha* be the right reading, and if it mean the *Earth*, Heligoland is the better and likelier spot for worship; since *Hertha* is a German word.

I reconcile these difficulties by suggesting that the *Varini* had one *holy island*, and the *Angli* another—so that the *insule sacræ*, with their corresponding *casta nemora*, were *two*

in number, and I submit that a writer, with no better means of knowing the exact truth than Tacitus, might, in such a case, when he recognised the *insular* character common to the two forms of *cultus*, easily and pardonably refer them to one and the same island. In other words, he might know the general fact that the *Angli* and *Varini* worshipped in an island, without knowing the particular fact of their each having a separate one. If so—

The hypothesis is as follows:—

a. The true and undoubtedly Germanic *Angli* worshipped in Heligoland.

b. The probably Slavonic *Varini* worshipped in the Isle of Rugen.

c. The *holy island* of Tacitus is that of the *Angli*—

d. With whom the *Varini* are inaccurately associated—

e. The source of the inaccuracy lying in the fact of that nation having a *holy island*, different from that of the Angles, but not known to be so.

§ 32. Having thus gone through the texts of Tacitus and Procopius, we may truly say that the history of the Angles of Germany is obscure; that we only know what they were from their relation to the Angles of England; and, even here, our knowledge is very limited. They spoke the mother-tongue of the present English. This is a fact which no man need doubt or refine on; but it is about the only one we have. The reasons for this obscurity lie in their geographical position, and in the relations between them and the neighbouring populations. The Angles of Germany were too far north to come in contact with the Romans. We met with no *Angli* in the great Arminian Confederacy. When the Romans were the aggressors the *Angli* lay beyond the pale of their ambition. When the Romans were on the defensive the *Angli* were beyond the opportunity of attack.

Ptolemy's notice of the Angles is as follows:—

Τῶν δὲ ἐντὸς καὶ μεσογείων ἔθνῶν μέγιστα μὲν ἔστι τό, τε τῶν Σουήβων τῶν Ἀγγειλῶν, οἳ εἰσιν ἀνατολικώτεροι τῶν Λαγγοβάρδων

ἀνατείνοντες πρὸς τὰς ἄρκτους μέχρι τῶν μέσων τοῦ Ἑλλβίου ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ τῶν Σουήβων τῶν Σεμνόνων, οἵτινες διήκουσι μετὰ τὸν Ἑλλβιν ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰρημένου μέρους πρὸς ἀνατολὰς μέχρι τοῦ Σουήβου ποταμοῦ καὶ τὸ τῶν Βουγούντων τὰ ἐφεξῆς καὶ μέχρι τοῦ Οὐιστούλα κατεχόντων.

Now—

a. The Angli of Tacitus were *probably* on the south side of the Elbe; the Angli of Ptolemy were *certainly* so.

b. The Angli of Tacitus were *probably* a large population; the Angli of Ptolemy were *certainly* so.

c. But the Angli of Beda and the current historians were, at one and the same time, small in respect to their area, and occupants of a district beyond, or north of, the Elbe. In other words, they were unimportant Nordalbingians.

More facts must be dealt with before these discrepancies are explained. At present, however, I so far anticipate my decision as to call attention to the magnitude of such a fact as the Angle conquest of Britain, to remark that a great effect implies a great cause, and to infer from this that the *primâ facie* view is in favour of the mother country of the English Language being measured by the measure of Ptolemy rather than by that of Beda.

CHAPTER V.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.—CLASSICAL AUTHORS.—PTOLEMY.—THE SAXONS.

§ 33. PTOLEMY, as has been already stated, is the first writer who gives us the name *Saxon*. What does he say about it? What he says of the Angli we have seen.

The *Saxons* of Ptolemy lay to the north of the Elbe, on the neck of the Chersonese, and the Sigulones occupied the Chersonese itself, *westwards*.

“Then,” writes Ptolemy, “come—

2. *The Sabalingii*; then—

3. *The Kobandi*; above these—

4. *The Chali*; and above them, but more to the west—

5. *The Phundusii*; more to the east—

6. *The Charudes*; and more to the north of all—

7. *The Cimbr*.

8. *The Pharodini* lay next to the Saxons, between the rivers Chalusus and Sucbus.”

The text is as follows:—

Τὴν δὲ παρωκεανίτιν κατέχουσιν ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Βουσακτέρους οἱ Φρίσσιοι μέχρι τοῦ Ἀμασίου ποταμοῦ· μετὰ δὲ τούτους Καῦχοι οἱ μικροὶ μέχρι τοῦ Οὐισούργιος ποταμοῦ· εἶτα Καῦχοι οἱ μείζους μέχρι τοῦ Ἄλβιος ποταμοῦ· ἐφεξῆς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν αὐχένα τῆς Κιμβρικῆς Χερσονήσου Σάξονες· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν Χερσόνησον ὑπὲρ μὲν τοὺς Σάξοντας Σιγούλωνες ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εἶτα Σαβαλιγγιοὶ, εἶτα Κοβανδοί.

Ἐπὲρ οὗς Χάλιοι, καὶ ἔτι ὑπὲρ τούτους δυσμικώτεροι μὲν Φουνδοῦσοι, ἀνατολικώτεροι δὲ Χαροῦδες, πάντων δὲ ἀρκτικώτεροι Κίμβροι.

Μετὰ δὲ τοὺς Σάξοντας ἀπὸ τοῦ Χαλούσου ποταμοῦ μέχρι τοῦ Σουήβου ποταμοῦ Φαροδεινοί.

In another place "the three islands of the Saxons are mentioned"—Σαξόνων νήσοι τρεῖς.

§ 34. The *Saxons* of Ptolemy fall into two divisions—those of the continent and those of the islands. The conditions under which the former come are as follows:—

a. They must lie as far south as the Elbe, in order to come next (ἐφεξῆς) to the Chauci Majores.

b. They must be on the *neck* of the Chersonose; which *neck* may mean one of two things; either the line between Hamburg and Lubeck, or the line between Toningen and Rendsburg.

c. They must touch the sea; inasmuch as the fact of any island being *Saxon* implies that the coast opposite to it (the *Peræa*, so to say) was *Saxon* also.

d. They must lie sufficiently to the west to have the *Sabalingians* on the east; and—

e. They must lie sufficiently to the east to have the *Sigulones* on the west.

Nevertheless, as aforesaid, they must touch the sea.

These are not very easy conditions to satisfy—indeed, unless we suppose that Ptolemy's maps were slightly different from our own, they are impracticable.

Without, then, attempting any closer details than our materials will allow, let us identify the continental part of the *Saxon* area of Ptolemy with the districts *Stormar* and *Ditmarsh*.

The *Saxons* of the *Islands* are also difficult to fix. Sylt, Fohr, and Nordstrand, are the ones most generally quoted. Perhaps, however the relations of the land and water have altered since the time of Ptolemy; so that the physical history of the North Sea may be the proper complement to the ethnological inquiries for these parts. The matter is unimportant. It is only necessary to remember that there were *Saxons* on two localities—*Saxons* on the islands, and *Saxons* on the sea-coast, *Insular Saxons*, and *Saxons* (so to say) of the *Peræa*.

To what language did this word *Saxon* in Ptolemy belong?

Was it native, *i. e.* did the Saxons use it to designate themselves? We cannot answer this question in the affirmative. Nor yet can we say that it was German. In Tacitus, where the names *are* German, it finds no place. This is *pro tanto* against it. Add to this that none of the names with which it is associated can be shown to be German, *e. g.* *Sigulones*, *Kobandi*, &c.

The evidence that the *Saxons* belonged to the Angle branch of the German family is just as inconclusive. They may have been in the same category with the Chauci Majores, *i. e.* Frisians. Or they may have been Slavonians—extensions of the Slavonic population of what, in the Carlovingian times, was Wagria and Polabingia—the former in eastern Holstein, the latter in Lauenburg.

CHAPTER VI.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—CONSIDERATION OF THE CHANGES WHICH MAY HAVE TAKEN PLACE BETWEEN THE CLASSICAL AND THE CARLOVINGIAN PERIODS.

§ 35. THE mother-country of the German invaders of England, in the time of the Carlovingians (say the tenth century) and in the eyes of the Franks, included *Frisia* along with *Saxonia*, or (changing the expression) *Saxonia* along with *Frisia*. Of these two areas, *Saxonia* fell into divisions and subdivisions:—

- I. Frisia.
- II. Saxonia.

A. *Cisalbian*.

Westphalia.

Angraria.

Ostphalia.

1. South.

3. Middle.

3. North.

B. *Transalbian (Nordalbingian)*.

1. Thiedmarsii.

2. Stormarii.

3. Holsuti.

In the time of the classical writers (say the first or second centuries) the subsequently Carlovingian—

I. Frisia was the country of the Frisii Majores, Frisii Minores, and Chauci.

II. Saxonia, that of the—

1. Angrivarii in Angraria.

2. Chamavi, Dulgubini, and Chasuarii in Westphalia.

3. *a.* Cherusei for South,*b.* Fosi for Middle, and*c.* Angli for North

} Ostphalia.

4. Saxones, Sigulones, and Harudes for Nordalbingia.

The Suevi ($\Sigma\upsilon\upsilon\eta\beta\omicron\iota$) have (for the present) been eliminated from the investigation—ignored, so to say. They, with the Langobardi, stand over for further notice.

§ 36. Looking, in the first instance, to the texts of the classical writers only, we cannot but observe that, although there is a certain amount of agreement between those of Tacitus and Ptolemy, there is a considerable deal of difference also; and—

Still more is this the case with the Classical and Carlovingian accounts; *e. g.* the Saxony of Ptolemy consists of a small tract of land in the so-called Cimbric Chersonese, whereas the Saxony of Charlemagne is a vast region.

Again—and, to a certain extent, the consequence of the preceding—several of the individual tribes of Tacitus are no longer

apparent. Thus, there are no Fosi; no Cherusci; no Longobardi; since the Carlovingian Longobardi are the Lombards of Lombardy, Lombards of Italy—not of Germany. Even the Angles are known only as the Angles of Britain—England—the Island. There is a faint notice of the Angles of the continent—the descendants of the Angli of Tacitus; but nothing more.

These discrepancies must be investigated; since it is very important for us to know whether the *Saxonia* of the tenth century do or do not contain the descendants of the occupants of the same area in the second, third, or fourth. It may do this, or it may not. If it do, the history of the English Language is simplified. Fix the Angli of Tacitus to a certain part of Germany, and find how that part is occupied under the Carlovingian period, and you determine the original country of the ancestors of the present English. The name has changed, but the population is the same.

Assume, on the other hand, a migration, a conquest, or an extermination, and the whole question is altered; or, rather, a new one is raised, and the origin of the Angles of England is an unsolved problem.

§ 37. It is certain there has been a change of some kind. Of this there is no doubt whatever. There is only a doubt as to its nature—was it real or nominal? Were the Cherusci, for instance, bodily changed, either by being exterminated on their soil, or by being transported elsewhere? or did they only lose the name Cherusci, taking (instead) that of Saxons? Cæsar, Strabo, Velleius Paterculus, all speak of the Cherusci, and all say nothing about the Saxons. On the other hand Claudian is the last writer in whom we find the word Cherusci.

“ ——— venit accola silvæ

Bructerus Hercyniæ, latisque pauidibus exit
Cimber, et ingentes Albim liquere *Cherusci*.”

Cousul. iv. Honor. 450.

As long as we have the Cherusci there are no Saxons.

As soon as we meet with the Saxons, the Cherusci disappear.

If we wish to cut the Gordian knot, we can have recourse to the assumption of migration and displacement—in which case the Old Saxons cease to be the descendants of the Cherusci and their allies, and represent a new and intrusive population as foreign to the old Cheruscan country of Germany as they were to that of the Britons. There are certain facts that encourage this view. If so, the change is a *real* one. But there are others that suggest a different set of facts. *The name may have changed, the population remaining the same.* If so, the change is *nominal*.

§ 38. Nominal changes are of three kinds.

a. A population that at a certain period designated itself by a certain term, may let that term fall into disuse and substitute another in its place. When this has been done, a name has been actually changed.

b. A population may have more than one designation, *e. g.* it may take one name when it is considered in respect to its geographical position, another in respect to its political relations, and a third in respect to its habits, &c. Of such names one may preponderate at one time, and another at another.

c. Thirdly, its own name may remain unchanged, but the name under which it is spoken of by another population may alter.

Now, I hold that *real* changes are rarer than *nominal* ones; and that not in Germany only but all the world over. It is rare for a population to be absolutely exterminated. It is rare for a migration to empty a whole country. Possibly, however, I may have a tendency to exaggerate the rarity of these phenomena; since there are many competent authorities who think differently. This may or may not be the case. In either alternative, however, the following rules are safe ones—safe, and, if ethnology is to be anything better than guess-work, indispensable.

1. *Neither migrations nor exterminations are to be multi-*

plied unnecessarily. 2. Real changes are not to be assumed from nominal ones.

Fundamentally, these two rules are one, or rather, they both flow from the same fact, viz. from that of nominal changes being far commoner than real ones.

Of the *nominal* changes, which is commonest, I cannot exactly say; I can only say that the third is very common.

The other results to which the criticism leads will be kept back until the *internal* evidence bearing upon the ethnographical philosophy of the English Language has been considered.

CHAPTER VII.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY FROM WHICH IT WAS INTRODUCED.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LANGUAGE.—PRELIMINARY REMARKS.—THE OLD SAXON.

§ 39. THE terms Old Saxon and Frisian have been used. They bring us to a new investigation, viz. that of the philological affinities of the English Language—the more immediate and closer affinities—not the wider and more general ones.

The written language nearest akin to the written English of the present century is the written English of the last—and so on.

The unwritten forms of speech nearest akin to the written English are the provincial dialects of the counties of Huntingdon, Rutland, the north-eastern part of Northamptonshire, and the southern part of Lincolnshire.

This means that the standard of our speech is in its newest form to be found in the most recent written compositions of the *literati* of England; and that the dialects (if so they can be called) of the districts just named are the purest of our provincial modes of speaking.

But the two statements carry with them something beyond this. They suggest the fact that when languages become the vehicles of literature and the exponents of the thoughts of educated men, they must be viewed in two ways.

a. They must be viewed in respect to the written and literary language of the country to which they belong in its earlier forms; and—

b. They must be viewed in respect to the provincial dialects spoken around and contemporary with them.

Both these are points of minute philology, and neither of them finds its full exposition in the present chapter. They are merely indicated. Special notice will be taken of the different stages of our tongue and special notice will be taken of our provincial dialects hereafter. The point immediately before us is, the question of the general relations of the English to the other allied languages of the Continent of Europe, the area on which it originated. In which case, all the different dialects and all the differences of the same dialect are merged under the common denomination of English; and the English language means English and Anglo-Saxon—English and Lowland Scotch—English and the English provincial or literary dialects; these being dealt with generally and collectively as elements and ingredients of a single tongue.

§ 40. When languages first separate from a common stock they are most like each other. Hence, in comparing the speech of England with the speech of Germany, we take the languages of the two countries in the first known period of their growth. English and the Dutch of Holland are alike in their present forms; but English and Dutch in their oldest known respective forms are liker still.

This rule is general and convenient, but it is not universal.

Although when languages first separate from a common stock they are most like each other, it does not always follow that the longer they are separated the more unlike they become. Languages which differ in an older form may so far change according to some common principle as to become identical in a newer one.

To take a single instance. Let two languages have different signs of the infinitive mood. Let each lose this sign. What follows? Even this, that the two originally different forms become similar.

Thus *bærn-an* is Anglo-Saxon, *bærn-a* Frisian. Here is difference. Eject the last syllable. The remainder is *bærn*. Here is likeness.

Hence it follows that when two languages have in their older stages been differentiated from each other by means of characters that become obsolete as either language grows modern, they may grow liker and liker as time proceeds.

§ 41. With these preliminary points of criticism, we may look to the Continent of Germany and ask about the languages there spoken, which are nearest akin to our own.

The mother-tongue of the present English is called Anglo-Saxon, and no written specimen of this Anglo-Saxon can be shown to have originated otherwise than as the language of *England*, and on *English* ground. The manuscripts by which they have been transmitted to us were written in English monasteries; and the dialects which they embody are the dialects of certain English counties. We cannot often give the exact locality, nor yet determine the particular form of speech represented, but we can always safely say that England was the country in which the language was spoken and the words written. I am not aware of any exception to these statements. If such exist, they are unimportant.

Yet the English language originated in Germany nevertheless; and in Germany the so-called Anglo-Saxon must have been spoken during the whole period that the English invasion was going on, as well as for some time both before it began

and after it had left-off. It was certainly *spoken*, and may have been *written*. It may have been written, or (if not written) embodied in poetry, and so handed down orally. Have any such specimens come down to us? This was answered in the negative when it was stated that all the extant specimens of the mother-tongue of the present English are of English origin. Consequently, they are all later than the Anglo-Saxon invasions.

This, however, applies only to the *form* of the Anglo-Saxon compositions. I do not say that the *matter* of some of them may not be continental. For instance, there is a famous poem called Beowulf, in which no mention is made of England at all, and of which the heroes are Danes, Frisians, Geats, and Angles—Angles as they were in the original Angle-land of Germany, not Angles after the fashion of Ecbert, Alfred, and the English kings. Nevertheless, it is only the *matter* of Beowulf that is continental. Its *language* is that of the Anglo-Saxons of England, and England was the country in which it took the Anglo-Saxon form. Originally Pagan and German, it took its ultimate form from the hands of a Christian and an Anglo-Saxon of England.

There is no such thing, then, as a specimen of language which is at one and the same time Anglo-Saxon in form and continental in origin.

§ 42. There is, however, something like it. If we eject from the word Anglo-Saxon the prefix *Angle*, we are enabled to consider the word *Saxon* as a sort of generic term for a group of closely-allied dialects, of which the mother-tongue of the present English was one. Others they might have; others there probably were; others there actually were. Although there are no vestiges of the *Anglo*-Saxon of the Continent, there still is a Saxon form of speech of continental origin.

Instead of *Anglo*- write *Old*-, and you have the current and ordinary name by which the language under notice is designated by the scholars of the nineteenth century; viz. *Old*-

Saxon—*Old-Saxon* as opposed to *Anglo-Saxon*, with *Anglo-Saxon* as opposed to *Old-Saxon*.

How far either of the elements of this compound (*Old* and *Saxon*) is exceptionable or unexceptionable is another matter. The present chapter deals with the *real* rather than the *nominal* question as to the nature of a particular form of speech spoken in a particular part of Germany during, and for some time subsequent to, the reign of Charlemagne. This, whatever else it may be, is the Saxon of the Continent (or Germany) as contrasted with the Saxon of the British Isle (or England).

It is the Saxon of the Continent, not because it was never spoken in England, but because it is only known to us by specimens which took the form in which they have come down to us in some part of continental Germany. And similarly—

The Anglo-Saxon is the Saxon of England, not because it was never spoken in continental Germany (for it *was* so spoken), but because it is known to us by specimens which took the form in which they have come down to us in some part of insular England.

§ 43. *Old-Saxon compositions*.—The *Old-Saxon* specimens which have come down to us are not numerous. The first in importance is called the *Heliand*. This means *Healer*, or *Saviour*; the work so entitled being a Gospel History in the *Old-Saxon* language, and in metre.

Although it was in some part of Westphalia that the *Heliand* took its *Old-Saxon* form, it was in an English library that the MS. of it was first discovered. Hence it passed for a form of the Anglo-Saxon. But this form was so peculiar as to require an hypothesis to account for it; and the doctrine that a certain amount of *Danish* influence was the cause of it so far took form, and gained credence, as to establish the term *Dano-Saxon*. In the eyes, then, of Hickes, Lye, and the older Anglo-Saxon scholars, the *Heliand* was a *Dano-Saxon* composition, and so it continued until the present century, when

not only was its Danish character denied, but its Westphalian origin was indicated. Hence came the name *Old-Saxon*.

Specimen.

Heliand, pp. 12, 13. (*Schmeller's Edition.*)

LUC. II. 8—13.

Tho uuard managun cud,
 Obar thesa uuidon uuerold.
 Uuardos antfundun,
 Thea thar ehuscalcos
 Uta uuarun,
 Uueros an uuahtu,
 Uuiggeo gomean,
 Fehas aftar felda :
 Gisahun finistri an tuue
 Telatan an lufte ;
 Endi quam liocht Godes,
 Uuanum thurh thui uolcan ;
 Endi thea uuardos thar
 Bifeng an them felda.
 Sie uurdun an forhtun tho,
 Thea man an ira moda ;
 Gisahun thar mahtigna
 Godes Engil cuman ;
 The im tegegnes sprac.
 Het that im thea uuardos—
 “ Uuiht ne antdredin
 Ledes fon them liochta.
 Ic scal eu quadhe liobora thing,
 Suido uuarlico
 Uuilleon seggean,
 Cudean craft mikil.
 Nu is Krist geboran,
 An thesere selbun naht,
 Salig barn Godes,
 An thera Davides burg,
 Drohtin the godo.
 That is mendislo
 Manno cuñneas,
 Allaro friho fruma.
 Thar gi ina fidan mugun,

Then it was to many known,
 Over this wide world.
 The words they discovered,
 Those that there, as horse-grooms,
 Without were,
 Men at watch,
 Horses to tend,
 Cattle on the field—
 They saw the darkness in two
 Dissipated in the atmosphere,
 And came a light of God
 —through the welkin ;
 And the words there
 Caught on the field.
 They were in fright then
 The men in their mood—
 They saw there mighty
 God's angel come ;
 That to them face-to-face spake.
 It bade thus them these words—
 “ Dread not a whit
 Of mischief from the light.
 I shall to you speak glad things,
 Very true ;
 Say commands ;
 Show strength great.
 Now is Christ born,
 In this self-same night ;
 The blessed child of God,
 In the David's city,
 The Lord the good.
 That is exultation
 To the races of men,
 Of all men the advancement.
 There ye may find him

An Bethlema burg,
 Barno rikiost.
 Hebb'ath that te tecna,
 That ic eu gitellean mag,
 Uuarun uoordun,
 That he thar biuundan ligid,
 That kind an enera cribbiun,
 Tho he si cuning obar al
 Erdun endi himiles,
 Endi obar eldeo barn,
 Uueroldes uualdand."
 Reht so he tho that uoord gespra-
 cenun

So uuard thar engilo te them
 Unrim cuman,
 Helag heriskepi,
 Fon hebanuuanga,
 Fagar folc Godes,
 Endi filu sprakun,
 Lofuuord manag,
 Liudeo heron ;
 Afhobun tho helagna sang,
 Tho sie eft te hebanuuanga
 Uundun thurh thiu uuolcan.
 Thea uuardos hordun,
 Huo thiu engilo craft
 Alomahigna God,
 Suido uuerdlico,
 Uuordun louoduu.
 " Dirida si nu," quadun sie,
 " Drohtine selbun,
 An them hohoston
 Himilo rikea ;
 Endi fridu an erdu,
 Firiho barnum,
 Goduuilligun gumun,
 Them the God antkennead,
 Thurh hluttran hugi."

In the city of Bethlehem,
 The noblest of children—
 Ye have as a token
 That I tell ye
 True words,
 That he there swathed lieth,
 The child in a crib,
 Though he be King over all
 Earth and Heaven,
 And over the sons of men,
 Of the world the Ruler."
 Right as he that word spake,

So was there of Angels to them,
 In a multitude, come
 A holy host,
 From the Heaven-plains,
 The fair folk of God,
 And much they spake
 Praise-words many,
 To the Lord of Hosts.
 They raised the holy song,
 As they back to the Heaven-plains
 Wound through the welkin.
 The words they heard,
 How the strength of the Angels
 The Almighty God,
 Very worthily,
 With words praised.
 " Love be there now," quoth they,
 " To the Lord himself
 On the highest
 Kingdom of Heaven,
 And peace on earth
 To the children of men,
 Goodwilled men
 Who know God,
 Through a pure mind."

Next in length to the Heliand come what are called the
Carolinian Psalms.

Specimen.

FROM THE TEXT OF A. YPEIJ.

Taalkundig Magazijn. P. 1, No. 1.—p. 54.*Psalm LIV.*

2. GEHORI got gebet min, in ne furuir bida mina; thenke te mi in gehori mi.
3. Gidruouit bin an tilogon minro, in mistrot bin fan stimmon fiundes, in fan arbeide sundiges.
4. Uuanda geneigedon an mi unreht, in an abulge unsuoti uuaron mi.
5. Herta min gidruouit ist an mi, in forta duodis fiel ouir mi.
6. Forthta in biuonga quamon ouer mi, in bethecoda mi thuisternussi.
7. In ic quad "uuie sal geuan mi fetheron also duuon, in ic fliugon sal, in raston sal."
8. Ecco! firroda ic fliende, inde bleif an eudi.
9. Ic sal beidan sin, thie behaldon mi deda fan luzzilheide geistis in fan geuuidere.
10. Bescurgi, herro, te deile tunga iro, uuanda ic gesag unriht in fluoc an burgi.
11. An dag in naht umbefangan sal sia ouir mura ira, unreht in arbeit an mitdon iro in unreht.
12. In ne te fuor fan straton iro prisma in losunga.
13. Uuanda of fiunt flukit mi, is tholodit geuuisso; in of thie thie hatoda mi, ouir mi mikila thing spreke, ic burge mi so mohti geburran, fan imo.
14. Thu geuuisso man einmuodigo, leido min in cundo min.
15. Thu samon mit mi suota nami muos, an huse gode giengon uuir mit geluni.
16. Cum dot ouir sia, in nithir stigin an hellon libbiinda. Uuanda arbeide an selethe iro, an mitdon ini.
17. Ic eft te gode riepo, in herro behielt mi.
18. An auont in an morga in an mitdondage tellon sal ic, in kundon; in he gehoron sal.

19. Irlosin sal an frithe sela mina fan then, thia ginacont mi, uuanda under managon he uuas mit mi.

20. Gehorun sal got in ginetheron sal sia; thie ist er uueroldi.

21. Ne genuisso ist ini uuihsil; in ne forchtedon got. Theneda hant sina an uuitherloni.

Shorter than either the Heliand or the Carolinian Psalms is the third of the Old-Saxon compositions—*Hildebrand* and *Hathubrand*. Like the Heliand, it is in metre; but, unlike the Heliand, it is, if not a pagan poem, a poem founded on the legends of a semi-pagan period, Hildebrand and Hathubrand being heroes of that cycle of fictions of which the famous Diedrich of Berne (Theodoric of Verona) is the centre.

After this comes the so-called *Abrenuntiatio Diaboli*, which, like the Hildebrand and Hathubrand, points to the pagan period.

Forsachistu diabolae? Et *resp.* Ec forsacho diabolae, end allu diabolgelde. *Respon.* End ec forsacho allum diabolgeldae, end allu dioboles uuercum, anduurdum, Thunar ende Woden, ende Saxnote ende allem them unholdum the hiro genotas sint.

Q. Gelobis tu in Got Alamehtigan Fadaer?

R. Ec gelobo in Got Alamehtigan Fadaer.

Q. Gelobis tu in Crist Godes Suno?

R. Ec gelobo in Crist Godes Suno.

Q. Gelobis tu in Halogan Gast?

R. Ec gelobo in Halogan Gast.

In English.

Renouncest thou the Devil? *Answer.* I renounce the Devil, and all Devil-guilds. *Answer.* And I renounce all Devil-guilds, and all the Devil's works, and words; Thunar, and Woden, and Saxnot (?) and all the unholy (ones) who are their fellows.

Q. Believest thou in God, the Almighty Father?

R. I believe in God, the Almighty Father.

Q. Believest thou in Christ, God's Son?

R. I believe in Christ, God's Son.

Q. Believest thou in the Holy Ghost?

R. I believe in the Holy Ghost.

The remaining samples are of less importance, being equally fragmentary with the *Abrenuntiatio*, and less interesting. They may be found in Lacomblet's "Archiv für Geschichte des Niederrheins" (vol. i. pp. 4, 9), and in Graf's "Diutisca" (vol. ii. pp. 190, 192), consisting of a piece of legend relating to St. Boniface, a creed (quoted as *Confessionis Formula Essensis*), an extract from some monastic muniment (*Rotulus Essensis*), and a number of Glosses (*Glossæ Saxonica*). The so-called *Frekenhorst Roll*, and the specimens in Lipsius, I have not seen. They are enumerated, however, by Schmeller, whose edition of the *Heliand* is the standard work on the Old Saxon. His third reference, too, to the "Diutisca" (vol. ii. pp. 195-230) is doubtful. The glosses there found seem to be Low German rather than Old Saxon,—though upon this point I speak with hesitation.

All these compositions represent the language of the German part of the Continent rather than of the island of Britain.

Of the Saxon parts of Germany, they represent Westphalia most especially.

They are certainly not Frisian.

They cannot be shown to be Ostphalian.

They are, then, so far as they are not absolutely and exclusively Westphalian, Angrarian or the Old Dutch of Holland, rather than aught else; Angrarian, when they come from the parts eastward, Old Dutch when they come from the parts westward.

CHAPTER VIII.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LANGUAGE.—THE FRISIAN.

§ 44. AT the present moment, Friesland is one of the united provinces that constitute the kingdom of Holland.

The Frisian form of speech, however, has in it so much of what is peculiar that it generally passes for something more than a mere dialect of the Dutch. The following specimen is, undoubtedly, as like the ordinary language of the kingdom of the Netherlands as any outlying provincial dialect of our own island is to the standard English. Still it differs; especially in the form of the infinitive mood—*drieuwe* as opposed to *drijven*. And when we go into the more distant dialects, or into the older samples, the difference increases. Hence, in the more extreme forms it is convenient to keep the standard literary Dutch of Holland, and the provincial Frisian of Friesland, more or less separate.

FRISIAN.

1.

De noordewyn hu kaald en stoer
En fel yn winterflaaignen,
Al waait ze trog de laeae su soer,
Ys mest nei uis behaaignen.

2.

Al ys myn man den oppe see,
Hy sol nei huis wol drieuwe,
En yzzer tuis ov oppe ree,
Su motter tuis wol blieuwe.

DUTCH.

1.

De noordewind zo koud en guur
En fel in wintervlagen,
Al waait hij door de leen zo zuur,
Is meest naar ons behagen.

2.

Al is mijn man dan op de zee,
Hij zal naar huis wel drijven
En is hij 't huis of op de ree,
Zo moet hij 'thuis wel blijven.

Besides the Frisian of the Dutch province of Friesland, there is the Frisian of Westphalia, or Hanover. This is spoken only in the very fenny district called Saterland, or Sagelterland.

Besides the Frisian of the Dutch and Hanoverian Frieslands, there is the Frisian of the island of Heligoland.

And akin to that there is what is called the *North* Frisian. This is spoken in that part of the Duchy of Sleswick, which faces the North Sea, and lies between the towns Bredsted and Husum. The North Frisian has a Dual number.

DER FREYER VOM HOLSTEIN.

Diar kam en skep bi Sudher Siöe
 Me tri jung Fruers öu di Floom.
 Hokken wiar di fördeorst ?
 Dit wiar Peter Rothgrun.
 Hud süät hi sin spooren ?
 Fuar Hennerk Jerkens düür.
 Hokken kam tö Düür ?
 Marrike sallef,
 Me Krük en Bekker ön di jen hundh,
 En gulde Ring aur di udher hundh.
 Jü nöödhighst höm en sin Hinghst in,
 Död di Hingst Haaver und Peter wün.
 Toonkh Gott fuar des gud dei.
 Al di Brid end bridmaaner of wei,
 Butolter Marri en Peter allüning !
 Jü look höm ün to Kest
 En wildh höm nimmer muar mest.

In English.

There came a ship by the South Sea,
 With three young woovers on the flood ;
 Who was the first ?
 That was Peter Rothgrun.
 Where set he his tracts ?
 For Hennerk Jerken's door.
 Who came to door ?

Mary-kin herself,
With a pitcher (crock) and beaker in the one hand,
A gold ring on the other hand.
She pressed him and his horse (to come) in,
Gave the horse oats and Peter wine.
Thank God for this good day!
All the brides and bridesmen out of the way!
Except Mary and Peter alone.
She locked him up in her box,
And never would miss him more.

In Dutch Friesland, the Frisian is the language of the agricultural population; so that, if Dutch be the language of the towns, it is Frisian which we find in the villages and farm-houses.

Frisian, too, is the language of that remarkable series of islands which runs like a row of breakwaters from the Helder to the Weser. Such are Ameland, Terschelling, Wangeroog, and the others—each with its dialect or sub-dialect.

But beyond this, the continuity of the range of language is broken; for Frisian is *not* the proper dialect of Groningen. Nor yet of Westphalia *generally*. Nor yet (notwithstanding the name) of East Friesland.

At present, then, the populations which speak the Frisian form of speech are broken and disjointed: inasmuch as the natural inference from their present distribution is the doctrine that, at some earlier period, they were spread over the whole of the sea-coast from Holland to Jutland; in other words, that they were the oldest inhabitants of Friesland, Oldenburg, Lower Hanover, and part of Holstein. If so, they must have been the *Frisii* of Tacitus. No one doubts this. They must also have been the *Chauci* of that writer, as has already been assumed.

The Frisian is a disjointed and broken population; its history being peculiar. In most cases where we find languages and peoples in a fragmentary condition there has been conquest, invasion, or amalgamation; in other words, the effects are the result of human agency. But the history of the Frisians,

though human agencies have been important, is, to a great extent, a *physical* history. Some branches of the stem to which they belong have, certainly, been lopped off by the hand of man, by war, by famine, by oppression bravely withstood. But others have given way to a stronger and more unconquerable power—that of Nature. It is the Frisian area that most of the great inundations of the North Sea have broken in upon. What Vesuvius has been to Campania, Ætna to Sicily, Hecla to Iceland, the Ocean has been to Frisia.

§ 45. *Stages of the Frisian Language.*—In Westphalia, Heligoland, and North Friesland, the specimens are all of recent date—all modern. But with Friesland Proper this is not the case. Over and above the numerous samples of the Frisian of the present century, there is a Frisian literature which dates as far back as the twelfth century. In this, are embodied the laws of the Free Frisians—both East (or Hanoverian) and West (or Dutch) Friesland.

The extent to which the *Old* Frisian of the laws resembles the Anglo-Saxon, and, as a consequence thereof, the English, has been enlarged upon by both jurists and philologists. The following extracts illustrate it:—

Asega-bog, i. 3. pp. 13, 14. (*Ed. Wiarda.*)

Thet is thiū thredde liodkest and thes Kynig Kerles ieft, theter allera monna ek ana sina eyna gode besitte umberavat. Hit ne se thet ma' hine urwinne mith tele and mith rethe and mith riuchta thingate. Sa hebbere alsam sin Asega dema and dele to lioda londriuchte. Ther ne hach nen Asega nenne dom to delande hit ne se thet hi to fara tha Keysere fon Rume esweren hebbe and thet hi fon da liodon ekeren se. Sa hoch hi thenne to demande and to delande tha fiande alsare friounde, thruch des ethes willa, ther hi to fara tha Keysere fon Rume esweren heth, tho demande and to delande widuon and weson, waluberon and alle werlosa liodon, like to helpande and sine threa knilinge. Alsa thi Asega nimth tha unriuchta mida and tha urlouada panninga, and ma hini urtinga mi mith twam sine juenethon an thes Kyniges bonne, sa ne hoch hi nenne dom mar to delande, truch thet thi Asega thi biteknath thene

prestere, hwande hia send siande and hia skilun wesa agon there heliga Kerstenede, hia skilun helpa alle tham ther hiam seluon nauwet helpa ne muge.

The same, in English.

That is the third determination and concession of King Charles, that of all men each one possess his own goods (house ?) unrobbed. It may not be that any man overcome him with charge (tales), and with summons (rede), and with legal action. So let him hold as his Asega (judge) dooms and deals according to the land-right of the people. There shall no Asega deal a doom unless it be that before the Cæsar of Rome he shall have sworn, and that he shall have been by the people chosen. He has then to doom and deal to foes as to friends, through the force (will) of the oath which he before the Cæsar of Rome has sworn, to doom and to deal to widows and orphans, to wayfarers and all defenceless people, to help them as his own kind in the third degree. If the Asega take an illegal reward, or pledged money, and a man convict him before two of his colleagues in the King's Court, he has no more to doom, since it is the Asega that betokens the priest, and they are seeing, and they should be the eyes of the Holy Christendom, they should help all those who may nought help themselves.

Old Frisian Laws—Later Form.

Friesche Volks-Almanak, pp. 84-85.

Dat oder laudriucht is, hweerso dyo moder her kyndes eerwe foerkapet, jefsta foerwixled mit har fryonda reed eer dat kind jerig is; als hit jerich se, likje him di caep, so halde hitt, ende likje him naet, so fare hit oen syn ayn eerwe sonder stryd ende sonder schulde.

So hwaso dat kind bifucht jefte birawet op syn ayn eerwe, so breckt hy tyen lyoedmerck ende to jens dine frane (?) dat sint XXI schillingen: ende alle da lyoed agen him to helpen ende di frau, dat hij comme op syn ayn eerwe, deer hi eer bi riuchta aechts: hi ne se dat hio et seld hadde jef seth, jef wixled truch dera tria haudneda een, deer hio dis kyndes des lives mede hulp. Dyo forme need is: hweerso een kynd jong is finsen ende fitered noerd oer

hief, jefsta suther wr birgh, soe moet dio moder her kyndes eerwe setta ende sella ende her kynd lesa ende des lives bihelpa. Dyo oder need is: jef da jere diore wirdet ende di heta honger wr dat land faert, ende dat kynd honger stera wil, so moet dio moder her kyndes eerwe setta ende sella ende capia har bern ku ende ey ende coern. deerma da kynde des lives mede helpe. Dyo tredde need is: als dat kynd is al stocknaken jefsta huusleas ende dan di tinestere nevil ende calda winter oencomt, so faert aller manick oen syn hof ende oen syn huus ende an waranne gaten, ende da wylda dier seket dyu holla beam ende der birgha hly, aldeer hit syn lyf oen bihalden mey: sa weynet ende scryt dat onjeriga kynd ende wyst dan syn nakena lyae ende syn huusleas ende syn fader deer him reda schuld to jenst dyn honger ende winter nevil cald dat hi so diepe ende dimme mitta flower neylen is onder eke ende onder da eerda bisloten, ende bitacht; so moet dio moder her kyndes eerwe setta ende sella, om dat hio da bihield hadde ende biwaer also lang so hit oujerrick is, dat hit oen forste ner oen hoenger naet forfare.

In English.

The other landright is: whenever the mother sells the inheritance of her child, or exchanges (it) with rede (counsel) of her friends before the child is of age; when he is of age, likes he the bargain, let him hold it, and does he not like it, let him fare (enter) on his own inheritance without strife and without debts.

Whoever fights or bereaves the child on his own ground, he forfeits ten ledemarks, and to the king's attorney the mulct is XXI schillings; and all the lede (people) ought to help him and the king's attorney that he may come to his own inheritance, which he owned before by right: unless she has sold, or set (pawned) or exchanged it through one of the three headneeds (necessities) by which she helped the life of the child. The first need is: whenever a child is made prisoner and fettered northward over the sea, or southward over the mountains, the mother must set (pawn) and sell her child's inheritance, and release her child and save its life. The other need is; if the years become dear, and sharp hunger goes over the land, and the child will starve of hunger, then the mother must set and sell her child's inheritance, and buy her child's cows and ewes, and corn, wherewith the life of the child is helped. The third need is: when the child is stark-naked,

or houseless, and then the dark fog and the cold winter come on, when every man fares (enters) his house and its appurtenances, and lurking-holes, and the wild deer (beasts) seek the hollow beam (tree) and the lee of the mountains, where it may save its life: then moans and weeps the minor child, and shows his naked limbs, and his being houseless, and (points at) his father, who should provide for him against hunger and the wintry fog-cold, that he so deep and dim is locked up and covered under the earth with four nails: so the mother must set and sell her child's inheritance, since she has the keeping and guarding as long as (the child) is under age, that it dies not from frost or from hunger.

§ 46. *The Middle Frisian*.—Without determining too nicely at what exact time the *Old Frisian* stage ceases, we may take the middle of the seventeenth century (*say* A.D. 1650) as the date for the fullest development of the *Middle*; the chief classic of the *Middle Frisian* literature being Gysbert (Gilbert) Japicx; not, however, without both an important forerunner and an important contemporary; Jan Janszoon Starter the forerunner, J. Althuisen the contemporary. The following* is from G. Japicx:—

1.	1.
Swiet, ja swiet is 't, oere miete 't boaskien foar' e jonge lie;	Sweet, yes sweet is over measure The marrying for the young Iede (people);
Kreftich swiet is 't, sizz' ik jiette, As it giet mei âlders rie.	Most sweet is it, I say yet, When it goes with the rede of the elders.
Mar oars tiget 'et to'n pleach, As ik oan myn geafeynt seach.	But otherwise it tends to a plague, As I saw on my village.
2.	2.
"Goune Swobke, lit uws pearje," Bea hy har mei mylde stemm. "Ofke," sei se, "ho scoe'k it klearje!	"Golden Swobke, let us pair," He bade her with a mild voice. "Ofke," she said, "how should I clear it!
Wist du! rie to heite in mem?"	Knowest thou! rede, father and mother?"
"Ijeaf dat nim ik to myn laest." Dear mei wier de knôte faest.	"Love! I take this to my last." Therewith the knot was fast.

* Taken from Bosworth's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (p. lxxiii). See also *Friesche Volk's-Almanak* (pp. 95-96).

3.

Da dit pear to gear scoe ite,
In hja hiene nin gewin,
Heite seach, as woe hy bite,
Mem wier stjoersch in lef fen sin.

"Ofke," sei se, "elk jier in bern.
Wier ik fæem ! ik woe 't so jern."

4.

Hoite in Hoatske Sneins to keamer

Mekken it mei elkoarme klear.
Tetke krigge Sjolle kreamer,
To Sint Eal by wyn in bjear.

Nu rint elk om as in slet,
In bekleye 't ; mar to let.

5.

Oeds die better, nei ik achtje,
Da hy Saets syn trou tosei :
Hy liet de alders even plachtje,
Hwet se oan elke ich joene mei.

Nu besit hy huws in schuw'r,
In syn bern fleane all' man uwr.

6.

Ork, myn Soan, wolt du bedye,
Rin naet oan allyk ien moll' !
Jeld in rie lit mei dy frye,
Bern, so gean' dyn saken wol.
Den scil de himel uwr dyn dwaen

Lok in mylde seining' jaen.

3.

When this pair should eat together,
And they had no gain,
Father saw as if he would bite,
Mother was stern and cross of humour.

"Ofke," she said, "each year a child.
Were I maiden ! I would it so willingly."

4.

Hoite and Hoatske every Sunday
in the inn

Made it clear with each other.
Tetke got Sjolle the pedlar
To St. Aloh's fair unto wine and
beer.

Now each runs about as a slut,
And complains it ; but too late.

5.

Oeds did better in my opinion,
When he said his troth to Saets :
He let the elders even plight,
What they on each edge (side) gave
with.

Now he possesses house and barn,
And his children outdo all men.

6.

Ork, my Son, wouldst thou prosper,
Run not on all like a mole ;
Let age and rede woo with thee,
Child, then thy affairs go well ;
Then the heaven shall give over
thy doings

Luck and mild blessings.

The *New* or *Modern* Frisian has been illustrated by the specimens with which we began the chapter.

§ 47. Attention was directed to the forms *drieuwe* and *drijven* in the first extract.

The Frisian of Friesland, &c., in its very oldest stage, forms its infinitive mood, as well as certain cases, in *-a*.

The Dutch of Holland, in its very newest stage, forms its infinitive mood, as well as certain cases, in *-en*.

Now the form in *-en* has not grown out of that in *-a*. On the contrary, the tendencies to change are in the other direction.

Such being the case, it cannot be said that the Modern Dutch is derived from the Old Frisian, or that the Old bears the same relation to the Modern Dutch that the Anglo-Saxon does to the English.

The truer view is—

1. That two closely-allied forms of speech were once spoken in Holland and Friesland.

2. That from the Northern of these we have the Modern Frisian of Friesland.

3. From the Southern, the Modern Dutch of Holland.

Old Frisian grammar compared with Anglo-Saxon.—We begin with—

The Transition of Letters.

á in Frisian corresponds to *eá* in A. S.; as *dád, rád, lás, strám, bám, cáp, áre, háp*, Frisian; *deád, reád, leás, streám, beám, ceáp, cáre, heáp*, Saxon; *dead, red, loose, stream, tree* (boom), *bargain* (cheap, chapman), *ear, heap*, English.

é in Frisian corresponds to ^a), the A. S. *á*; as *Eth, téken, hél, bréd*, Fris.; *áp, tácen, hál, brád*, Saxon; *oath, token, hale, broad*, English;—^b), to A. S. *æ*; *hér, déde, bréda*, Frisian; Fris. *hær, dæd, brædan*, A. S.; *hair, deed, roast*, English.

e to *ea* and *æ* A. S.—Frisian *thet*, A. S. *þæt*,^c Engl. *that*. Fris. *gers*, A. S. *gærs*, Engl. *grass*.—Also to *eo*; *prestere*, Fr.; *preost* A. S., *priest* Engl.; *berck* Fr., *beorh* A. S.; *hill* (*berg*, as in *iceberg*) Engl.; *melok* Fr., *meoloc* A. S., *milk* Engl.

i to *eo* A. S.—Fr. *irthe*, A. S. *eorðe*; Fris. *hirte*; A. S. *heorte*; Fris. *fir*, A. S. *feor* = in English *earth, heart, far*.

já = *eo* A. S.; as *bjáda*, *bebdan*, *bid*—*thet fjárde*, *feorðe*,
the fourth—*sják*, *sebc*, *sick*.

ju = *y* or A. S. *e*; *rjucht*, *ryth*, *right*—*frjund*, *freond*, *friend*.

Dz = A. S. *cg*; Fr. *sedza*, *lidzja*; A. S. *secgan*, *licgan*;
 Engl. *to say*, *to lie*.

Tz, *ts*, *sz*, *sth* = A. S. *c* or *ce*; as *szereke*, or *sthereke*, Frisian;
cyrice A. S., *church* Engl.; *czetel* Fr., *cytel* A. S., *kettle*
 English.

ch Fr. = *h* A. S.; as *thjach* Fr., *þeoh* A. S., *thigh*, Engl.—
berch, *bebrh*, *hill* (berg)—*dochter*, *dohtor*, *daughter*, &c.

As a general statement we may say, that in the transition of letters the Frisian corresponds with the A. S. more closely than it does with any other language. It must, moreover, be remarked, that, in such pairs of words as *frjund* and *freond*, the difference (as far at least as the *e* and *j* are concerned) is a mere difference of orthography. Such also is probably the case with the words *déd* and *dæd*, and many others.

The Anglo-Saxon inflection of *) Substantives ending in a vowel, ^b) substantives ending in a consonant, ^c) Adjectives with an indefinite ^d) Adjectives with a definite sense, ^e) Verbs Active ^f) and verbs auxiliar, may be seen in the comparison between the A. S. and the Icelandic. The corresponding inflections in Frisian are as follows:—

(a.)

Substantives ending in a vowel.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> 'Are (<i>an ear</i>)	<i>Campa</i> (<i>a champion</i>)	<i>Tunge</i> (<i>a tongue</i>).
	<i>Acc.</i> 'Are	<i>Campa</i>	<i>Tunga.</i>
	<i>Dat.</i> 'Ara	<i>Campa</i>	<i>Tunga.</i>
	<i>Gen.</i> 'Ará	<i>Campa</i>	<i>Tunga.</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> 'Ara	<i>Campa</i>	<i>Tunga.</i>
	<i>Acc.</i> 'Ara	<i>Campa</i>	<i>Tunga.</i>
	<i>Dat.</i> 'Aron	<i>Campon</i>	<i>Tungon.</i>
	<i>Gen.</i> 'Arona	<i>Campona</i>	<i>Tungona.</i>

(b.)

Substantives ending in a consonant.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> Skip (<i>a ship</i>)	Hond (<i>a hand</i>).
	<i>Acc.</i> Skip	Hond.
	<i>Dat.</i> Skipe	Hond.
	<i>Gen.</i> Skipis	Honde.
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> Skipu	Honda.
	<i>Acc.</i> Skipu	Honda.
	<i>Dat.</i> Skipum	Hondum (-on).
	<i>Gen.</i> Skipa	Honda.

With respect to the masculine substantives terminating in a consonant, it must be observed that in A. S. there are two modes of declension; in one, the plural ends in *-s*; in the other in *-a*. From the former the Frisian differs; with the second it has a close alliance; *e. g.*:—

	<i>Saxon.</i>	<i>Frisian.</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> Sunu (<i>a son</i>)	Sunu.
	<i>Acc.</i> Sunu	Sunu.
	<i>Dat.</i> Suna	Suna.
	<i>Gen.</i> Suna	Suna.
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> Suna	Suna.
	<i>Acc.</i> Suna	Suna.
	<i>Dat.</i> Sunum	Sunum.
	<i>Gen.</i> Sunena	(Sunena).

(c.)

Indefinite Declension of Adjectives.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> Gód	Gód	Gód.
	<i>Acc.</i> Gód	Gódene	Góde.
	<i>Dat.</i> Góda (-um)	Goda (-um)	Gódere.
	<i>Gen.</i> Gódes	Gódes	Gódere.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Plur. Nom.</i>	Góde	Góde	Góde.
<i>Acc.</i>	Góde	Góde	Góde.
<i>Dat.</i>	Gódum (-a)	Gódum (-a)	Gódum (-a).
<i>Gen.</i>	Gódera	Godera	Godera.

(d.)

Definite.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Sing. Nom.</i>	Góde	Góda	Góde.
<i>Acc.</i>	Góde	Góda	Góda.*
<i>Dat.</i>	Góda*	Góda*	Góda.*
<i>Gen.</i>	Góda*	Góda*	Góda.*
<i>Plur. Nom.</i>	Góda*	Góda*	Góda.*
<i>Acc.</i>	Góda*	Góda*	Góda.*
<i>Dat.</i>	Góda (-on)	Góda (-on)	Góda (-on).
<i>Gen.</i>	Góda (-ona)	Goda (-ona)	Goda (-ona).

(e.)

*The Persons of the Present Tense.**Indicative Mood.*

<i>Sing.</i>	1. Berne	<i>I burn.</i>
	2. Bernst	<i>Thou burnest.</i>
	3. Bernth	<i>He burns.</i>
<i>Plur.</i>	1. Bernath	<i>We burn.</i>
	2. Bernath	<i>Ye burn.</i>
	3. Bernath	<i>They burn.</i>

In the inflection of the verbs there is between the Frisian and A. S. this important difference. In A. S. the infinitive ends in *-an*, as *macian*, to make, *lëran*, to learn, *bërnan*, to burn; whilst in Frisian it ends in *-a*, as *maka*, *lëra*, *berna*.

* In A. S. all these forms would end in *-n*; as *godan*.

*The Auxiliar Verb Wesa, To Be.**Indicative.*

	<i>Present.</i>		<i>Past.</i>	
<i>Sing.</i>	1. Ik ben		1. Ik	} Was.
	2. ?		2. Thú	
	3. Hi is		3. Hi	
<i>Plur.</i>	1. Wi	} Send	1. Wi	} Weron.
	2. I		2. I	
	3. Hja		3. Hja	

Subjunctive.

	<i>Present.</i>		<i>Past.</i>
<i>Sing.</i>	1. 2. 3. Se		1. 2. 3. Wére.
<i>Plur.</i>	1. 2. 3. Se		1. 2. 3. Wére.
<i>Infjn.</i> Wesa.	<i>Pr. Part.</i> Wesande.		<i>Past Part.</i> E-wesen.

The Frisian numerals (to be compared with those of the Anglo-Saxons, are as follows:—*E'n, twá, thrjú, fjúwer, fif, sex, sjúgun, achta, njugun, tian*, &c. Of these the first three take an inflection, e. g. *en*, like *gode* and the adjectives, has both a definite and an indefinite form, *en*, and *thet ene*; whilst *twa* and *thrjú* run as follows:—*Nom.* and *Acc. Neut.* *twa*; *Masc.* *twene*; *Fem.* *twa*; *Dat.* *twam*; *Gen.* *twira*; *Nom.* and *Acc. Neut.* *thrjú*; *Masc.* *thre*; *Fem.* *thrja*; *Dat.* *thrim*; *Gen.* *thrira*.

In respect to the Pronouns, there is in the Old Frisian of *Dutch* Friesland no dual number (the *North* Frisian has one), as there is in Anglo-Saxon. On the other hand, however, the Frisians (whilst they have no such form as *his*) possess, like the Icelandic, the inflected adjectival pronoun *sin*, corresponding to the Latin *suus*: whilst, like the Anglo-Saxons, and unlike the Icelanders, they have nothing to correspond with the Latin *se*.

In Frisian there is between the demonstrative pronoun used as an article, and the same word used as a demon-

strative in the limited sense of the term, the following difference of declension:—

THE ARTICLE.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Sing. Nom.</i>	Thet	Thi	Thjú.
<i>Acc.</i>	Thet	Thene	Thá.
<i>Dat.</i>		Thá	There.
<i>Gen.</i>		Thes	There.
<i>Plur. Nom.</i>		Thá.	
<i>Acc.</i>		Thá.	
<i>Dat.</i>		Thá.	
<i>Gen.</i>		Théra.	

PRONOUN.

The demonstrative in the limited sense of the word.

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Sing. Nom.</i>	Thet	Thi	se.
<i>Acc.</i>	Thet	Thene	se.
<i>Dat.</i>		Tham	There.
<i>Gen.</i>		Thes	There.
<i>Plur. Nom.</i>		Se.	
<i>Acc.</i>		Se.	
<i>Dat.</i>		Thám.	
<i>Gen.</i>		Théra.	

The Saxons draw no such a distinction. With them the article and demonstrative is declined as follows:—

	<i>Neuter.</i>	<i>Masculine.</i>	<i>Feminine.</i>
<i>Sing. Nom.</i>	þæt	se	seo.
<i>Acc.</i>	þæt	þone	þá.
<i>Dat.</i>		þam	þæ're.
<i>Sing. Gen.</i>		þæs	þæ're.
<i>Plur. Nom.</i>		þá.	
<i>Acc.</i>		þá.	
<i>Dat.</i>		þám.	
<i>Gen.</i>		þára.	

Specimen of Glossarial affinity.—Taken from Rask's Preface to his Frisian Grammar:—

<i>Frisian.</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>
'Age	Eáge	<i>Eye.</i>
Háved	Heáfod	<i>Head.</i>
Kind	Cild	<i>Child.</i>
Erva	Eafora	<i>Heir.</i>
Drochten	Drihten	<i>Lord.</i>
Nacht	Niht	<i>Night.</i>
Réd	Ræ'd	<i>Council (Rede).</i>
Déde	Dæ'd	<i>Deed.</i>
Nose	Nasu	<i>Nose.</i>
'Ein	Agen	<i>Own.</i>
Kápie	Ceapige	<i>I buy (Chapman).</i>
Dua	Dou	<i>To do.</i>
Slá	Sleán	<i>Slay.</i>
Gunga	Gangan	<i>Go (Gang).</i>

CHAPTER IX.

GERMAN ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.—PART OF GERMANY FROM WHICH IT WAS INTRODUCED.—POINTS OF INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—LOCAL NAMES.

§ 48. As a general rule, the Angle names for geographical localities are compound words; compounds after the usual fashion of the English language; compounds wherein the element of the wider and more general signification comes *last*. In other words we have, in such names as *Stán-tún*, or *Sand-*

wic, the *town* characterised, defined, or particularised by the presence of *stones*, or the *wic* characterised, defined, or particularised by the presence of *sand*. The nature of these second elements, although more or less varied, is still pretty constant. We often have the name of some natural feature of the country—a *hill*, a *stream*, a *ford*: often, too, the name of some artificial construction—*town*, *borough*, *ham*, *thorp*. This is nothing more than what we expect *à priori* from the nature of the subject.

§ 49. For studying these in their modern forms, a map of England, along with one of Northern Germany, is sufficient. For the local names of the Anglo-Saxon period, the great repertorium is the "Codex Diplomaticus" of Mr. Kemble. To this may be added a treatise on the "Local Nomenclature of the Anglo-Saxon" by Professor Leo, of Halle.

It is from the preface to the third volume of the Codex that the following list of those Anglo-Saxon words which enter into the composition of local names is taken.

Æsc, A. S.; *ash*, English. This tree is often mentioned in the boundaries of charters.

Bæc, A. S.; *beck*, English. It is the High German *bach*, and is a word of some importance. At present, it is found so much more in the northern than in the southern parts of Britain, and it is so much commoner in the Norse than in the proper German parts of the Continent, that it has somewhat hastily been considered a Danish rather than an Angle element.

Botl, A. S.; *bottle*, English—as in *Harbottle*. It means *dwelling-place, building*. In Germany we find it in *Wolfenbüttell*, &c. It is particularly common in the western half of the Duchy of Holstein—*i. e.* in Ditmarsh.

Beorh, A. S.; *-berg*, English = *hill*.

Bróc, A. S.; *-brook*, English—*Spell-brook*, &c.

Brycg, A. S.; *-bridge*, English—*Wey-bridge*, &c.

Buruh, *Burh*, A. S.; *borough*, *burgh*, *bury*, English.

Clif, A. S.; *cliff*, English.

Cot, A. S.; *cot*, *cottage*, English.

Croft, A. S.; *croft*, English.—*Wudu-croft*, A. S.; *Wood-croft*, English.

Dic, A. S.; *dike*, *ditch*, English.

Ea, A. S. = *river*, *stream*.

Eg, *Ig*, A. S. = *island*; as in *Ceortes-ig* = *Cherts-ey*.

Ecg, A. S.; *edge*, English.

Feld, A. S. Form for form, this is the English *field*. In A. S., however, it meant an open tract of land rather than an enclosure, as with us.

Fen, A. S. = *fen*, English.

Fleet, A. S.; *fleet* (as in the *Fleet Ditch*, or the river *Fleet*), in English. "Sometimes used alone, as the *Fleet* at Thorpe, near Chertsey, in Surrey; but generally, in composition, as *Byfleet*."—Kemble.

Ford, A. S.; *ford*, English. This is important. Word for word, it is the same as the Danish *Fiord*; a substantive which also has a place amongst the elements of the English compounds.

The confusion that this double form has a tendency to engender may be avoided by remembering that the Saxon *-fords* lie inland, and are simply what the English word *ford* is, viz. the names of those parts of our rivers and streams which can be forded, *i. e.* walked over in the water. The Danish (Norse) *f-rd*, on the other hand, means an *arm of the sea*. Consequently, it occurs on the coast rather than in the parts inland. Its form varies; in Scotland becoming *Firth* (*Frith*), as *Firth of Tay*. In Ireland it occurs in the compounds *Strang-ford*, *Carling-ford*, &c. The term *Firth of Forth* is remarkable. Both forms—the one in *-irth* and the one in *-orth*—come from Norse *F-rd*. They are, however, differentiated in the form; one meaning the *river*, which is more or less of an æstuary throughout; the other meaning the more special portion of its outlet. Roughly speaking, when *F-rd* = *vadum* it is Angle and German, when = *æstuarium* it is Danish, Norse, or Scandinavian.

Gráf, A. S.; *grove*, English.

Hæg, A. S.; *hedge*, English.

Ham, A. S. 'This is the *-ham* in words like Notting-*ham*, Threeking-*ham*, &c.

Hangra, A. S.; *-anger*, English, as in Birch-*anger*, Pensh-*anger* = a *meadow* or *grassplat*, usually by the side of the road.

Hlaw, A. S.—a *rising ground*. This is the *-law* so frequent in Scotland, as applied to hills, *e. g.* Berwick-*law*, &c.

Hol, A. S.; *-hole*, English.

Holt, A. S.; *-holt*, English = a *wood*.

Hrycg, A. S.; *ridge*, English.

Hyrne, A. S. = *corner*, *angle*. This word is, to a certain degree, in the same category with *-beck*. It is Danish as well as Saxon, and from being found in the more Danish parts of Britain, has passed for an *exclusively* Danish word—which it is not.

Hyrst, A. S.; *-hurst*, English = *copse* or *wood*. This is one of the most characteristic words of the list, as may be seen from the inspection of any map of Northern Germany.

Hyð, A. S.; *-hithe*, English = "a place that receives the ship on its landing; a low shore, fit to be a landing-place for boats."

Lád, A. S.; *lode*, English. "In the fen countries, this denotes not only a water-channel, but the raised banks on each side."

Land, A. S. and English.

Lane, A. S. and English.

Leah, A. S.; *lea*, English. The usual form this word takes in English compounds is *-ley*, as Baddow-*ley*, Mading-*ley*.

Mæd, A. S.; *mead* (*meadow*), English

Meane, A. S.; *mark* = *boundary*, English.

Mere, A. S. and English—Whittlesea-*Mere*.

Mersc, A. S.; *marsh*, English.

Mór, A. S.; *moor*, English.

Mós, A. S.; *moss*, English; as in *Chat-mos*, where *mos* = *moor* or *swamp*, i. e. a locality where *mosses* grow abundantly rather than the *moss* itself.

Myln, A. S.; *mill*, English, "generally, but not exclusively, watermills."

Næs, A. S.; *ness* (or *naze*), English—*Shoebury-ness*, *Walton-on-the-Naze*—Scandinavian as well as German. Indeed, it is more or less Slavonic and Latin as well—*Noss* and *Nas-us*.

Ofer, A. S. = *shore*.

Pæð, A. S.; *path*, English.

Pól, A. S.; *pool*, English.

Pyt, A. S.; *pit*, English.

Ræ'we, A. S.; *row*, English.

Seta, A. S. = *settlement*—*Somer-set*, *Dor-set*.

Slæ'd, a "low, flat, marshy ground."

Slóþ, A. S.; *slough*, English.

Snæ'd, A. S. = *a portion or piece cut off*—*Whip-snæd*.

Stán, A. S.; *stone*, English—*Whet-stone*, &c.

Steal, A. S.; *stall*, English—*Heppen-stall*.

Stede, A. S. = *place* = the *-stead* in words like *Hampstead*, &c.

Stow, A. S. = *place*—*Stow*, *Wit-stow*.

Tóft, A. S. = *toft*, as in *Wig-toft*, English.

Tún, A. S. = *-ton*, English—*Nor-ton*, *Sut-ton* = *North-town*, *South-town*, &c.

Weald, A. S. and English.

Weg, A. S.; *-way*, English—*Strang-way*.

Were, A. S.; *-weir*, English.

Wic, A. S.; *wick*, *wich*, English—*Wick*, *Aln-wick*, *Green-wich*.

Worðig, A. S. = the *-worth* in *Tam-worth*, *Box-worth*.

Wudu, A. S.; *-wood*, English—*Sel-wood*, *Wich-wood*, &c.

Wyl, A. S.; *-well*, English—*Ash-well*, *Am-well*, &c.

þorp, A. S.; *-thorp*, English—*Maple-thorp*, *Addle-thorp*, &c.

§ 50. As a general rule (as aforesaid), the Angle (and English) names for localities are compound words, of which the latter element is the more general. This is determined or limited by the former. Nearly all the words of the preceding list belong to the *second* part of the compound in which they occur.

The *prefixes* (of less importance) can be well studied in Dr. Leo's work. Sometimes they are believed to represent the names of mythical or semi-mythical personages, *e. g.* the gods *Tiw, Woden, Thor,* and *Sæter*, appear in such names as *Tews-ley, Wan-borough (Wodnes-burg), Thurs-ley, Satterthwaithe*, just as truly as in the days of the week—*Tues-day, Wedn-esday, Thurs-day, Satur-day*. Again, in words like *Offan-dic* and *Credian-tun*, we have the *dike* of King Offa, and the town of *Cridda*—real or fictitious sovereigns. *Oxford, Hazel-hurst, Sand-hurst*, give us names taken from the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms.

§ 51. The application of the criticism which the nature and analysis of the *local* names of the English language suggests, will find place when the closely-allied question of *personal* names has been noticed. Meanwhile a point or two may be foreshadowed. Thus—

In investigating the distribution of similar local names, the physical features of the county must always be borne in mind. We cannot expect the nomenclature of a mountainous county in a fen; or *vice versa*.

Some of the local terms are common to England and to the whole of Germany; when this is the case, we must look minutely to the differences of form.

Others are peculiar to Great Britain. This is the case with the numerous forms in *-den* (such as *Gad-s-den, &c.*), so common in many counties, and so particularly common in Kent. The element *-ton* (in A. S. *-tūn*), as in *New-ton, Sut-ton*, is eminently English.

Hence those names that are neither too general nor too exclusive help us the most.

§ 52. It has been indicated that the *form* is a matter of importance. It is so. The element *-ham* (as in Threeking-*ham*) is found all over Germany; but it is not found in the same shape. In one part it is *-heim*, as in Oppen-*heim*; in another *-hem*, as in Arn-*hem*; in a third *-um*, as in Hus-*um*. The re-appearance of a particular element is one thing; the form in which it re-appears is another.

CHAPTER X.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PART OF GERMANY, ETC.—POINTS OF INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—PERSONAL NAMES.—LAWS, CUSTOMS, SUPERSTITIONS, ETC.

§ 53. As a⁴ general rule the Anglo-Saxon personal names are compound words.

If the principle and details of these compounds ran exactly parallel with the principle and details upon which the names of the Anglo-Saxon geographical localities of the preceding chapter were constructed, the question as to their development and signification would be easy. In such a name as Alf-red, or Ed-ward, we should have the exact analogues of such words as Stán-tun, or Sand-wíc; wherein the elements *-red* and *-ward* would be the names for some class of men invested with certain personal attributes (say *councillor*, or *warden*), and *Alf-* and *Ed-* would be qualifying nouns which told us what sort of *warden* or *councillor* the particular one under notice might be. They might mean *wise*, or *lucky*, or aught else. In such a case, the name would be one like Wise-man, Good-fellow, or some similar compound of the nineteenth

century—all this being nothing more than what we expect *à priori* from the nature of the subject.

Now I do not say that this is not the case, and I also add that many good writers treat the whole subject of the Anglo-Saxon personal names as if it were so. At the same time, I deny that the names of the men and women who were our early ancestors come out in their analysis and explanation half as clear as do those of our early towns, villages, rivers, and mountains. This will become manifest as we proceed.

As the list of the preceding chapter was taken from Mr. Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus*, the examples of the present are from a paper by the same distinguished author *On the Names, Surnames, and Nic-Names of the Anglo-Saxons*, published in the *Proceedings of the Archaeological Institute for 1845*.

Sometimes the name consists of a substantive preceded by an adjective, as *Æðel-stán* = *Noble-stone*. Without asking how it comes that a *man* gets to be called a *stone*, we may see at once that the *combination* itself is an eminently intelligible one. It is just such a one as *Wise-man* or *Good-fellow* (the instances already adduced), where the juxtaposition and nature of the two elements is transparently clear. They may not always give us a name of which we can see the origin, but they always give one of which we can see the principle.

Sometimes the name consists of a substantive preceded by a substantive; a substantive which in this case is, more or less, adjectival in character—*e. g.* *Wulf-helm* (*Wolf-helm*). This only differs from words like *Æðel-stán* in the way that such a compound as *Lock-smith* differs from *Black-smith*.

Sometimes the name consists of an adjective preceded by a substantive, as *Wulf-heáh* (*Wolf-high*). Here begin difficulties. If we were at liberty to translate this the *high wolf*, the meaning would be intelligible, though the origin of the name might be inexplicable. But *Wulf-heáh* (if it mean anything) means *as high as a wolf*. Now a *wolf* is not an ordinary standard of measurement.

Sometimes the name consists of two adjectives, or (to repeat the previous formula) of an adjective preceded by an adjective, as *Æðel-heáh* (*Noble-high*). The English parallels to this are combinations like *light blue*, *deep green*. Now these are not compounds, but pairs of separate words, as is stated at large in the chapter on Composition.

Again, the first element in pairs of words like *light blue*, &c., qualifies or defines the second in a manner which (to say the least) is doubtful in such compounds as *Æðel-heáh*. They suggest the notion not only of their contrary, but of that contrary being as common an element of compound ideas as they are themselves. Thus a *light blue* supposes a *deep blue*, and a *deep green* a *light* (or a *pale*) green. Hence, then, a correlation (so to say) in their qualifying, distinctive, or defining functions.

Now it is doubtful whether this be the case with such words as *Æthel-heáh*. It is *very* doubtful whether they suggested the idea of *Ignoble Height*, as their opposite. It is more probable that, so far as they meant anything at all, they meant *Noble-and-high*; so expressing two qualifications in juxtaposition rather than any particular kind of any single one.

Without saying how far these difficulties are great or small, important or unimportant, I limit myself to the statement that they are of far more frequent occurrence amongst the personal names of the Anglo-Saxons and their allied populations, than they are amongst the local ones. Hence the facts of the present chapter are of less value as instruments of criticism than those of the preceding one—at least in the present state of philological criticism.

§ 54. In the Anglo-Saxon personal, as in the Anglo-Saxon local, names, the latter of the two elements is the more important. Of these the following are the chief; the list and classification being Mr. Kemble's:—

MALE.

Substantives: -bearn, -beorn, -gâr, -geld, -gist, -helm,

-hún, -here, -lác, -man, -mód, -mund, -rod, -sige, -stan, -weald, -weard, -wig, -wine, -ðegn—as in *Ed-gar*, *Beorht-helm*, *Ead-mund*, &c.

Adjectives: -beald, -beorht, -fus, -heâh, -ric, -heard, -nôð.

FEMALE.

Substantives: -buhr, -hâd, -gyfu, -læd, -hild, -rûn, -waru, -wên, -ðryð.

Adjective: -swið.

Some of these may begin as well as end a name. Others, on the contrary, are either exclusively initial, or exclusively final.

Exclusively initial: Eâd-, Os-, Beado-, Heaðo-, Cyne-, Eormen-, Eorcen-.

Exclusively final: -gyfu, -waru, -ðegn.

§ 55. As a general rule (as aforesaid), the Angle (and English) personal names are compounds. It has also been said, that, of these compounds the latter, or *final*, element claims our chief consideration. The initial syllables are, however, not without interest, as may be seen from the following extract:—“The Anglo-Saxon proper names have also very frequently a law of recurrence. It shows itself in the continued repetition of the first part of the compound in the names borne by members of the same family. Endless is the number of *Æthel*-helms, *Æðel*-bealds, *Æthel*-ðryðs, and *Æthel*-stâns. In one family we shall find in succession, or simultaneously, *Wig*-mund, *Wig*-helm, *Wig*-láf, *Wih*-stân, or *Beorn*-ric, *Beorn*-mód, *Beorn*-heâh, *Beorn*-helm. A few examples drawn from history will make this abundantly clear.

“*Eormen*-ric was the father of *Æthel*-berht, the first Christian king of Kent; *Æthel*-bert's son *Eâd*-bald had issue two sons, *Eorcen*-berht and *Eormen*-ræd. Of *Eormen*-ræd's six children, three have their names compounded with *Eormen*-, three with *Æðel*-; thus, *Eormen*-burh, *Eormen*-berg, *Eormen*-gyð, *Eðel*-ðryð, *Æðel*-ræd, *Æthel*-beorht. *Eorcen*-berht's daughters were *Eorcen*-gote and *Eormen*-hild.

“Of the seven sons of Æðelfrið, king of Northumberland, five bore names with *Os-*; thus, *Os-laf*, *Os-lác*, *Os-wald*, *Os-win*, *Os-widu*. In the successions of the same royal family we find the male names *Os-frið*, *Os-wine*, *Os-ric*, *Os-ræd*, *Os-wulf*, *Os-bald*, and *Os-beorht*, and the female name *Os-ðryð*, and some of these are repeated several times.

“Saint *Wig-stan* was the son of *Wig-mund* the son of *Wig-láf*, king of Mercia; and the sons of *Æthel-wine*, duke of East Anglia, were *Æðel-wine*, *Æthel-wold*, *Ælf-wold*, and *Æthel-sige*. His grandson, again, was *Æðel-wine*.

“Lastly, *Ælfred*’s son, *Eád-weard*, married *Eád-gfu*; their children were *Eád-wine*, *Eád-mund*, *Eád-red*, and *Eád-burh*. *Eád-mund*’s children, again, were *Eád-wig* and *Eád-gâr*. *Eád-gar* had children, *Eád-weard*, *Eád-gyð*, and *Eád-weard*. His son *Eád-mund*, again, had two sons, *Eád-mund* and *Eád-gâr*.”—*Kemble, in Transactions, &c.*

In our second chapter this fact has been partially anticipated. In the same chapter, too, may be seen the extent to which it differs from the ordinary alliteration of the Angle metres. However necessarily it may follow that words beginning with the same syllable shall also begin with the same letter, there is a broad difference between the two principles. It is one thing for so many words to begin with the same initial, another for so many compounds to be formed out of the same elements. If the latter carry with it the former, it is only in a secondary manner.

§ 56. *Forms in -ing*.—The same chapter, with its so-called pedigrees, is referred to for instances of the affix-*ing*. It has the same power as the *-idn;* in the Greek Patronymics, so that *Eádgar-ing* means the *son of Edgar*, and *Eádberht Eadgar-ing*, *Eadbert the son of Edgar*—*Edbert Edgarrison*.

Compounds of sunu = son.—Could such a word as *Edgarson* (allowing for a difference of form) occur in the Angle stage of the English language? Assuredly, it is common enough in the English stage of the Angle, *i. e.* in the

language of the nineteenth century;—so it has been for some time.

Now the paper which has already supplied so much gives us the following extract:—"Ministro qui Leófwine nomine et Bondan *sunu* appellatur cognomine." (No. 1739.)

Hence our answer is in the affirmative, it being safe to say that in the Angle stage of our language the method of signifying descent by the affix of the patronymic *-ing* was *not* the only one. Over and above, there was the use of the word *sunu* = *son*.

Why, however, was the question asked? Because, common as are the compounds of *son* in English, they were rare in Angle. Again, common as were the forms in *-ing* in Angle, they are rare in English.

This is a reason, but it is only one out of two.

§ 57. The other is the weightier one.

a. The forms in *-son* are not only rare in Angle, but they are rare in all the *Proper* German dialects; and—

b. They are not only *rare* in all the *Proper* German dialects (the Angle included), but they are extremely *common* in the Danish, Norse, and Swedish, *i. e.* in all the languages of the Scandinavian branch.

The inference from this can hardly fail to be drawn, *viz.* that all the numerous *Ander-sons*, *Thomp-sons*, *John-sons*, *Nel-sons*, &c., of England, are, more or less Danish, as opposed to Angle.

Now, as the previous extract stands, it invalidates this inference.

But it should be added that it comes from a charter of the *Danish* King Cnut's (A.D. 1023). So doing, it leaves the original inference as it was.

Hence I have limited myself to saying that the use of the word *son* (*sunu*) occurs during the Angle stage of the English language. I do not say that it occurs in the pure and unmodified language of the Angles.

The Latin extract is from the beginning of the Charter. At the end of it we find the same combination in Anglo-Saxon: "Ðis is Ʒára VII. hida bók tó Hanitúne Ʒe Cnut Ang. gebócode *Leofwine Bondan sunu* on éce yrfæ."—" *This is the book (deed) of the seven hydes at Hannington, which Cnut, the king, granted to Leofwine Bondeson for a heritage for ever.*"

§ 58. The application of the criticism which the structure and analysis of the personal names in the English language supply, will find its place along with that which arises out of the structure and analysis of the local names.

It will not, however, give equal results; this being what we are prepared to expect from the remarks that have been made on the unsatisfactory character of some of the compound appellations under notice.

Nor is this all. Other circumstances impede the free use of even our best lists as instruments of philological criticism.

a. Sometimes the full compound is abbreviated, as truly as *Thom*-as is abbreviated into *Tom*; *e. g.* "quare non et nobis perrigis panem nitidum, quem et patri nostro *Saba*," (sic namque illum appellare consuerant,) "dabas?"—*Beda, Ecc. Hist.* ii. 5. The evidence that this *Saba's* full name was *Sabeorht* is found in the same chapter.

b. Sometimes the form is like that of an abbreviation, without there being any evidence of its actually being one; *e. g.* *Becca*, *Beonna*, *Ucca*, and the prominent and often-mentioned one of *Beda*.

c. Sometimes it is doubtful whether the name be truly Angle, or even German, in the wider and generic sense of the word. Few names, in this respect, have been more discussed than that of one *Coif*. When Christianity was making its way into Northumberland, no one was more active in breaking up the old pagan idols than an active and energetic priest so designated. "But the name," say some critics, "is a strange one. Is it so certainly an Angle, or Anglo-Saxon one, as it

seems? May it not have been British, and, if so, the name of some Christian Briton; nay possibly, of some converted Druid?"—"No," says Mr. Kemble (though not exactly in these words), "it is only the West-Saxon word *Céſt*, or *Céfig*, in a Northumbrian form, just as *Cénræd* in Hampshire becomes *Coïn*ræd in Durham. It is a derivative from the adjective *cóf* = *strenuus*." The present writer says nothing; he merely quotes the name as an illustration,—firstly, of one of the bearings of the line of criticism involved in the discussion; and, secondly, of the difficulties that attend the investigation.

d. To those that more especially arise out of the possibility of Angle names being taken for British, and *vice versâ*, he draws particular attention. That a certain *Cædweal*ha, although the son of a father with so Angle a name as *Cênberht*, bore a *British* name is suggested by Mr. Kemble, who, adding that his brother was named *Múl*, infers that the mother was a Briton. Now the British-sounding name *Cædweal*ha brings in that of *Cad*-wallader, who (we are told) was the son of *Cad*-wallon, who was the son of *Cad*-wal. What is this but a *fac-simile*, in Keltic Britain, of the process that in Angle England gave us the *Æthel*-wulfs, *Æthel*-stans, and a long line of similar compounds of *Æthel*-, and some varying affix, of *Æthel* + *x* (so to say)? Yet the process is too peculiar to be considered as one common to tongues so different as the Angle and British. Nor is it very likely that the one would borrow it from the other. In my eyes, the fact of such compounds repeating themselves to the extent to which they are said to do is suspicious;—suspicious from the very fact before us. It cannot well be valid for both the Britons and the Angles; what, then, is the explanation of it?

Can the forms in question be despatched to that realm of *eponymies*, *alliterational pedigrees*, and events in *eight-year cycles*, to a notice of which a great part of our second chapter has been devoted? Not altogether. The fact that,

with one exception, all the kings between Ecbert and Cnut bear names beginning with either *Æthel-*, or *Ead-* is against this summary mode of dispensation.

The historical succession of such a series of kings as *Æthel-wulf*, *Æthel-bald*, *Æthel-bert*, *Æthel-ræd*, *Ælf-ræd* (the only exception), *Ead-ward*, *Æthel-stan*, *Ead-mund*, *Ead-red*, *Ead-wig*, *Ead-gar*, *Ead-weard*, *Æthel-ræd*, *Ead-mund*, forbids it. Nevertheless I hold that a large percentage of the individuals belonging to the majority of these peculiarly-formed pedigrees are fictitious, and inventions of the genealogists.

The alliterational character of the early German poetry has been noticed. This made it a metrical necessity that certain names should begin with the same letter. To proceed from one similar initial to two, and from two to a whole syllable, is by no means an improbable step; and such a step I believe to have been actually made.

Equivocal position of certain personal names in respect to the language to which they belong.—In the preceding chapter, the word *-ness* gave rise to the remark that it was a root common to more languages than one. It was found in the Latin under the form *nas-us*, and in the Slavonic under that of *nos*. Hence its appearance in a given combination was by no means proof of that combination being German. This, of course, subtracted from its value as a characteristic.

The same applies to more than one element of the *personal* names. They are not exclusively German. Some (to go no further) are Slavonic as well; *e.g.* the terminations in *-ric*, *laf*, *-ld*, *-rod*, *-ast*, and others.

Equivocal origin of certain elements in personal names.—All the world over, a word, when it is placed as an element in a compound, has a tendency to depart from that full and complete form which it exhibited whilst it was separate and independent.

Take such a word as *feri*. It is easy to see how likely it would be to lose the *e* and become *fri*, or lose the *i* and be-

come *fer*, when subordinated to another word, and with its accent removed.

Or take a pair of words like *-old*, and *-olf*, and let each lose the final consonant. The result is *ol*—a form which might arise from either.

Both these are points to be remembered in the application of personal names as instruments of criticism.

Indeed, I repeat the statement, that, though of great importance in some fields of philological and ethnological inquiry, they are, in the one before us, of subordinate value;—one reason for this lying in the fact of the study of them being in a more immature state than that of the names of geographical localities.

For this reason I have given the lists of pp. 73, 74, without any translation; inasmuch as the current renderings have not always been satisfactory. Some, indeed, are clear enough; *e. g.* *beald* = *bold*, *athel* = *noble*, *heah* = *high*. The majority, however, are by no means of the unequivocal character of the words *-hurst*, *-lea*, *-wudu*, &c., of the previous chapter.

In some cases I have even allowed myself to suppose that it is not within the pale of the German language that the etymologies are to be sought. This, however, is with the so-called Gothic, Vandal, and Burgundian names, rather than with the Angle. The possibility of certain words being German only in the way that *sparrow grass* (an adaptation of *asparagus*) is English, may advantageously be recognised as a point of caution—the true language being the Slavonic.

§ 59. *Laws, customs, superstitions, &c.*—All that is said at present upon the evidence derived from the likeness between certain laws, customs, and superstitions of the Angles of England to those of the populations of Northern Germany is that the comparison is limited; but that, as far as it goes, it supports rather than invalidates the conclusions derived from the other more important sources, *viz.* the external testimony of authors, and the phenomena of language.

CHAPTER XI.

GERMAN ORIGIN, ETC.—PARTS OF GERMANY, ETC.—AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL EVIDENCE.
 —DEFINITION OF THE ORIGINAL SAXON AND FRISIAN AREAS.
 —THE SPECIALLY ANGLE PARTS THEREOF.

§ 60. *Retrospect*.—Let us now look back upon the facts and questions of the preceding chapters, review the different points from which the subjects have been contemplated, consider the connection between them, and ask what results they prepare us for.

1. That the English language came from Germany;
2. That it fixed itself in England between A.D. 369 and A.D. 597, has been admitted without doubt or reservation.
3. That by the middle of the eighth century it had displaced the Latin of the Roman conquest over the whole of the area from which the Latin had displaced the original British, has been inferred.

With this ends the list of positive and admitted facts. They are evidently few enough. And not only are they few in number, but they are as little precise as numerous. Germany is a large place; the interval between A.D. 369 and A.D. 597 a long one. The commonest of the current histories tells us more than this, tells it in fewer words, and tells it in a less indefinite and roundabout manner. Be it so.

4. The second chapter justifies the hesitation and circumlocution of the preceding one, and is devoted to the exposition of some of the chief reasons which invalidate not only the current accounts, but the original *data*, on which they are founded. Doing this, it foreshadows the necessity of a

different line of criticism. Special and direct evidence being wanting, we must betake ourselves to inference instead.

For the time and place under notice, we have neither maps nor descriptions; no map for Northern Germany, no description, during the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, for the North-German populations. We have, however, an accredited date for the first invasion of Britain—viz. A.D. 449, the year of the supposed advent of Hengest and Horsa.

Taking this as a sort of central epoch, we ask three questions:—

5. What accounts have we, in the way of external evidence, for the times nearest this date and *following* it?

6. What accounts have we, in the way of external evidence, for the times nearest this date and *preceding* it?

7. What changes took place in the interval?

The answer is—

8. That the notices of Northern Germany of the second century are essentially the same as those of the ninth, the differences being apparent rather than actual, and the changes which those differences imply being *nominal* rather than *real*. Hence the accounts of certain early classical, and of certain later Carolingian writers are, to a certain extent, valid for the events of the interval between A.D. 369 and A.D. 597.

So much for the question of external evidence, which is not direct, but circumstantial. Respecting this, we have got at the fact that the two sets of witnesses that supply it agree with, rather than contradict, each other. At the same time, the agreement is by no means transparently visible on the surface, or complete when seen.

9. It requires strengthening, does this same external evidence.—This is done in the remaining four chapters, which deal with the Languages, Personal Names, &c., of Northern Germany, and supply so much evidence of the kind called *internal*.

10. The two kinds agree.

How closely?

§ 61. *Comparison of Maps*.—The maps will tell us this.

In a map of *England*, take the counties of Surrey, Herts, Beds, and Huntingdon, and note the character of the local names, looking out more especially for the forms in *-hurst* and *-beck*—the counties just named being the best for the following reason. They are the most purely Angle. Kent has some special peculiarities—real or supposed; whilst westward we get towards the Keltic frontier; and northwards into the Danish area. Cornwall, Lincolnshire, and Berkshire illustrate this—each differently. In the first we may note the compounds of *tre-* (*Tre-gonel*); in the second, the compounds of *-by* (*Spills-by*); in the third, the absence of these forms. Now *tre-* is British, and *-by* Danish; *-by* Danish, a point to be more especially remembered, and one of wide and important application, as will be seen in the sequel.

In a map of *Germany* take the tribes to which the classical writers refer—the Frisii, Chauci, Chamavi, Dulgubini, Cherusci, Fosi, Angrivarii, Angli, and Saxones; and then, for the Carolingians, take the Westphalians, Angrarii, Eastphalians, and Nordalbingians.

The same will include the districts to which the extant specimens of both the Frisian and Old-Saxon languages have been referred.

The same will agree more closely with the more Angle parts of England than will any other part of Germany.

§ 62. *The -horsts of the Lower and Middle Weser.*—On the Lower Weser we shall find a whole mass of the characteristic *-horsts*—*Delmen-horst*, *Fahren-horst*, and *Staf-horst* north-west of Nienburg. Higher up we branch off into the valleys of the Aller and Leine, in each of which the *-horsts* are numerous. So they are about Minden, Herford, and *Engern* (important *Angri-varian* localities) *e. g.* *Jen-horst*, *Bohn-horst*, *Schnat-horst*, *Wallen-horst*. For the parts about Munster and Dülmen we have *Horst-mar*, *Senden-horst*, *Frekken-horst*, *Wolf-horst*, *Issel-horst*, and *Borg-horst*.

As we go south-east they decrease. *Segel-horst* is to be found in Hesse; but it is an outlier.

§ 63. *Holstein*.—Divide the Duchy of Holstein into two parts, a larger one and a smaller one; the larger one being on the west, the smaller one on the east; the larger one coinciding with the drainage of the Elbe, the smaller with that of the Plöner and other lakes and the river Trave. The eastern, or smaller, portion will be Slavonic, the western, or larger, Saxon—Nordalbingian Saxon, Nordalbingian Saxon belonging to Stormar, Ditmarsh, and Holsatia.

Here, there is a well-defined region of forms in *-horst*. There are none in the extreme east, none in the extreme west. There are several in the middle district. Ditmarsh has only one or two on its eastern border. The parts east of Kiel and Lübeck have none. The Eyder on the north, and two artificial lines, slightly irregular in outline, give us the boundaries. One is drawn from the most southern part of the bend of the Eyder to Glückstadt. The other joins Kiel and Lauenburg. This was Slavonic; so that the absence of Angle forms is accounted for.

In Ditmarsh, *-horst* is replaced by the equally Angle forms *-wisch*, and *-büttel*—the one being the *-was* in *Alre-was*, the other the *bottle* in *Har-bottle*, &c.

It is highly probable that what is now the barren Segeberger Heath was once the forest that gave their ships to the Nordalbingian part of the Angle invaders of Britain, and its name to the district of *Holt-satia*, *Holstein*, or *Holt* (*wood*).

The Eyder, like the Elbe, was a Transalbingian boundary.

In *Sleswick* we find much that is Frisian, as will be noticed in another place; something Slavonic, which will support an hypothesis in prospect; much that is High-German, and which is recent; and a good deal which is Danish, of uncertain date. But we find nothing distinctively and characteristically Angle—*not even in the district called Anglen*.

Lauenburg need scarcely be divided. For practical purposes it is Slavonic. An old division between the two populations is the river Bille.

§ 64. *Lüneburg*.—Lüneburg, like Holstein, though pro-

bably, at one time, exclusively Slavonic, must have a line drawn through it. For the south, that of the railway will serve; for the north, one drawn from Bergedorf to Lüneburg. Or we may take the valley of the river Ilmenau, which, without being less accurate than either of the others, is *natural*. It can be followed as far as Bodenteich.

§ 65. At Bodenteich a short line, drawn westward, will take us to the frontier of Altmark, the Old March, Border, or Debatable Land. No part of Altmark can be claimed for ancient Saxony, except under the doctrine that all its numerous signs of Slavonic occupation are referable to recent colonisation. The local names in Altmark are well nigh as Slavonic as in Mecklenburg, or Posen; *e. g.* Schaplitz, Wiebelitz, Gieseritz, Peckwitz, Kalbitz, &c., &c. The course of the river Ohre, from its source to its junction with the Elbe, gives us the line here.

The Ohre falls into the Elbe; and, instead of considering, as is often done, the latter river the boundary of Slavonia, we should remember that Altmark is Slavonic, and that the Ohre bounds Altmark.

The Ohre falls into the Elbe. On the other hand, the rivers of Brunswick, and the contiguous parts of Hanover, fall into the Weser.

The Elbe itself is now our boundary, as far as the junction of the Saale; afterwards, the Saale as far as Bernburg. For this district the Slavonic character of the eastern bank is much more certain than the Saxon character of the western—indeed, the common maps give us, for the German side, a few undoubted Slavonic forms, *e. g.* Schleibnitz, south-west of Magdeburg.

South and south-west of Bernburg, the western side of our line, even when German, ceases to be Saxon. Probably it had done so before.

Here, within a few miles of the town of Zerbst, are no less than three forms in* *-by*—Bar-*by*, Steck-*by*, and Brum-*by*—

* Unless the maps mislead me, and the *-by* be *-bg*, an abbreviation for *-burg*.

more than can be found in all the rest of Germany put together.

From Bernburg westwards the line is difficult and obscure.

There is the complicated ethnology of the Hartz for one complication.

There is the complicated ethnology of the Hessian frontier for another.

§ 66. *The Hartz—Eastern division.*—The Brocken is our centre here; and next to the Brocken the water-systems that diverge from it.

On the east the Elbe, on the west the Weser, have each their affluents from the Hartz.

Let the eastern parts be taken first.

Of this eastern division there is a northern and a southern subdivision—the northern, with the drainage of the Holzeme and the Bode, the southern, with those of the Wipper and the Helme.

In the parts to the *north* and *north-east* of the Brocken, certain forms in *-s-leben* are at their *maximum*—*e. g.* in the parts about Quedlingburg, *Aschers-leben*, *Oschers-leben*, *Halberstadt*, *Magdeburg*, *Brunswick*. Here we have *Barten-s-leben*, *Ermer-s-leben*, *Erx-leben* (*Erk-s-leben*), *Moor-s-leben*, *Alteringer-s-leben*, *Osteringerod-s-leben*, *Uhr-s-leben*, *Wefen-s-leben*, *Eil-s-leben*, *Soer-s-leben*, *Badel-s-leben*, *Oft-s-leben*, *Hoten-s-leben*, *Ohr-s-leben*, *Wacker-s-leben*, *Gun-s-leben*, *War-s-leben*, *Au-s-leben*, *Ott-leben*, *Hamer-s-leben*, *Branter-s-leben*, *Altenbranter-s-leben*, *Oscher-s-leben*, *Hadmer-s-leben*.

The drainage of the Holzeme and Bode (as aforesaid) gives us these. The area, however, of the *-s-leben*-forms extends further. They will be found both due north, as well as due south of the Brocken. Nevertheless, their chief development is in an eastern and north-eastern direction.

In the *south-east* they decrease, and on the drainage of the Wipper and Helme the termination which characterises an extraordinary proportion of words is the vowel *a*; *e. g.* *Stein-a*,

Sachs-*a*, Trebr-*a*, Wied-*a*, Wern-*a*, Berg-*a*, Tyr-*a*, Schwend-*a*, Kellbr-*a*.

I find few or none on the Bode northwards, or on the Weser, Oder, &c., westwards.

I consider that they lead toward another division of the German dialects, *viz.* the Thuringian.

§ 67. *Western division*.—To the north and north-west lie the parts about Brunswick, Wolfenbüttel, Schöpferstedt, Schöningen, Helmstedt, &c. In these certain forms in *-um* are at the *maximum*. We may almost fancy ourselves in Friesland—Ohr-*um*, Börs-*um*, Born-*um*, Rockl-*um*, Eil-*um*, Eitz-*um*, Ahl-*um*, Ahz-*um*, Volz-*um*, Hach-*um*, Gilz-*um*, Lechl-*um*, Eit-*um*, Watz-*um*, Saltz-*um*.

The *south-western* division has no such notable characteristics as the other three, or rather it is remarkable for the absence of them. To the west and south-west of Andreasburg, and on the drainage of the Oder the Frisian (?) *-um*, the Thuringian (?) *-a*, are equally wanting, the forms in *-s-leben* being rare.

To recapitulate: on the Wipper the forms in *-s-leben* are rare; those in *-um* non-existent; those in *-a* common—Wippr-*a*, Horl-*a*, Gonn-*a*.

On the Oder, these are wanting, as are all forms in *-um*.

On the Helme, the *-a*'s attain the *maximum*.

Where the *leben*'s are most abundant the forms in *-um* decrease, and *vice versâ*.

Within the area of the forms in *-s-leben* signs of Slavonic occupancy may be discovered, increasing as we get eastward—Selze, Silze, Selke, Sulze, Harbke, Schermke, Scherbenitz, Wend-essen.

Probably the Hartz was Eastphalian Saxon—less the part drained by the Wipper and the Helme; in which case a line may be drawn from (say) Bernburg to Andreasburg with Aschersleben, Quedlingburg, Ballensted, Güntersburge, and Elbengerode on the north; and Stolberg, and Nordhausen on the south. Near

Andreasburg the line turns southwards, and we get into the valley of the Oder.

§ 68. The line now becomes both natural and political; for the watershed between the source of the Leine and its feeders and those of the Wipper and Helme is the southern boundary of the kingdom of Hanover.

It runs west and south-west, dipping downward. Gottingen and Grubenhagen lie to the north of it, consequently may be claimed as portions of Saxon Germany. Nevertheless, it is not the local names that bring us to this result. Of these the words ending in *-beck* are the most important. *Beck* = *brook*, and is an English form, as in *Wel-beck*, &c. But it is Platt-Deutsch or Low-German as well—the High-German form being *bach*.

Now these forms in *-beck* and *-bach* are irregularly distributed. They are by no means uncommon on the Upper Leine and in the parts about Gottingen—*Sparr-beck*, *Kre-beck*, &c. On the main stream, however, of the Weser itself we find a *Golm-bach*, a *Lo-bach*, and a *Frost-bach* to the north of Hoxter, and *south* of these forms in *a*; a *Beven-beck*, a *Rose-beck*, and a *Röhr-beck* within the Hessian frontier.

§ 69. The external evidence respecting the Saxons of the Diemel, taken along with (what will be noticed more fully in the sequel) the Platt-Deutsch form of speech, must help us here. It justifies us in carrying our line from Andreasburg to Duderstadt, and from Duderstadt to Münden.

That a Saxon population of *some kind* lay further southwards, and dipped into and indented the Hessian frontier, is a matter of fact resting upon the special evidence of a passage already quoted. *Wolfshanger*, in its immediate neighbourhood, was a joint-occupancy—Frank and Saxon—the two populations living together. *Zeuss* (in *voc. Hessi*) uses an expression which brings the Saxon frontier far downwards and southwards, for he speaks of the *Saxons that pressed forwards* (*vordringenden*).

I would not say that some of the Hessian Saxons were not

in situ. I abstain, however, from refining on Zeuss' view; and, after remarking that the Saxon frontier was not very far off, pass from Hesse Cassel westwards.

In the southern extremity of the Principality of Waldeck is a *Sachsen-berg*, and in the centre a *Sachsen-häusen*. Were the Saxons that these names suggested *in situ*? Or were they conquering and intrusive populations? Or were they colonists, settled by the Franks? I think that they were *in situ*.

Due west of Waldeck lies the Sauerland, with the watershed between the Weser and the Rhine. The Ruhr has some of its head-waters here. Now *Sauer-land* is *Suther-land*, or *Southern-land*. Yet if we look at either the Hessian area, or the Frank, it lies quite at the *northern* extremity. This is just what we have in our own island, of which the most northern county is the *Southern-land* (*Suther-land*). Why is this? Simply because the name was given by a population which viewed it from the north; viz. the Norwegians of Orkney and Shetland, the old lords of northern Scotland.

Apply this view to *Sauer-land*. It is an intelligible name, if we suppose that a Saxon population gave it; but not otherwise. But in order for it to be given, the Saxon frontier must have come down as far south as the Sauerland frontier. This it touched; perhaps included.

§ 70. *The forms in -um*.—If we look at a map of the Dutch province of Friesland, we shall be struck with the number of local names that end in *-um*; if we look to one of Germany, or England, we shall find an explanation of its meaning. It is the *-ham* in such English words as *Notting-ham*, *Three-king-ham*, &c. It is the *-heim* in such *High-German* words as *Oppen-heim* and *Mann-heim*. It is the *-hem* in such *Low-German* words as *Arn-hem*, *Berg-hem*. It is the German *heim*, the English *home*, the A. S. *hām*. It enters into composition, and varies in its form with the different forms of speech which coincide with the different divisions of the German area. In

Friesland, at least, it takes its shortest form, having ejected the initial aspirate.

In *Friesland* itself, so abundant are these compounds of *-um*, that two out of three of the places within a few miles of *Leeuwarden*, end in that element. On the other hand, in *Zeeland* but few words are compounded of the equivalent to *-ham* and *-heim* at all; perhaps none except the word *Ritthem*; which is in *h* and *e*.

Thus we have within the kingdom of *Holland* the two extremes; *i. e.* the Frisian topography at its *maximum* in *Friesland*, and at its *minimum* in *Zeeland*.

Between these two extremes the following is the order of transition.

Groningen.—Here the Frisian compound predominates, and that with the Frisian form. In the *arrondissement* of *Appingadam* only, we have eighteen names in *-um*.

Drenthe.—Here they do not occur at all. But *Drenthe* seems to be recently-reclaimed land, and as such, the *habitat* of a population less aboriginal than that of *Friesland* and *Groningen*.

Oberijssel.—*a. Arrondissement of Zwolle*.—Here we have three compounds of *-hem*, *viz.*: *Blanken-hem*, *Windes-heim*, and *Wils-um*—all three different; one Saxon, one German, and one Frisian.

b. Arrondissement of Deventer.—One compound in *-um*, *Hess-um*.

c. Arrondissement of Almelo.—Three compounds—*Ootmars-um*, *Rent-um*, and *Ross-um*.

Notwithstanding this diminution of Frisian characteristics, there is between *Almelo* and *Ommen* a *Vriesen-veen* = *Frisian fen*.

Gelderland.—*a. Arrondissement of Arnhem*.—Here *Arnhem* takes the form in *hem*. On the contrary, *Helsum* and *Benkum* occur, and so do *Bennekom* and *Ellekom*.

b. Arrondissement of Nimeguen.—Forms in *-um* rare, if any.

c. Arrondissement of Tiel.—Heukel-um, Gelic-um, and Ross-um.

North Brabant.—Three or four forms in -um at most.

d. Arrondissement of Zutphen.—Forms in -em almost (or wholly) to the exclusion of those in -um—Lochem, Zelhem.

Limburg.—Here are four forms, Wessum, Sevenum, Wansum, and Ottersum; but they occur in the northern *arrondissement* (that of Roermonde) only, and that in contact with Groet-hem and Baex-hem.

Utrecht.—Utter, or nearly utter, absence of Frisian forms.

South Holland.—Ditto.

North Holland.—*a. In the arrondissement of Amsterdam.* Blaricum, Helmersum, Bussum.

b. In the arrondissement of Hoorn.—Wognum.

Notwithstanding this paucity of Frisian forms in North Holland, part of the province is called *West Friesland*; from which we may infer that, even though the termination -um be non-existent, there may have been a Frisian occupancy.

With this preponderance of the forms in -um in Friesland, and with the evidence as to its then Frisian character, are we justified in coming, at once, to the conclusion that they are definite and absolute signs of Frisian occupancy? They are certainly abundant enough in Friesland; whilst the High-German, the Low-German, the Anglo-Saxon, and the English forms are transparently different. Again—in Scandinavia, the normal form, at least, is -jem, as in Trond-jem. Thirdly, a very great proportion of the forms of -um, that occur beyond the limits of Holland, are either on the Dutch frontier, or else in localities where a Frisian population either exists at the present time, or is known to have once existed.

Thus—they occur in that part of the kingdom of Hanover which is called *East Friesland*, *i. e.* in the parts about Embden. But here the very name of the district explains their presence; to say nothing about the Frisian language being still spoken in the fenny tract called Saterland.

They occur all along the coast from Embden to Cuxhaven,

from the Dollart to the Elbe, as also in the islands opposite—Wanger-oog, &c. But this is neither more nor less than the country of the ancient Chauci, who were members of the Frisian group.

They occur in the Duchy of Sleswick, on its western side, and in the parts north of the Eyder, between Bredsted and Hus-um—Olz-hus-um, Bogel-um, Lug-um, &c., &c. But this is neither more nor less than the country of the *North* Frisians at the present moment, a population whose language is neither Danish nor German, but Frisian, and who call themselves, and are called by their neighbours, *Friese*.

In the *islands* the form appears again; its distribution being as follows:—

a. In Föhr we have Duns-um, Utters-um, Hedehus-um, Vits-um, Niebel-um, Baldiks-um, Vreks-um, Oevens-um, Midl-um, Alkers-um, Borgs-um, Toft-um, Klint-um, Olds-um, Duns-um.

b. In Sylt, Horn-um, Mors-um, Arks-um, Keit-um, Tinn-um—*all in the southern half of the island.*

c. In *northern* Romö, Toft-um. In *southern* Romö, none.

d. In Fanö, none.

e. f. g. In Amröm, in Pelvorm, and in Nordstrand, none.

The islands, however, like the opposite part of the Continent, are North Frisian.

Thus far, then, all is clear.

§ 71. But it is *not* clear when we move northwards. Premising that *-by* is an unequivocal sign of Scandinavian occupancy, let us look to the following list of local names for that part of North Sleswick which lies between Töndern and Ripe.

Oster-by.	Hus-um.
Wiis-by.	Ball-um.
Gammel-by.	Woll-um.
Nor-by.	Win-um.
Kohl-by.	Nust hus-um.
Reis-by.	Bjerr-um.
Kirke-by.	————

Mol-by. —

Meel-by. —

Here there is intermixture—intermixture which should make us ask whether the form under notice may not be something else besides Frisian, *i. e.* Danish, Norse, or Scandinavian. The propriety of asking this increases when we look further. All over Jutland, all over the Danish Isles, in Sweden, and in Norway, do we find this form. Here, then, it is either not Frisian at all, or not Frisian in the strict, limited, and definite sense it was in Holland, Hanover, Oldenburg, Sleswick, and the North-Sea Islands.

Over and above this form in *-um* being Frisian and Scandinavian, can it be Old-Saxon? There are forms in *-um* in certain parts of Germany, which are more likely to have been Old-Saxon than Frisian, *e. g.* *Drat-um*, *Stock-um*, *Boch-um*, in Westphalia. A case, too, in favour of the Old-Saxons having left out the *-h* can be made out.

The English *her* in A. S. is *hire*, in O. S. *ir*.

„ *their* „ *hira*, „ *iro*, &c.

The answer, then, to this question is more *Yes* than *No*.

Over and above this form in *-um* being Frisian, Scandinavian, and (probably) *Old-Saxon*, can it be *Anglo-Saxon*? At one time I would have said more *No* than *Yes*. Now, it is more *Yes* than *No*. The main reason against it lies in the forms of the English of the nineteenth century being in *-ham*; with the aspirate retained, and with *a* for the vowel. But it by no means follows that because a form in *ham* should change but slightly in England, it should not change considerably on the Continent; neither is it certain that, *if we take the English forms as they are sounded rather than as they are written*, the difference is so great as it appears to be. Plenty of speakers say *Notting-am*, and even *Notting-um*—whether rightly or wrongly is another question.

Under this point of view I think that such forms in *-um* as occur in those parts of Germany which are more likely to have been *Anglo-Saxon* than *Frisian*, must be looked upon as *Anglo-*

Saxon, notwithstanding the English forms in *-ham*. At the same time, an important fact, which complicates many of our investigations, must be borne in mind, viz. the fact of there having been Frisian (we may also say Slavonic) colonies in different parts of the Carlovingian Saxonia.

At present this is sufficient; sufficient because it has been made clear that, whether the forms in *-um* were Anglo-Saxon and Old-Saxon as well as Frisian and Norse, or whether they were not, the practical result, for the present investigation, is the same. They were not Low-German, and they were not High-German. They were not Thuringian, Hessian, or Frank. Neither is there a shadow of evidence for assuming that they were anything intermediate, *i. e.* referable to some division of the German stock which was neither High-German nor Low-German (Platt-Deutsch), neither Frank nor Frisio-Saxon.

§ 72. If so, we have an instrument of criticism, and can continue our line; which must include the parts about Boch *-um* on the Lower Ruhr, the forms in *-um* in the northern part of Limburg, and the few *-ums* of North Brabant.

Draw it, then, from Waldeck to Duisberg, from Duisberg to Roermonde, from Roermonde to Endhoven, and from Endhoven to Herzogenbosch (Bois le Duc).

Draw it from the Diemel to the Dommel, the Diemel a Waldeck, the Dommel a North Brabant, river.

This contains Paderborn, Detmold, Bukeburg (Lippe Schaumburg), Callenburg, Hildesheim, Grubenhage, the northern Hartz, Brunswick, and the parts between that Duchy and the Altmark. It also contains Oldenburg and Hanover, and part of Luneburg. It also contains the western two-thirds of Holstein, but not the eastern third. It contains all Friesland and Westphalia.

In respect to the frontier—

1. The Northern was Danish.
2. The Eastern was Slavonic.
3. The southern was—

a. Frank in the direction of the Rhine.

b. Hessian in the parts south of Paderborn.

c. Thuringian for the obscure parts about the Hartz.

Within these ethnological limits lay Saxonia + Frisia, or Frisia + Saxonia, as determined both by internal and external evidence; for we have seen that they agree pretty closely.

Of this Saxon or Frisian area it is safe to say that—

The extreme south was either *Old-Saxon* or Frisian, as opposed to Angle.

The extreme north was Angle, as opposed to Frisian and *Old-Saxon*.

The extreme west was Frisian, as opposed to *Old-Saxon* and Angle.

The more southern and eastern were the parts of *East-phalia* the less were they Angle.

The parts about Bremen, Verden, Celle, Hanover, along with the Duchy of Holstein, were, probably, the most Anglian. Hence—

The *Saxonia* of the Franks contained *Anglia*, *Engla-land*, or *Eng-land*, and something more.

This is what we arrive at if we look at a map of Germany as it was under the Carovingians. But Germany as it was under the Carovingians was not *exactly* the Germany that sent forth the invaders of Britain. It was the Germany of some three centuries *later*.

We must also look at the Germany of Tacitus, &c.; this being different from the Germany of the Angles of England; different because it was the Germany of some three centuries *earlier*.

What do we find here? That the most Angle part of the Carovingian Eastphalia was the country of the *Angli*; the parts which, comparatively speaking, were less Angle than the others; being the districts of the Fosi, Cherusci, and Longobardi. Nevertheless, these are to be looked at as closely-allied populations — *Angli-form*, so to say; since Ptolemy brings the Angle name as far southwards as the Middle Elbe.

In the way of *internal* evidence the forms in *-um* help us, though not much. Without committing ourselves to the doctrine that they are not Angle, we may safely say that their Angle character (if Angle they be) is less marked and patent than their Frisian. Neither is it so easily inferred as it was with the Old-Saxons.

Now it is just in these parts where the Classics and the Carolingians indicate an *England* (*Anglia*, or *Angla-land*) that the forms in *-um* are rarest. They fringe the coast of Oldenburg and Hanover; where they may be Frisian. They thin off as we go inland; and without entirely disappearing when we get east of Bremen, Bremenvorde, and Stade, they are hard to find.* In Holstein I have not found them at all.

Hence, the two kinds of evidence agree, and point to the parts between Rendsburg and Hanover, between Verden and Lüneburg, and between Bremenvorde and Celle, as the original area of those Angles of Germany who afterwards became the so-called Anglo-Saxons of Britain, and later still the English of England.

Further *minutiæ*, then, in the way of *South-Saxon* philology and ethnology will not be attempted; either in respect to place or time. That the area of the two great Saxon and Frisian names was, there or thereabouts, what it has been made out to be, is a safe fact in geography. *When* such a line ran is another question; and no simple one either. It involves the ethnological position of certain populations on the frontier which interest the classical as well as the mediæval investigator; *e. g.* that of the Bructeri, and Chattuarii (Boructuarii and Hetvære), also of the Chamavi, the Salii, and others. Some of these may have been (as the Salii and Chamavi, according to the current doctrines, actually were) Franks, indenting the Saxon, or Frisian area; some Saxons, indenting that of the Franks; some Frisians; some even Hessians. There is evidence, good or bad, on all these points.

* There is a Holt-*um* north of Verden, and a Bar-*um* north of Uelzen. Of the district about Brunswick I take no notice at present.

Hence, the Frisio-Saxon area as I have given it, is not asserted to have been Frisio-Saxon in all its parts at the same time; nor yet is it said to include *all* the members of the Frisian and Saxon names. On the contrary, all that is intended is, that no populations be enumerated as Saxon or Frisian which were, originally, other than such, and that no portion of the Frisio-Saxon area be attributed to any Frisio-Saxon population, which, for a time at least, was not occupant of it.

The encroachments of the Frank upon the Saxon, and of the Saxon upon the Frank, have been, if not equal, at least mutual; so that their history (except towards its conclusion) has been that of two equally-balanced powers. If it were otherwise our problems would be simplified. If the Frank, for instance, had *always* encroached, and the Frisio-Saxon *always* receded, the phenomena which occur between the Englishman of America and the American Indian, or the Northman of Scandinavia and the Lap, would repeat themselves. But such is not the case. Until the time of Charlemagne the Saxons seem to have forced the Frank, as much as the Franks forced the Saxon, boundary. The Frisians, perhaps, *have*, as a general rule, receded, but this is not certain.

§ 73. To recapitulate—

Saxonia + Frisia (or *Frisia + Saxonia*) was, in the eyes of the Franks of the Carlovingian period, West-phalia, East-phalia, Angraria, and Nordalbingia.

Of these, Nordalbingia, and the northern part of East-phalia, were the eminently *Anglo*-Saxon portions.

In the geography of the classical writers, the Angli + certain other populations, occupy them—one of these bearing the name of *Saxon*.

This may or may not have been allied to the Angles, it being by no means certain that the informants of Ptolemy, who first uses the word, and the Franks, used it in the same sense.

That the Angli of Tacitus were the Angles of the Anglo-Saxon conquests is certain. That any other of the populations with which they are associated were so is uncertain.

CHAPTER XII.

SPECIAL AND DIRECT EVIDENCE OF BEDA, ETC., CONSIDERED.
 —JUTES.—JUTES (SO-CALLED) OF THE ISLE OF WIGHT.—
 WERE THERE ANY?—THE SAXONS.—ANGLI.—GOTHIC AND
 FRANK HYPOTHESES.

§ 74. As opposed to the line of criticism that has been exhibited in the previous chapter, the evidence upon which the current doctrines respecting the Angle (or Anglo-Saxon) invasions are based may be called direct or special.

The palmary passage is the following; and it is, perhaps, unnecessary to say that it is from Beda; whose date, locality, and opportunities have already been so fully considered:—"Ad-
venerant autem de tribus Germaniæ populis fortioribus, id est Saxonibus, Anglis, Jutis. De Jutarum origine sunt Cantuarii et Vectuarii, hoc est ea gens, quæ Vectam tenet insulam, et ea, quæ usque hodie in provincia Occidentalium Saxonum Jutarum natio nominatur, posita contra ipsam insulam Vectam. De Saxonibus, id est ea regione, quæ nunc Antiquorum Saxonum cognominatur, venere Orientales Saxones, Meridiani Saxones, Occidui Saxones. Porro de Anglis, hoc est de illa patria, quæ Angulus dicitur et ab eo tempore usque hodie manere desertus inter provincias Jutarum et Saxonum perhibetur, Orientales Angli, Mediterranei Angli, Mercii, tota Nordhumbrorum progenies, id est illarum gentium, quæ ad Boream Humbri fluminis inhabitant, ceterique Anglorum populi sunt orti. Duces fuisse perhibentur eorum primi duo fratres Hengist et Horsa; e quibus Horsa postea occisus in bello a Brittonibus, hactenus in Orientalibus Cantie partibus monu-

mentum habet suo nomine insigne. Erant autem filii Victgilsii, cujus pater Vitta, cujus pater Vecta, cujus pater Voden, de cujus stirpe multarum provinciarum regium genus originem duxit."—*Eccl. Hist.* i. 15.

The following is from the Saxon Chronicle (A.D. 449):—

“ Ða comon þa men of þrim megðum Germaniæ, of Ald-Seaxum, of Anglum, of Jotum.

“ Of Jotum comon Cantware and Wihtware, þæt is seo mæiað, þe nú eardað on Wiht, and þæt cyn on West-Sexum ðe man gyt hætt Iútnacyn. Of Eald-Seaxum comon Eást-Seaxan, and Suð-Seaxan, and West-Seaxan. Of Angle comon (se á siððan stôd westig betwix Iútum and Seaxum) Eást-Engle, Middel-Engle, Mearce, and ealle Norðymbra.”

“ Then came men from three powers of Germany, from Old-Saxons, from Angles, from Jutes.

“ From the Jutes came the inhabitants of Kent and of Wight, that is, the race that now dwells in Wight, and that tribe amongst the West-Saxons which is yet called the Jute kin. From the Old-Saxons came the East-Saxons, and South-Saxons, and West-Saxons. From Angle (which has since always stood waste betwixt the Jutes and Saxons) came the East-Angles, Middle-Angles, Mercians, and all the Northumbrians.”

The latter is little more than a translation of the former—the word *Germaniæ* serving to show which of the two was the original.

There were then, as accredited elements to the population of England,—

1. Angles.
2. Saxons, and
3. Jutes in three places—viz. in
 - a. Kent (*Cantwære*).
 - b. Hampshire (*Jutnacyn*).
 - c. Isle of Wight (*Wihtwære*).

§ 75. To begin with the *Wiht-wære*—What is the evidence concerning them? Not that the *Wiht-wære*, *Vectuarii* (*Vecti-colæ*), or *Isle-of-wight-men* were of Jute origin.

This is only an opinion, based, perhaps, on historical testimony; but, perhaps, based only on the resemblance of names, and, if so, no piece of evidence at all (either direct or indirect), but an inference.

The real testimony—the testimony of Beda's informant—lies in the words *Vectuarii, hoc est ea gens quæ Vectam tenet insulam*. For this we may fairly consider that we have the personal knowledge of Bishop Daniel as a guarantee. We may also remark that the fact of there being a population known as *Wiht-wære (Vectuarii)* is spoken of as if it were generally and universally known.

This population is noticed by a third author—King Alfred—who writes:—

“Comon of þrym folcum þa strangestan Germaniæ, þæt of Saxum, and of Angle, and of Geatum; of Geatum fruman sindon Cantwære and Wiht-sætan, þæt is seo þeód se Wiht þat ealond on eardab.”

“Came they of three folk the strongest of Germany; that of the Saxons, and of the Angles, and of the Geats. Of the Geats originally are the Kent-people and the Wiht-settlers, that is the people which Wiht the Island live on.”

Now, as Alfred is translating Beda, we have no new evidence in the extract from him. We have, however, the fact that his translation of the Latin *Vectu-arii* is not the same as that of the Chronicle. The Chronicle writes *Wiht-wære*, Alfred, *Wiht-sætan*; wherein the *-sæt* is the *-set* in *Somer-set*, *Dor-set*, &c. = *settlers*. Hence *Wiht-sætan* and *Wiht-wære* are synonyms = *Vecti-colæ*, or *Vecti-enses*.

Alfred's form is in *G*, as *Geat*; the Chronicle's in *W*, as *Wiht*.

The Chronicle follows Beda, and translates the words “*et ea quæ usque hodie in provincia Occidentalium Saxonum, Jutarum natio nominatur, posita contra ipsam insulam Vectam,*” rendering *Jutarum natio* by *Jutna-cyn*; *Jutna* being the Genitive Plural of *Jute*, even as *Jut-arum* is of *Jutæ*. Alfred omits these second Jutes.

Now *Wiht-wære* and *Wiht-sætan* mean simply the residents of the Isle of *Wight*.

In England Beda found Angles, Saxons, and *Wiht-wære*, all in geographical juxtaposition.

On the Continent he found Angles, Saxons, and *Jutes*; all in geographical juxtaposition also.

That the Angles and Saxons of England came from Germany he knew. That the *Wiht-wære* came from *Jut-land* he *inferred*—he himself, or Daniel his informant.

But it may be objected that *Wit-*, and *Jut-* are not sufficiently alike to be thus confused. Perhaps they are not, if we only look at them *à priori*. But what say the texts themselves?

They say that they *were* confused. Beda deduces his *Vect-uarii* as decidedly from the *Jutæ*, as he does his *Jutarum natio*. The Chronicle does the same. Alfred, himself, though he gives us the form in *W-* only, still connects them with the *G-eats*.

The *à priori* unlikelihood, then, of forms so different as *Jut-* and *Wit-* being dealt with as identical is not to be relied on. The real facts of the case before us tell us differently. They show that in the case of *Vectis*, or the Isle of *Wight*, a name which was as old as the time of the Romans, and was of British rather than German origin, was current in the South of England long before the names of either Hengest or Horsa were invented. Hence, the confusion and assimilation actually took place.

And what took place in respect to *Jut-land*, the supposed mother country of these *Isle-of-Wight-men*? Precisely the same. The *J* became *V*, and the *u* became *i*. In the Saxon Chronicle for A.D. 952; we find "*Dania Cismarina quam Vit-land appellat*. We also find the form *Vith-landia*."—Zeuss in *v. Jutæ*, 500; *note*.

But even the *à priori* objection is inaccurate. The words *William* and *Guglielmus* are to one another as *Witæ* and *Jutæ*.

Again, the population which the majority of writers called *Juthungi*, Sidonius Apollinaris calls *Vithungi*.

“*Nam post Vithungos et Norica bella.*”—*Carm.* vii. 233.

Were the *Wihl*-wære, then, simply Saxons, Angles, or Anglo-Saxons, differing from the population of the opposite coast only in the fact of their being islanders? As far as we have hitherto gone, we have found nothing to make us believe that they were not.

At the same time they may have been something very different. They may have been distinguished from the ordinary Anglo-Saxons by the fact of their being islanders, but also by other characteristics besides.

Nay, it by no means follows that because they are not shown to be Jutes from Jutland by the particular evidence before us, they may not have been so nevertheless. I have not yet denied their Jute origin. I have only denied that the extracts from Beda prove it. They *may* have been Jutes; and a very slight amount of independent evidence would make me believe that they were. But there is none such. The great Jute characteristic, the termination in *-by* for geographical localities, is wholly absent throughout the island; nor does any other equivalent characteristic replace it.

What were they, then? There *is* some evidence to make them something; though it is not very good. A passage in Asser makes them Britons; Alfred's mother “*Osburg nomina- batur, religiosa nimium (sic) fæmina, * Nobilis ingenio, nobilis et genere; quæ erat filia Oslac †—qui Oslac Gothus erat natione, ortus enim erat de Gothis et Jutis; de semine scilicet Stuf et Wihlgar—qui acceptâ potestate Vectis Insulæ—paucos Britan- nos, ejusdem insulæ accolæ, quos in eâ invenire potuerant, in loco qui dicitur Gwitigaraburgh occiderunt, cæteri enim ac- colæ ejusdem insulæ ante sunt occisi aut exules aufugerant.*” —*De Gestis Alfredi Regis.*

* A pentametre, and as such a quotation.

† It must be owned that this name is eminently Norse, and (as such)

Now, just as Canterbury (in A. S. *Cantwæra-burg*) was the chief town of Kent (the *Cant-wære* or *Cant-uarii*), so was Gwit-i-gara-burg the chief town of the *Gwit-gare* (note the fresh form in *-gw*), *Wiht-wære*, *Wiht-sætan*, *Vect-uarii* or *Isle-of-Wight-men*, a town which, in the present English, has lost the prefix *Gwit-*, and become *Caris-brook*. According to Asser this was the last stronghold of the Britons of *Vectis* (Wight).

So far, then, as there is any separate substantive evidence for the *Wiht-wære* being anything other than ordinary Angles or Saxons, or Anglo-Saxons, it is in favour of their having been Britons.

Observe the words *Gothus—de Gothis et Jutis*.

§ 76. *The Jutnacyn and Cantuarii*.—If we repeat the criticism that has been applied to the *Wiht-wære* with the Jutnacyn of Hampshire, and ask whether there is any separate evidence of their having been *Jutes from Jutland*, the answer will be in the negative.

We then ask whether there is any separate evidence of their having been other than ordinary Angles, or Anglo-Saxons. The answer to this question is just more *Yes* than *No*. Two of the names of the early kings of Wessex were *Cyneric* and *Cwihelm*. Now if we allow ourselves to identify these with *Hunneric* and *Wilhelm*, we get two names which minute philology may just pronounce to be *Gothic* rather than *Angle*.

With the *Cantuarii*, the same questions are repeated, and they give the same answer. There is *no* satisfactory evidence to the early existence of any *Jutes from Jutland*. There *is* satisfactory evidence to the early Germans of Kent having been other than ordinary Angles or Anglo-Saxons.

§ 77. *The Saxons (so-called)*.—Does any separate evidence confirm this distinction of Beda's between the *Saxons* and the *Angles* that is suggested by the text of Beda?

The strongest fact in favour of the Angles and the Saxons having been notably different lies in the names, *Es-sex*, *Sus-*

sex, *Middle-sex*, and *Wes-sex* = *East-Saxons*, *South-Saxons*, *Middle-Saxons*, and *West-Saxons*.

The strongest fact against them is that of the king (Ecbert) who is said to have determined that England should be called *Angle-land*, having been a king of the *West-Saxons*. This is as if the King of Prussia should propose that all Germany should call itself Austria.

§ 78. *The district of Anglen*.—An exception is taken to the statement that the Angles of a large country like England came from so small a district as *Anglen*, to the exclusion of the other parts of Nordalbingia and Eastphalia—Holstein and Hanover. It has been already stated that in the eyes of Ptolemy and Tacitus the Angli were a large population. It has also been stated that, as the conquest of Britain was a fact of considerable magnitude, the original Angle area should be measured by the standard of the classical authors, who make it large, rather than by that of Beda, who makes it probably small.

§ 79. *Frank and Gothic hypotheses*.—The views of the present author respecting the texts of Beda are as follows:—

1. That there was no notable difference between the *Angles* and *Saxons*, but that the latter were the former under a *Frank* name. Hence—

2. It is not from the small district of Anglen that the Angles are to be deduced *exclusively*.

3. The so-called *Jutes* of the *Isle of Wight* were Britons—*Vecticolæ*, or *Wiht-wære*.

4. The so-called *Jutes* of Hants were, perhaps, *Goths* from Gaul; certainly not *Jutes from Jutland*.

5. The Kent population was peculiar.

Whatever it was, it agreed with the Franks in calling the *Angles* by the name of *Saxon*, hence the names *Sus-sex* for the districts around.

It used a word *lathe*. “While the other English shires are parted into hundreds or wapentakes, the county of Kent alone is divided into six *lathes* of regular form, and nearly equal

magnitude. These divisions, which have, in later times, become mere districts for judicial purposes, served at an early period for the quartering and muster of the general levy. But in the Jutish Law a military expedition is still called a *lething* (in modern Danish *leding*): whence the district summoned together for such an expedition may have borne that name.—*Lap-
penberg*, vol. i. p. 96, *Thorpe's Translation*.

Now *Leti*, *Læti*, or *Liti* was a word belonging to the military nomenclature of Rome during the fourth century, as well as earlier and later. It applied to the parts opposite Britain—*viz.* Gaul and Western Germany. It denotes a certain kind of military retainers; the service which they were in being the Roman. Julian, in Ammianus (xx. 8) writes of them thus:—"Equos præbebo Hispanos, et miscendos gentilibus atque scutariis adolescentes *Lætos* quosdam, cis Rhenum editam barbarorum progeniem, vel certe ex dedititiis, qui ad nostra desuescunt."

Zosimus gives the form *Λετοί*. He speaks of the emperor as being a barbarian by blood, who by residence amongst the *Λετοί*, Gallic nation, acquired some Latin cultivation (2, 54).

Belgium, Gaul, and the Rhine, being the chief localities in which they were settled, we are not surprised to find certain gentile adjectives connected with their name. The *Frank Læti* were settled by Maximianus, as we learn from Eumenius (*Panegyric. Constantio Cæs.* A.D. 296):—"Tuo—natu Nerviorum et Treverorum arva jacentia *Lætus* postliminio restitutus et receptus in leges *Francus* excoluit."

The *Notitia* has a long list of them—"Præfectus *Lætorum* Teutoniciorum, Carnunto Senoniæ Lugdunensis.

Præfectus *Lætorum* Batavorum et gentilium Suevorum *Bajocas* et Constantiæ Lugdunensis secundæ (observe the word *Bajocas* = *Bayeux*).

Præfectus *Lætorum* gentilium Suevorum, Cenomannos Lugdunensis tertię.

Præfectus *Lætorum Francorum*, Redonas Lugdunensis tertię.

Præfectus *Latorum* Lingonensium, per diversa dispersorum Belgicæ primæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* Actorum, Epuso Belgicæ primæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* Nerviorum Fanomartis Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* Batavorum Nemetacensium, Atrebatibus Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* Batavorum Contraginensium Noviomago Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* gentilium Remos et Silvanectas Belgicæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* Lagensium, prope Tungros Germaniæ secundæ.

Præfectus *Latorum* gentilium Suevorum, Arvernos Aquitaniæ primæ."

In this list we find the numerous genitive cases take two forms—one in *-nsium*, and one in *-orum*. The former seems to denote the particular head-quarters, the latter the nation, of the different *Let* companies, or colonies. Of these it may be remarked that the former are Gallic rather than German, the latter German rather than Gallic; so that the general view of the *Læti* is that they were German settlers on Keltic soil.

Zeuss (*v. Leti*), to whom all the texts that have been laid before the reader are due, concludes with a notice touching the question of the Kentish *lathes* most closely. The Theodosian Code states "That the lands appointed to the *Læti*, who were removed to them, were called *terræ Læticiæ*."

Such a word, then, as *lathe* may have grown out of [*terra*] *Læticiæ*, such a [*terra*] *Læticiæ* having previously grown out of *Læti*.

That there were *Læti* and [*terræ*] *Læticiæ*, and possibly *lathes* in Romano-Keltic Gaul, has been shown abundantly. That these were the same in the Romano-Keltic Britain (especially in the parts nearest Gaul) is probable. At any rate it is likely that the Kentish *lathe* is the Germano-Gallic *Læt*.

§ 80. *Hampshire, Gothic; Kent, Frank*.—It has been

shown that the *Læti* were Germans. But it has not been shown that they were *Gothic* Germans.

Can it be done? What say the previous extracts? It cannot be said that they say much in favour of the Gothic division of the Germans being the one to which the *Læti* were peculiar. Perhaps, it may be said that they are adverse rather than favourable to this view. They are so. If the particular division of the Germans to which the *Læti* are most particularly referred must be named, the evidence points chiefly to the *Franks*—to the Franks rather than to the *Goths*.

If so, the suggested explanation of the word *lathe* proves not that the *Jutes* (so called) of Kent, were *Goths*, but that the Jutes were *Franks*.

This was probably the case. Either—

Kent was *Frank*, and Hampshire *Gothic*; or—

Hampshire was *Gothic*, and Kent *Gothic* and *Frank* as well.

CHAPTER XIII.

AFFINITIES OF THE ENGLISH WITH THE OTHER LANGUAGES
OF GERMANY AND WITH THOSE OF SCANDINAVIA.

§ 81. *High and Low German*.—Over and above the Old-Saxon and Frisian forms of speech, the relations of which to the Angle, or Anglo-Saxon, have been so fully noticed; there are others spoken in Germany, and allied to the Angle or Anglo-Saxon, though less closely than the two already named.

The first of these, the *Old High-German*, was spoken in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, in Suabia, Bavaria, and Franconia.

The *Middle High-German* ranges from the thirteenth century to the Reformation.

The *Modern High-German* is the present literary language of Germany in general, and the *spoken* language (in different dialects) of Hesse, Thuringia, the Upper Rhine, Franconia, Suabia, Saxony, Baden, Bavaria, and the German parts of Austria and Switzerland.

The *Low-German* is spoken over the whole of the Ancient *Frisia*, and *Saxonia*; Holstein, Sleswick, Hanover, Oldenburg, East Friesland, and Westphalia being all *Low-German*. But it is spoken further still; viz.: in those parts which were originally Slavonic,—Mecklenburg, Pomorania, Prussia, Courland, Livonia. The Germans call the *High-German* of Upper* or Southern Germany the *Hoch-Deutsch* (High-

* On the *Upper* parts of the Rhine, Elbe, Oder, &c.

Dutch), the *Low-German* of Lower* or Northern Germany, the *Platt-Deutsch* (*Flat*, or *Broad Dutch*). It is unfortunate that these words have not been naturalised in England; since *Low-German* is an inconvenient term. It has two meanings, a *general* meaning when it signifies a division of the Germanic languages, comprising English, Dutch, Anglo-Saxon, Old Saxon, and Frisian, and a limited one when it means the particular dialects of the Ems, the Weser, and the Elbe.

§ 82. *The Mæso-Gothic*.—The third is called *Mæso-Gothic*. It is in the *Mæso-Gothic* that the most ancient specimen of any Gothic tongue has been preserved. It is also the *Mæso-Gothic* that was spoken by the conquerors of ancient Rome.

In the reign of Valens, when pressed by intestine wars, and by the movements of the Huns, the Goths were assisted by that emperor, and settled in the Roman province of *Moesia*.

Furthermore, they were converted to Christianity; and the Bible was translated into their language by their Bishop *Ulphilas*.

Fragments of this translation, chiefly from the Gospels, have come down to the present time; and the Bible translation of the Arian Bishop *Ulphilas*, in the language of the Goths of *Moesia*, during the reign of Valens, exhibits the earliest sample of any Gothic tongue.

§ 83. *The Scandinavian Languages*.—Over and above those languages of Germany and Holland which were akin to the Anglo-Saxon, cognate languages were spoken in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and the *Feroe Isles*, *i. e.* in *Scandinavia*.

§ 84.—*Gothic*.—The usual collective designation for the Germanic tongues of Germany and Holland, and for the Scandinavian languages of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland and the *Feroe Isles*, is taken from the name of those German tribes, who, during the decline of the Roman Empire, were known to the Romans as the *Goths*.

* On the *Lower* parts of the Rhine, Elbe, Oder, &c.

Of this great *stock* of languages the Scandinavian is one *branch*; the Teutonic,* another.

The Scandinavian branch comprehends—1. The dialects of Scandinavia Proper, *i. e.* of Norway and Sweden; 2. of the Danish Isles and Jutland; 3. of Iceland; 4. of the Feroe Isles.

The most characteristic difference between the Saxon and Icelandic (indeed between the Teutonic and Scandinavian tongues) lies in the peculiar position of the definite article in the latter. In the Scandinavian the article, instead of preceding, *follows* its noun, *with which it coalesces*; *e. g.* sol, *sun*; bord, *a table*; solen, *the sun*; bordet, *the table*.

Another characteristic of the Scandinavian language is the possession of a *passive* form, or a *passive* voice, ending in *-st*: *ek, þu, hann brennist = I am, thou art, he is burnt*; *ver brennumst = we are burnt*; *þér brennizt = ye are burnt*; *þeir brennast = they are burnt*. Past tense, *ek, þu, hann, bren-dist*; *ver brendumst, þér brenduzt, þeir brendust*. Imperat.: *brenstu = be thou burnt*. Infinit.: *brennast = to be burnt*.

* This means *German* in the limited sense of the term; inasmuch as *German* is often used in a wide sense as equivalent to *Gothic*.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE LANGUAGES ANTERIOR TO—THE LANGUAGES SUBSEQUENT TO—THE ANGLE (OR ANGLO-SAXON).—KELTIC GROUP.—CLASSICAL GROUP.

§ 85. THE language of England has been formed out of three elements.

a. Elements referable to the original British population, and derived from times *anterior* to the Anglo-Saxon invasion.

b. Anglo-Saxon elements.

c. Elements introduced *since* the Anglo-Saxon conquest.

§ 86. *Keltic group.*—The languages of Great Britain at the invasion of Julius Cæsar were of the Keltic stock.

Of the Keltic stock there are two branches.

1. The British or Cambrian branch, represented by the present Welsh, and containing, besides, the Cornish of Cornwall (lately extinct), and the Armorican of the French province of Brittany.

2. The Gaelic or Erse branch, represented by the present Irish Gaelic, and containing, besides, the Gaelic of the Highlands of Scotland and the Manks of the Isle of Man.

§ 87. *Classical group.*—The languages of Greece and Rome belong to one and the same stock.

The Greek with its dialects, both ancient and modern, constitutes the Greek branch of the Classical stock.

The Latin with its dialects, the old Italian languages allied to it, and the modern tongues derived from the Roman, constitutes the Latin branch of the Classical stock.

Now, although the Greek dialects are of only secondary

importance in the illustration of the history of the English language, the *Latin* elements require a special consideration.

This is because the Norman-French, introduced into England by the battle of Hastings, is a language derived from the Roman, and consequently a language of the *Latin branch of the Classical stock*.

From Italy, its original seat, the Latin was extended—

1. To the Spanish Peninsula.
2. To Gaul.
3. To Dacia and Pannonia.

From these different introductions of the Latin into different countries we have the following modern languages—1st. Italian, 2nd Spanish and Portuguese, 3rd French, 4th, Wallachian; to which must be added a 5th, the Romanese of part of Switzerland.

§ 88. *The Norman-French*.—The north-western form of the French language in Normandy, Picardy, &c., is called *Norman-French*. The Battle of Hastings introduced it into England. Hence, it is also called *Anglo-Norman*.

Specimen.

FROM THE ANGLO-NORMAN POEM OF "CHARLEMAGNE."

Un jur fu Karléun al Seint-Denis muster,
 Reout prise sa corune, en croiz seignat sun chef,
 E ad ceinte sa espée: li pons fud d'or mer.
 Dux i out e demeines e baruns e chevalers.
 Li emperères regardet la reine sa muillers.
 Ele fut ben coronée al plus bel e as meuz.
 Il la prist par le poin desuz un oliver,
 De sa pleine parole la prist à reisuner:
 "Dame, véistes unkes hume nul de desuz ceil
 Tant ben séist espée ne la corone el chef?
 Uncore cunquerrei-jo citez ot mun espees."
 Cele ne fud pas sage, folement respondeit:
 "Emperere," dist-ele, trop vus poez preiser.
 "Uncore en sa-jo uu ki plus se fait léger,

Kuant il porte corune entre ses chevalers ;
Kaunt il met sur sa teste, plus belement lui set."

In the northern French we must recognise not only a Keltic and a Classical, but also a Gothic element: since Clovis and Charlemagne were no Frenchmen, but Germans.

In the northern French of *Normandy* there is a second Gothic element, *viz.* a Scandinavian element.

CHAPTER XV.

HISTORICAL AND LOGICAL ELEMENTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 89. THE Keltic elements of the present English fall into five classes.

1. Those that are of late introduction, and cannot be called original and constituent parts of the language. Some of such are the words *flannel*, *crowd* (a fiddle), from the Cambrian, and *kerne* (an Irish foot-soldier), *galore* (enough), *tartan*, *plaid*, &c., from the Gaelic, branch.

2. Those that are originally common to* both the Keltic and Gothic stocks. Some of such are *brother*, *mother*, in Keltic *brathair*, *mathair*; the numerals, &c.

3. Those that have come to us from the Keltic, but have come to us through the medium of another language. Some of such are *druid* and *bard*, whose *immediate* source is, not the Keltic but, the Latin.

* Such, at least, is the general opinion.

4. Keltic elements of the Anglo-Norman, introduced into England after the Conquest, and occurring in that language as remains of the original Keltic of Gaul.

5. Those that have been retained from the original Keltic of the island, and which form genuine constituents of our language. These fall into three subdivisions.

a. Proper names—generally of geographical localities; as *the Thames, Kent, &c.*

b. Common names retained in the provincial dialects of England, but not retained in the current language; as *gwet-hall = household stuff*, and *gwlanen = flannel* in Herefordshire.

c. Common names retained in the current language.—The following list is Mr. Garnett's:—

<i>Welsh.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Welsh.</i>	<i>English.</i>
Basgawd	<i>Basket.</i>	Greidell	<i>Grid in Gridiron.</i>
Berfa	<i>Barrow</i>	Grual	<i>Gruel.</i>
Botwm	<i>Button.</i>	Gwald (hem, {	{ <i>Wet.</i>
Bràn	<i>Bran.</i>	border)	
Clwt	<i>Clout, Rag.</i>	Gwiced (lit- {	{ <i>Wicket.</i>
Crochan	<i>Crockery.</i>	tle door)	
Crog	<i>Crook, Hook.</i>	Gwn	<i>Gown.</i>
Cwch	<i>Cock, in Cock-boat.</i>	Gwyfr	<i>Wire.</i>
Cwysed	<i>Gusset.</i>	Masg (stitch {	{ <i>Mesh.</i>
Cyl, Cyln	{ <i>Kiln (Kill, pro-</i>	in netting)	
	vinc.)	Mattog	<i>Mattock.</i>
Dantaeth	<i>Dainty.</i>	Mop	<i>Mop.</i>
Darn	<i>Darn.</i>	Rhail	{ <i>Rail.</i>
Deentur	{ <i>Tenter, in Tenter-</i>	(fence)	
	hook.	Rhashg	{ <i>Rasher.</i>
Fflaim	{ <i>Fleam, Cattle-</i>	(slice)	
	lancet.	Rhuwch	<i>Rug.</i>
Fflaw	<i>Flaw.</i>	Sawduriaw	<i>Solder.</i>
Ffynnell	{ <i>Funnel.</i>	Syth (glue)	<i>Size.</i>
(air-hole)		Tacl	<i>Tackle.</i>
Gefyn (fetter)	<i>Gyve.</i>		

§ 90. *Latin of the first period.*—Of the Latin introduced by Cæsar and his successors, the few words remaining are those that relate to military affairs; *viz. street (strata)*; *-coln* (as in *Lincoln = Lindi colonia*); *-cest-* (as in *Gloucester = Gleve castra*) from *castra*. The Latin words introduced between the time of Cæsar and Hengest may be called the *Latin of the first period*, or the *Latin of the Keltic period*.

The Anglo-Saxon.—This is not noticed here, because, from being the staple of the present language, it is more or less the subject of the book throughout.

§ 91. *The Danish, or Norse.*—The pirates that pillaged Britain, under the name of Danes, were not exclusively the inhabitants of Denmark. Of the three Scandinavian nations, the Swedes took the least share, the Norwegians the greatest in these invasions.

The language of the three nations was the same; the differences being differences of dialect. It was that which is now spoken in Iceland, having been once common to Scandinavia and Denmark.

The Danish that became incorporated with our language, under the reign of Canute and his sons, may be called the *direct* Danish element, in contradistinction to the *indirect* Danish of p. 117.

The determination of the amount of Danish in English is difficult. It is not difficult to prove a word *Scandinavian*; but, then, we must also show that it is not German as well. A few years back the current opinion was against the doctrine that there was much Danish in England. At present, the tendency is rather the other way.

1. The Saxon name of the present town of *Whitby* in Yorkshire was *Streoneshalch*. The present name *Whitby*, *Hvitby*, or *Whitetown*, is Danish.

2. The Saxon name of the capital of Derbyshire was *Northweorthig*. The present name is Danish.

3. The termination *-by*, = *town*, is Norse.

4. Several words in the northern dialects are Norse rather than Saxon.

<i>Provincial.</i>	<i>Common Dialect.</i>	<i>Norse.</i>
Braid	<i>Resemble</i>	Bråas, <i>Swed.</i>
Eldin	<i>Firing</i>	Eld, <i>Dan.</i>
Force	<i>Waterfall</i>	Fors, <i>D. Swed.</i>
Gar	<i>Make</i>	Göra, <i>Swed.</i>
Gill	<i>Ravine</i>	Gil, <i>Iceland.</i>
Greet	<i>Weep</i>	Grata, <i>Iceland.</i>
Ket	<i>Carrion</i>	Kiöd = flesh, <i>Dan.</i>
Lait	<i>Seek</i>	Lede, <i>Dan.</i>
Lathe	<i>Barn</i>	Lade, <i>Dan.</i>
Lile	<i>Little</i>	Lille, <i>Dan.</i>

§ 92. *Latin of the second period.*—Of the Latin introduced under the Christianised Saxon sovereigns, many words are extant. They relate chiefly to ecclesiastical matters, just as the Latin of the Keltic period bore upon military affairs. *Mynster*, a minster, *monasterium*; *portic*, a porch, *porticus*; *cluster*, a cloister, *claustrum*; *munuc*, a monk, *monachus*; *bisceop*, a bishop, *episcopus*; *arcebisceop*, archbishop, *archiepisopus*; *sanct*, a saint, *sanctus*; *profost*, a provost, *propositus*; *pall*, a pall, *pallium*; *calic*, a chalice, *calix*; *candel*, a candle, *candela*; *psalter*, a psalter, *psalterium*; *mæsse*, a mass, *missa*; *pistel*, an epistle, *epistola*; *prædic-ian*, to preach, *prædicare*; *prof-ian*, to prove, *probare*.

The following are the names of foreign plants and animals:—*camell*, a camel, *camelus*; *ylp*, elephant, *elephas*; *fic-beam*, fig-tree, *ficus*; *feferfuge*, feverfew, *febrifuga*; *peterselige*, parsley, *petroselinum*.

Others are the names of articles of foreign origin, as *pipor*, pepper, *piper*; *purpur*, purple, *purpura*; *pumic-stan*, pumicestone, *pumex*.

This is the Latin of the second, or Saxon period.

§ 93. *The Anglo-Norman elements.*—The chief Anglo-Norman elements of our language are the terms connected with the feudal system, the terms relating to war and chivalry,

and a great portion of the law terms—*duke, count, baron, villain, service, chivalry, warrant; esquire, challenge, domain, &c.*

When we remember that the word *Norman* means *man of the north*, that it is a *Scandinavian*, and *not a French* word, that it originated in the invasions of the followers of Rollo and other *Norwegians*, and that just as part of England was overrun by Pagan buccaneers called *Danes*, part of France was occupied by similar *Northmen*, we see the likelihood of certain Norse words finding their way into the French language, where they would be superadded to its original Keltic and Roman elements.

The extent to which this is actually the case has only been partially investigated. It is certain, however, that some French words are Norse or Scandinavian. Such, for instance, are several *names of geographical localities* either near the sea, or the river Seine, in other words, within that tract which was most especially occupied by the invaders. As is to be expected from the genius of the French language, these words are considerably altered in form. Thus,—

NORSE.	ENGLISH.	FRENCH.
Toft	Toft	Tot
Beck	Beck	Bec
Flöt	Fleet*	Fleur, &c.

and in these shapes they appear in the Norman names *Yvetot, Caudebec, and Harfleur, &c.*

Now any words thus introduced from the Norse of Scandinavia into the French of Normandy might, by the Norman Conquest of England, be carried further, and so find their way into the English.

In such a case, they would constitute its *indirect* Scandinavian element.

A list of these words has not been made; indeed the question requires far more investigation than it has met with. The

* Meaning *ditch*.

1. That it has a direct ratio to the date of the introduction, *i. e.* the more recent the word the more likely it is to retain its original inflexion.

2. That it has a relation to the number of meanings belonging to the words: thus, when a single word has two meanings, the original inflexion expresses one, the English inflexion another—*genius, genii, (spirits), geniuses (men of genius)*.

3. That it occurs with substantives only, and that only in the expression of number. Thus, although the plural of substantives like *axis* and *genius* are Latin, the possessive cases are English. So also are the degrees of comparison for adjectives, and the tenses, &c., for verbs.

The following is a list of the chief Latin substantives introduced during the latter part of the fourth period, and preserving the *Latin* plural forms—

FIRST CLASS.

Words wherein the Latin plural is the same as the Latin singular.

(a) <i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	(b) <i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Apparatus	apparatus	Caries	caries
Hiatus	hiatus	Congeries	congeries
Impetus	impetus	Series	series
		Species	species
		Superficies	superficies.

SECOND CLASS.

Words wherein the Latin plural is formed from the Latin singular by changing the last syllable.

(a).—Where the singular termination *-a* is changed in the plural into *-æ* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Formula	formulæ	Nebula	nebulae
Lamina	laminæ	Scoria	scoriæ.
Larva	larvæ		

(b).—Where the singular termination *-us* is changed in the plural into *-i* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Calculus	calculi	Polypus	polypi
Colossus	colossi	Radius	radii
Convolvulus	convolvuli	Ranunculus	ranunculi
Focus	foci	Sarcophagus	sarcophagi
Genius	genii	Schirrhus	schirrho
Magus	magi	Stimulus	stimuli
Nautilus	nautili	Tumulus	tumuli.
Œsophagus	oesophagi		

(c).—Where the singular termination *-um* is changed in the plural into *-a* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Animalculum	animalcula	Mausoleum	mausolea
Arcanum	arcana	Medium	media
Collyrium	collyria	Memorandum	memoranda
Datum	data	Menstruum	menstrua
Desideratum	desiderata	Momentum	momenta
Effluvium	effluvia	Premium	premia
Emporium	emporia	Scholium	scholia
Encomium	encomia	Spectrum	spectra
Erratum	errata	Speculum	specula
Gymnasium	gymnasia	Stratum	strata
Lixivium	lixivia	Succedaneum	succedanea.
Lustrum	lustra		

(d).—Where the singular termination *-is* is changed in the plural into *-es* :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Amanuensis	amanuenses	Ellipsis	ellipses
Analysis	analyses	Emphasis	emphases
Antithesis	antitheses	Hypothesis	hypotheses
Axis	axes	Oasis	oases
Basis	bases	Parenthesis	parentheses
Crisis	crises	Synthesis	syntheses
Diæresis	diæreses	Thesis	theses

THIRD CLASS.

Words wherein the plural is formed by inserting -e between the last two sounds of the singular, so that the former number always contains a syllable more than the latter :—

<i>Sing.</i>			<i>Plur.</i>
Apex	sounded	apex-s	apices
Appendix	—	appendic-s	appendices
Calix	—	calic-s	calices
Cicatrix	—	cicatric-s	cicatrices
Helix	—	helic-s	helices
Index	—	indec-s	indices
Radix	—	radic-s	radices
Vertex	—	vertec-s	vertices
Vortex	—	vortec-s	vortices.

In all these words the *c* of the singular number is sounded as *k*, of the plural as *s*.

✓ The following is a list of the chief *Greek* substantives lately introduced, and preserving the *Greek* plural forms—

FIRST CLASS.

Words where the singular termination -on is changed in the plural into -a :—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Aphelion	aphelia	Criterion	criteria
Perihelion	perihelia	Ephemeron	ephemera
Automaton	automata	Phænomenon	phæmonena.

SECOND CLASS.

Words where the plural is formed from the original root by adding either -es or -a, but where the singular rejects the last letter of the original root.

Plurals in -es :—

<i>Original root.</i>	<i>Plu.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>
Apsid-	apsides	apsis
Cantharid-	cantharides	cantharis
Chrysalid-	chrysalides	chrysalis
Ephemerid-	ephemerides	ephemeris
Tripod-	tripodes	tripos.

Plurals in -a:—

<i>Original root.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>
Dogmat-	dogmata	dogma
Lemmat-	lemmata	lemma
Miasmat-	miasmata	miasma.*

Miscellaneous elements.—Of miscellaneous elements we have two sorts; those that are incorporated in our language, and are currently understood (*e. g.* the Spanish word *sherry*, the Arabic word *alkali*, and the Persian word *turban*), and those that, even amongst the educated, are considered strangers. Of this latter kind (amongst many others) are the Oriental words *humnum*, *kaftan*, *gul*, &c.

Of the currently understood miscellaneous elements of the English language, the most important are from the French; some of which agree with those of the Latin of the fourth period and the Greek, in preserving the *French* plural forms, as *beau*, *beaux*, *billets-doux*.

Italian.—Some words of Italian origin do the same; as *virtuoso*, *virtuosi*.

Hebrew.—The Hebrew words *cherub* and *seraph* do the same; the form *cherub-im*, and *seraph-im* being not only plurals but Hebrew plurals.

Beyond the words derived from these five languages, none form their plural other than after the English method, *i. e.* in *-s*, as *waltzes*, from the *German* word *waltz*.

§ 97. Hence, we have a measure of the extent to which a language, like the English, which, at one and the same time, requires names for many objects, comes in contact with the tongues of half the world, and has, moreover, a great power of incorporating foreign elements, derives fresh words from varied sources. This may be seen from the following incomplete notice of the languages which have, in different degrees, supplied it with new terms.

Arabic.—Admiral, alchemist, alchemy, alcohol, alcove,

* This list is taken from Smart's valuable and logical English

alembic, algebra, alkali, assassin. *Persian*.—Turban, caravan, dervise, &c. *Turkish*.—Coffee, bashaw, divan, scimitar, Janisary, &c. *Hindoo languages*.—Calico, chintz, cowrie, curry, lac, muslin, toddy, &c. *Chinese*.—Tea, bohea, congou, hyson, soy, nankin, &c. *Malay*.—Bantam (fowl), gamboge, rattan, sago, shaddock, &c. *Polynesian*.—Taboo, tattoo. *Tungusian or some similar Siberian language*.—Mammoth, the bones of which are chiefly from the banks of the Lena. *North American Indian*.—Squaw, wigwam, pemmican. *Peruvian*.—Charki = prepared meat; whence *jerked beef*. *Caribbean*.—Hammock.

A distinction is now drawn between the *direct* and *indirect*, the latter leading to the *ultimate origin* of words.

Thus a word borrowed into the English from the French might have been borrowed into the French from the Latin, into the Latin from the Greek, into the Greek from the Persian, &c., and so on *ad infinitum*.

The investigation of this is a matter of literary curiosity rather than any important branch of philology.

The ultimate known origin of many common words sometimes goes back to a great date, and points to extinct languages:—

Ancient Nubian.—Barbarous. *Ancient Egyptian*.—Ammonia. *Ancient Syrian*.—Cyder. *Ancient Lydian*.—Mæander. *Ancient Persian*.—Paradise.

Again, a word from a given language may be introduced by more lines than one; or it may be introduced twice over; once at an earlier, and again at a later period. In such a case its forms will, most probably, vary; and, what is more, its meaning as well. Words of this sort may be called *di-morphic*, their *di-morphism* having originated in one of two reasons—a difference of channel or a difference of date. Instances of the first are, *syrup*, *sherbet*, and *shrub*, all originally from the *Arabic*, *ʿarb*; but introduced differently, viz. the first through the Latin, the second through the Persian, and the third direct. Instances of the second are words like *minster*, introduced during the Anglo-Saxon, as con-

trasted with *monastery*, introduced during the Anglo-Norman, period. By the proper application of these processes, we account for words so different in present form, yet so identical in origin, as *priest* and *presbyter*, *episcopal* and *bishop*, &c.

Distinction.—The history of the languages that have been spoken in a particular country is a different subject from the history of a particular language. The history of the languages that have been spoken in the United States of America is the history of *Indian* languages. The history of the languages of the United States is the history of a Germanic language.

Words of foreign simulating a vernacular origin.—These may occur in any mixed language whatever; they occur, however, oftener in the English than in any other.

Let a word be introduced from a foreign language—let it have some resemblance in sound to a real English term; lastly, let the meanings of the two words be not absolutely incompatible. We may then have a word of foreign origin taking the appearance of an English one. Such, amongst others, are *beef-eater*, from *bœuffetier*; *sparrow-grass*, *asparagus*; *Shotover*, *Chateau-vert*; * *Jerusalem*, *Girasole*; † *Spanish beefeater*, *spina bifida*; *periwig*, *peruke*; *runagate*, *renegade*; *lutestring*, *lustrino*; ‡ *O yes*, *Oyez!* *ancient*, *ensign*.§

Dog-cheap.—This has nothing to do with *dogs*. The first syllable is *god* = *good* transposed, and the second the *ch-p* in *chapman* (= *merchant*) *cheap*, and *Eastcheap*. In Sir J. Mandeville, we find *god-kepe* = *good bargain*.

Sky-larking.—Nothing to do with *larks* of any sort; still less the particular species, *alauda arvensis*. The word improperly spelt *l-a-r-k*, and banished to the slang regions of the English language, is simply *lác* = *game*, or *sport*; wherein the *a* is sounded as in *father* (not as in *farther*). *Lek* = *game*, in the present Scandinavian languages.

* As in *Shotover Hill*, near Oxford. † As in *Jerusalem artichoke*.

‡ A sort of silk.

§ *Ancient Cassio*—"Othello."

Zachary Macaulay = Zumalacarregui, Billy Ruffian = Bellerophon, Sir Roger Dowlass = Surajah Dowlah, although so limited to the common soldiers and sailors, who first used them, as to be exploded vulgarisms rather than integral parts of the language, are examples of the same tendency towards the irregular accommodation of misunderstood foreign terms.

Birdbolt.—An incorrect name for the *gadus lota*, or *eel-pout*, and a transformation of *barbote*.

Whistle-fish.—The same for *gadus mustela*, or *weazel-fish*.

Liquorice = glycyrrhiza.

Wormwood = weremuth, is an instance of a word from the same language, in an antiquated shape, being equally transformed with a word of really foreign origin.

Sometimes the transformation of the *name* has engendered a change in the object to which it applies, or, at least, has evolved new ideas in connection with it. How easy for a person who used the words *beef-eater*, *sparrow-grass*, or *Jerusalem*, to believe that the officers designated by the former either eat or used to eat more beef than other people; that the second word was the name for a *grass* or herb of which *sparrows* were fond; and that *Jerusalem* artichokes came from Palestine.

What has just been supposed is sometimes a real occurrence. To account for the name *Shotover-hill*, I have heard that Little John *shot over* it. Here the confusion, in order to set itself right, breeds a fiction.

Sometimes, where the form of a word in respect to its *sound* is not affected, a false spirit of accommodation introduces an unetymological *spelling*; as *frontispiece* from *frontispecium*, *sovereign* from *sovrano*, *colleague* from *collega*, *lanthorn* (old orthography) from *lanterna*.

The value of forms like these consists in their showing that language is affected by false etymologies as well as by true ones.

§ 98. In *lambkin* and *lancet*, the final syllables (*-kin* and

-et) have the same power. They both express the idea of smallness or diminutiveness. These words are but two out of a multitude, the one (*lamb*) being of Saxon, the other (*lance*) of Norman origin. The same is the case with the superadded syllables: *-kin* being Saxon; *-et* Norman. Now to add a Saxon termination to a Norman word, or *vice versâ*, is to corrupt the English language.

This leads to some observations respecting the—

Introduction of new words and Hybridism.—Hybridism is a term derived from *hybrid-a*, a *mongrel*, a Latin word of Greek extraction.

The terminations *-ize* (as in *criticize*), *-ism* (as in *criticism*), *-ic* (as in *comic*)—these, amongst many others, are Greek terminations. To add them to words not of Greek origin is to be guilty of hybridism. Hence, *witticism* is objectionable.

The terminations *-ble* (as in *penetrable*), *-bility* (as in *penetrability*), *-al* (as in *parental*)—these, amongst many others, are Latin terminations. To add them to words not of Latin origin is to be guilty of hybridism.

Hybridism is the commonest fault that accompanies the introduction of new words. The hybrid additions to the English language are most numerous in works on science.

It must not, however, be concealed that several well-established words are hybrid; and that, even in the writings of the classical Roman authors, there is hybridism between the Latin and the Greek.

Nevertheless, the etymological view of every word of foreign origin is, not that it is put together in England, but that it is brought whole from the language to which it is vernacular. Now no derived word can be brought whole from a language unless, in that language, all its parts exist. The word *penetrability* is not derived from the English word *penetrable*, by the addition of *-ty*. It is the Latin word *penetrabilitas* imported.

In derived words all the parts must belong to one and the same language, or, changing the expression, *every de-*

rived word must have a possible form in the language from which it is taken. Such is the rule against hybridism.*

A true word sometimes takes the appearance of a hybrid without really being so. The *-icle*, in *icicle*, is apparently the same as the *-icle* in *radicle*. Now, as *ice* is Gothic and *icle* classical, hybridism is simulated. *Icicle*, however, is not a derivative, but a compound; its parts being *is* and *gicel*, both English words.

“ Be she constant, be she fickle,
Be she flame, or be she *ickle*.”

SIR C. SEDLEY.

On incompleteness of the radical.—Let there be in a given language a series of roots ending in *-t*, as *semat*. Let a euphonic influence eject the *-t*, as often as the word occurs in the nominative case. Let the nominative case be erroneously considered to represent the root, or radical, of the word. Let a derivative word be formed accordingly, *i. e.* on the notion that the nominative form and the radical form coincide. Such a derivative will exhibit only a part of the root; in other words, the radical will be incomplete.

Now all this is what actually takes place in words like *hæmo-ptysis* (*spitting of blood*), *sema-phore* (*a sort of telegraph*). The Greek imparisyllabics eject a part of the root in the nominative case; the radical forms being *hæmat-* and *semat-*, not *hæm-* and *sæm-*.

Incompletion of the radical is one of the commonest causes of words being coined faultily. It must not, however, be concealed, that even in the classical writers, we have in the words like *δίτομος* examples of incompleteness of the radical.

§ 99. The preceding chapters have paved the way for a distinction between the *historical* analysis of a language, and the *logical* analysis of one.

Let the present language of England (for illustration's sake only) consist of 40,000 words. Of these let 30,000 be Anglo-

* For a peculiar, but important and common, form of hybridism, see the Chapter on Composition.

Saxon, 5000 Anglo-Norman, 100 Keltic, 10 Latin of the first, 20 Latin of the second, and 30 Latin of the third period, 50 Scandinavian, and the rest miscellaneous. In this case the language is considered according to the historical origin of the words that compose it, and the analysis is an *historical* analysis.

But it is very evident that the English, or any other language, is capable of being contemplated in another view, and that the same number of words may be very differently classified. Instead of arranging them according to the languages whence they are derived, let them be disposed according to the meanings that they convey. Let it be said, for instance, that out of 40,000 words, 10,000 are the names of natural objects, that 1000 denote abstract ideas, that 1000 relate to warfare, 1000 to church matters, 500 to points of chivalry, 1000 to agriculture, and so on through the whole. In this case the analysis is not historical but *logical*; the words being classed not according to their *origin*, but according to their *meaning*.

Now the logical and historical analyses of a language generally in some degree coincide; that is, terms for a certain set of ideas come from certain languages; just as in English a large proportion of our chemical terms are Arabic, whilst a still larger one of our legal ones are Anglo-Norman.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE RELATION OF THE ENGLISH TO THE ANGLO-SAXON, AND
THE STAGES OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 100. THE relation of the present English to the Anglo-Saxon is that of a *modern* language to an *ancient* one: the words *modern* and *ancient* being used in a defined and technical sense.

Let the word *smiðum* illustrate this. *Smið-um*, the dative plural of *smið*, is equivalent in meaning to the English *to smiths*, or to the Latin *fabr-is*. *Smiðum*, however, is a single Anglo-Saxon word (a substantive, and nothing more); whilst its English equivalent is a pair of words (*i. e.* a substantive with the addition of a preposition). The letter *s*, in *smiths*, shows that the word is plural. The *-um*, in *smiðum*, does this and something more. It is the sign of the *dative case* plural. The *-um* in *smiðum* is a part of a word. The preposition *to* is a separate word with an independent existence. *Smiðum* is the radical syllable *smið* + the subordinate inflectional syllable *-um*; the sign of the dative case. The combination *to smiths* is the substantive *smiths* + the preposition *to*, equivalent in power to the sign of a dative case, but different from it in form. As far, then, as the word just quoted is concerned, the Anglo-Saxon differs from the English by expressing an idea by a certain *modification of the form of the root*, whereas the modern English denotes the same idea by *the addition of a preposition*.

To put the matter shortly, the Anglo-Saxon *inflection* is superseded by a *combination of words*.

The following sentences are mere variations of the same general statement.

1. The earlier the stage of a given language the greater the amount of its inflectional forms, and the later the stage of a given language, the smaller the amount of them.

2. As languages become modern they substitute prepositions and auxiliary verbs for cases and tenses.

3. The amount of inflection is in the inverse proportion to the amount of prepositions and auxiliary verbs.

4. In the course of time languages drop their inflections, and substitute in their stead circumlocutions by means of prepositions, &c. The reverse never takes place.

5. Given two modes of expression, the one inflectional (*smičum*), the other circumlocutional (to *smiths*), we can state that the first belongs to an earlier, the second to a later, state of language.

§ 101. By the middle of the twelfth century, the Anglo-Saxon of the standard Anglo-Saxon authors had undergone such a change as to induce the scholars of the present age to denominate it, not Saxon, but *Semi-Saxon*. It had ceased to be genuine Saxon, but had not yet become English.

§ 102. Further change brought about what is called the *Old English* stage.

In the Old English the following forms predominate:—

1. A fuller inflection of the demonstrative pronoun, or definite article; *þan, þæne, þære, þam*.

2. The presence of a dative singular in *-e*; *ende, smithe*.

3. The existence of a genitive plural in *-r* or *-ra*; *heora, theirs; aller, of all*.

4. The use of *heo* for *they*, of *heora* for *their*, of *hem* for *them*.

5. A more frequent use of *min* and *thin*, for *my* and *thy*.

6. The use of *heo* for *she*.

7. The use of the broader vowels; as in *iclepud* or *iclepod* (for *icleped* or *yclept*); *geongost*, youngest; *ascode*, asked; *eldore*, elder.

8. The use of the strong preterits (see the chapter on the tenses of verbs), where in the present English the weak form is found—*wex, wop, dalf*, for *waxed, wēpt, delved*.

9. The omission not only of the gerundial termination *-enne*, but also of the infinitive sign *-en* after *to*; *to honte, to speke*.

10. The substitution of *-en* for *-eþ* or *-eð*, in the first and second persons plural of verbs; *we wollen*, we will; *heo schul-len*, they should.

11. The comparative absence of the articles *se* and *seo*.

12. The substitution of *ben* and *beeth*, for *synd* and *syndon* = *we, ye, they are*.

The reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. may be said to form a transition from the *Old* to the *Middle*; those of Mary and Elizabeth from the *Middle* to the *New, Recent, or Modern English*. No very definite line of demarcation, however, can be drawn.

The *present* tendencies of the English may be determined by observation: and as most of them will be noticed in the etymological part of this volume, the few here indicated must be looked upon as illustrations only.

1. The distinction between the subjunctive and indicative mood is likely to pass away. We verify this by the very general tendency to say *if it is*, and *if he speaks*, rather than *if it be*, and *if he speak*.

2. The distinction between the participle passive and the past tense is likely to pass away. We verify this by the tendency to say *it is broke*, and *he is smote*, for *it is broken* and *he is smitten*.

3. Of the double forms, *sung* and *sang*, *drank* and *drunk*, &c., one only will be the permanent.

As stated above, these tendencies are but a few out of many, and have been adduced in order to indicate the subject rather than to exhaust it.

§ 103. The English Language stands to the Anglo-Saxon in the relation of a derived language to a mother tongue, or (changing the expression) the English may be called the Anglo-

Saxon in its most modern form; whilst the Anglo-Saxon may, with equal propriety, be called the English in its *most ancient* form. However, it is not so important to settle the particular mode of expressing the nature of this relation, as to become familiar with certain facts connected with recent languages as compared with the older ones from which they originate; facts which chiefly arise out of the tenses of the verbs, and the cases of the nouns. The Middle English has inflections which are wanting in the Modern, and the Early English has inflections which are wanting in the Middle. The Semi-Saxon has inflections that are wanting in the Early English, and the Anglo-Saxon has inflections which are wanting in the Semi-Saxon.

Similarly—The Middle Frisian has inflections which are wanting in the Modern, and the Early Frisian has inflections which are wanting in the Middle.

The earlier the stage of the Dutch language, the fuller the inflection.

The earlier the stage of the High-German, the fuller the inflection.

The inflection of the Mæso-Gothic is fuller than that of any of the allied languages.

The earlier the stage of the Danish, the more numerous the inflections.

The earlier the stage of the Swedish, the more numerous the inflections.

The earlier the stage of the Icelandic, the more numerous the inflections.

So much for the comparison between the different stages of one and the same language. It shows that the earlier the stage, the fuller the inflection; the later the stage, the scantier the inflection; in other words, it shows that as languages become modern they lose their inflections.

Now there is another method of proving this rule; and that is, by the comparison of allied languages that change with different degrees of rapidity.

The Danish language has changed more rapidly than the

Swedish, and, consequently, has fewer of its original inflections.

The Swedish language has changed more rapidly than the Feroic, and, consequently, has fewer of its original inflections.

The Feroic has changed more rapidly than the Icelandic, and, consequently, has fewer of its original inflections.

The Icelandic has changed so slowly, that it retains almost all the original inflections of the Old Norse.

In all the languages allied to the English, the earlier the stage, the more numerous are the inflections, and *vice versá*.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE DIALECTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 104. CERTAIN parts of England are named as if their population were pre-eminently *Saxon* rather than *Angle*; viz. *Wes-sex* (= West *Saxons*), *Es-sex* (= East *Saxons*), *Sus-sex* (= South *Saxons*), and *Middle-sex* (= Middle *Saxons*).

Others are named as if their population were pre-eminently *Angle* rather than *Saxon*; thus, the counties of Norfolk and Suffolk once constituted the kingdom of the East Angles, and even at the present moment are often spoken of as *East Anglia*.

It is safe to say that the dialects of the English language do *not* coincide with the distribution of these terms. That parts of the Angle differ from parts of the Saxon area in respect to the character of their provincialisms is true; but it is by no means evident that they differ on that account.

Thus, that the dialect of Hampshire, which was part of

Wes-sex, should differ from that of Norfolk, which was part of East *Anglia*, is but natural. There is a great space of country between them—a fact sufficient to account for their respective characteristics, without assuming an original difference of population. Between the *Saxons* of *Es-sex* and the *Anglians* of Suffolk, no one has professed to find any notable difference.

§ 105. The traces of the *Danes*, or *Northmen*, are distinct; the following forms of local names being *primâ facie* evidence (at least) of Danish or Norse occupancy:—

a. The combination *Sk-*, rather than the sound of *Sh-*, in such names as *Skip-ton*, rather than *Ship-ton*.

b. The combination *Ca-*, rather than *Ch-*, in such names as *Carl-ton* rather than *Charl-ton*.

c. The termination *-by* (= *town, habitation, occupancy*), rather than *-ton*, as *Ash-by*, *Demble-by*, *Spills-by*, *Grims-by*, &c.

d. The form *Kirk* rather than *Church*.

e. The form *Orm* rather than *Worm*, as in *Ormshead*.

In *Orms-kirk*, *Kirk-by* and *Carl-by*, we have a combination of Danish characteristics.

In respect to their distribution, the Danish forms are—

At their *maximum* on the sea-coast of Lincolnshire; *i. e.* in the parts about *Spills-by*.

Common, but less frequent, in Yorkshire, the Northern counties of England, the South-eastern parts of Scotland, Lancashire, (*Ormskirk*, *Horn-by*), and parts of South Wales (*Orms-head*, *Ten-by*).

In Orkney, and the northern parts of Scotland, the Norse had originally the same influence that the Anglo-Saxon had in the south.

This explains the peculiar distribution of the Norse forms. Rare, or non-existent, in central and southern England, they appear on the opposite sides of the island, and on its northern extremity; showing that the stream of the Norse population went *round the island rather than across it*.

QUESTIONS.

1. WHAT are the *present* languages of Wales, the Isle of Man, the Scotch Highlands, and Ireland?

2. What are the *present* languages of Germany and Holland? How are they related to the *present* language of England? How to the original language of England?

3. Enumerate the chief *supposed* migrations from Germany to England, giving (when possible) the *date* of each, the particular German tribe by which each was undertaken, and the parts of Great Britain whereon the different landings were made. Why do I say *supposed* migrations? Criticise, in detail, the evidence by which they are supported, and state the extent to which it is exceptionable. Who was Beda? What were the sources of his information?

4. Give reasons for believing in the existence of Germans in England anterior to A.D. 449.

5. Who are the present Jutlanders of Jutland? Who the inhabitants of the district called Anglen in Sleswick? What are the reasons for connecting these with the Jutes and Angles of Beda? What those for denying such a connexion?

6. What is the meaning of the termination *-uarii* in *Cantuarii* and *Vectuarii*? What was the Anglo-Saxon translation of *Antiqui Saxones*, *Occidentales Saxones*, *Orientalis Saxones*, *Meridionales Saxones*? What are the known variations in the form of the word *Vectis*, meaning the *Isle of Wight*? What those of the root *Jut-* as the name of the inhabitants of the peninsula of Jutland?

7. Translate *Cantware* and *Wihthware* into Latin. How does Alfred translate *Jutæ*? How does the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle? What is the derivation of the name *Carisbrook*, a town in the Isle of Wight?

8. Take exception to the opinion that *Jutes*, from *Jutland*, formed part of the German invasion of England; or rather,

take exception to the evidence upon which that opinion is based.

9. From what part of Germany were the *Angles* derived? What is Beda's statement concerning them?

10. What is the latest date for the introduction of the English language into England? What the reasons for considering the *Belgæ* to have been German? What those against so doing? Give the approximate date of the *Notitia*. What was the *Littus Saxonicum*? What the *Lati*? Distinguish between the *Wihlwære* the *Jutnacyn* and the Jute (so-called) *Cantwære*.

11. Give the localities of the Old-Saxons, and the Northalbingians. Investigate the area occupied by the Anglo-Saxons.

12. What is the present population of the Dutch province of Friesland? What its language? What the dialects and stages of that language?

13. What was the language of the Asega-bog, the Heliand, Beowulf, Hildubrand and Hathubrant, the Carolinian Psalms, the Gospels of Ulphilas, and the poems of Gysbert Japicx?

14. Make a map of Ancient Germany and Scandinavia according to the languages and dialects of those two areas. Exhibit, in a tabular form, the languages akin to the English. Explain the meaning of the words *Mæso-Gothic*, and *Platt-Deutsch*.

15. Analyse the Scandinavian forms *Solen*, *Bordet*, and *brennast*.

16. Exhibit the difference between the *logical* and the *historical* analysis of a language.

17. What are the Keltic words in the English language?

18. Enumerate the chief Germanic populations connected by ancient writers with the *Angles*, stating the ethnological relations of each, and noticing the extent to which they coincide with those of the Angles.

19. What are the reasons for believing that there is a *Frisian* element in the population of England?

20. What are the languages enumerated by Beda as being

spoken in England? What the *Latin* of that writer? What is meant by an *eponymy*? Criticise the statements of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle concerning *Port*, *Wihtgar*, and *Cissa*.

21. What was the *pagus Hessi Franconicus*? What the meaning of the word *Lathe*?

22. Exhibit, in a tabular form, the languages and dialects of the Classical stock.

23. What is the bearing of the statements of Tacitus and other ancient writers respecting the following Germanic populations upon the ethnological relations of the Angles—Aviones, Reudigni, Suevi, Langobardi, Frisii, Varini?

24. Translate the words *bæc*, *botl*, *fleot*, *hyrst*, *worðig*, *næs*.

25. Exhibit the different forms of *hám*, and the different meanings of *f-rd*. Trace the distribution of them.

26. What is the meaning of the Anglo-Saxon forms in *-ing*?

27. Classify the Keltic elements of the English language.

28. Enumerate the chief periods during which words from the Latin were introduced into English, and classify the Latin elements accordingly.

29. What words were introduced *directly* by the Danes, Scandinavians, or Norsemen? What *indirectly*? Through what language did these latter come?

30. Give the languages from whence the following words were introduced into the English—*flannel*, *jerked* (as *beef*), *hammock*, *apparatus*, *waltz*, *seraph*, *plaid*, *street*, *muslin*.

31. Distinguish between the *direct*, *indirect*, and *ultimate* origin of introduced words. What words have we in English which are supposed to have *originated* in the Ancient Ægyptian, the Syrian, and the languages of Asia Minor?

32. Under what different forms do the following words appear in English—*monasterium*, *πρεσβύτερος*, *ἐπίσκοπος*? Account for these differences. *Syrup*, *shrub*, and *sherbet*, all originate from the same word. Explain the present difference.

33. Give the *direct* origin (*i. e.* the languages from which they were *immediately* introduced) of—*Druid*, *epistle*, *chivalry*, *cyder*, *mæander*. Give the *indirect* origin of the same.

34. Investigate the process by which a word like *sparrow-grass*, apparently of *English* origin, is, in reality, derived from the Latin word *asparagus*. Point out the incorrectness in the words *frontispiece*, *colleague*, and *lanthorn*.

35. To what extent may *Norse*, and to what extent may *Keltic* words, not found in the current language of English, be found in the provincial dialects? What were the original names of the towns *Whitby* and *Derby*? From what language are the present names derived? Give the reason for your answer.

36. Show the extent to which the *logical* and *historical* analyses coincide in respect to the words introduced from the Roman of the second period, the Arabic, the Anglo-Norman, and the Keltic of the current English.

37. What are the plural forms of *criterion*, *axis*, *genius*, *index*, *dogma*? When is a word introduced from a foreign language *perfectly*, when *imperfectly*, incorporated with the language into which it is imported? Is the following expression correct—*the cherubim that singeth aloft*? If not, why?

38. What is there exceptionable in the words *semaphore* (meaning a sort of telegraph), and *witticism*? Give the etymologies of the words *icicle*, *radicle*, and *radical*. What are the singular forms of *cantharides*, *phenomena*, and *data*?

39. What are the stages of the English language?

40. Express, in general terms, the chief points wherein a modern language differs from an ancient one: or rather, the points wherein the different stages of the same language differ.

PART II.

CHAPTER I.

CERTAIN PROPERTIES OF THE MORE REMARKABLE ARTICULATE SOUNDS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

§ 106. *Spelling and Speaking.*—To two points connected with the subject of the following chapter, the attention of the reader is requested.

a. In the comparison of sounds the ear is liable to be misled by the eye. Thus—

The syllables *ka* and *ga* are similar syllables. The vowel is in each the same, and the consonant is but slightly different. Hence the words *ka* and *ga* are more allied to each other than the words *ka* and *ba*, *ka* and *ta*, &c., because the sounds of *k* and *g* are more allied than the sounds of *k* and *b*, *k* and *t*.

Comparing the syllables *ga* and *ka*, we see this affinity between the sounds, and we see it at the first glance.

It is, however, very evident that ways might be devised of concealing the likeness between the two sounds. One of such ways would be a faulty mode of spelling. If instead of *ga* we wrote *gha* the following would be the effect:—the syllable would appear less simple than it really was; it would look as if it consisted of three parts instead of two, and consequently its affinity to *ka* would seem less than it is. It is perfectly true that a little consideration would tell us that, as long as the sound remained the same, the relation of the two

syllables remained the 'same also. Still a little consideration would be required. Now in the English language we have the following modes of spelling that have a tendency to mislead:—

The sounds of *ph* and of *f*, in *Philip* and *fillip*, differ to the eye, but to the ear are identical. Here a difference is simulated.

The sounds of *th* in *thin*, and of *th* in *thine*, differ to the ear but to the eye seem the same. Here a difference is concealed.

Furthermore, these last sounds appear to the eye to be double or compound. This is not the case; they are simple single sounds, and not the sounds of *t* followed by *h*, as the spelling leads us to imagine.

b. Besides improper modes of spelling, there is another way of concealing the true nature of sounds. If I say that *ka* and *ga* are allied, the alliance is manifest; since I compare the actual sounds. If I say *ka* and *gee* are allied, the alliance is concealed; since I compare, not the actual sounds, but only the names of the letters that express those sounds. Now in the English language we have the following names of letters that have a tendency to mislead:—

The sounds *fa* and *va* are allied. The names *eff* and *vee* conceal this alliance.

The sounds *sa* and *za* are allied. The names *ess* and *zed* conceal the alliance.

In comparing sounds it is advisable to have nothing to do either with letters or names of letters. *Compare the sounds themselves.*

§ 107. *Sounds and syllables.*—In many cases it is sufficient, in comparing consonants, to compare *syllables* that contain those consonants; *e. g.* in order to determine the relations of *p*, *b*, *f*, *v*, we say *pa*, *ba*, *fa*, *va*; or for those of *s* and *z*, we say *sa*, *za*. Here we compare *syllables*, each consonant being followed by a vowel. But at times, this is insufficient. We are often obliged to isolate the consonant from its vowel, and bring our organs to utter the imperfect sounds of *p'*, *b'*, *t'*, *d'*.

§ 108. With these preliminaries let us consider some of the properties of the articulate sounds. Let any of the *vowels* (for instance, the *a* in *father*) be sounded. The lips, the tongue, and the parts within the throat remain in the same position; and as long as these remain in the same position the sound is that of the vowel under consideration. Let, however, a change take place in the position of the organs of sound; let, for instance, the lips be closed, or the tongue be applied to the front part of the mouth. In that case the vowel sound is cut short. It undergoes a change. It terminates in a sound that is different, according to the state of those organs whereof the position has been changed. If, on the vowel in question, the lips be closed, there then arises an imperfect sound of *b* or *p*. If, on the other hand, the tongue be applied to the front teeth or to the fore part of the palate, the sound is one of *t* or *d*. This fact illustrates the difference between the vowels and the consonants. It may be verified by pronouncing the *a* in *fate*, *ee* in *feet*, *oo* in *book*, *o* in *note*, &c.

It is a further condition in the formation of a vowel sound, that the passage of the breath be *uninterrupted*. In the sound of the *l* in *lo* (isolated from its vowel) the sound is as continuous as it is with the *a* in *fate*. Between, however, the consonant *l* and the vowel *a* there is this difference: with *a*, the passage of the breath is uninterrupted; with *l*, the tongue is applied to the palate, breaking or arresting the passage of the breath.

§ 109. The primary division of our articulate sounds is into *vowels* and *consonants*. The latter are again divided into liquids (*l, m, n, r*) and mutes (*p, b, f, v, t, d, k, g, s, z, &c.*)

§ 110. *Sharp and flat*.—Take the sounds of *p, f, t, k, s*. Isolate them from their vowels, and pronounce them. The sound is the sound of a *whisper*.

Let *b, v, d, k, z*, be similarly treated. The sound is no whisper, but one at the natural tone of our voice.

Now *p, f, t, k, s* are *sharp*, whilst *b, v, &c.*, are *flat*. Instead of *sharp*, some say *hard*, and instead of *flat*, some say

soft. The terms *sonant* and *surd* are, in a scientific point of view, the least exceptionable. They have, however, the disadvantage of being pedantic. The *tenuis* of the classics are sharp, the *mediæ* flat.

§ 111. *Continuous and explosive*.—Isolate the sounds of *b, p, t, d, k, g*. Pronounce them. You have no power of prolonging the sounds, or of resting upon them. They escape with the breath, and they escape at once.

It is not so with *f, v, sh, zh*. Here the breath is transmitted by degrees, and the sound can be drawn out and prolonged for an indefinite space of time. Now, *b, p, t, &c.*, are explosive, *f, v, &c.*, continuous.

§ 112. Concerning the vowels, we may predicate *a*) that they are all *continuous*, *b*) that they are all *flat*.

Concerning the liquids, we may predicate *a*) that they are all *continuous*, *b*) that they are all flat.

Concerning the mutes we may predicate *a*) that one-half of them is *flat*, and the other half *sharp*, and *b*) that some are *continuous* and that others are *explosive*.

§ 113.—The letter *h* is no *articulate* sound, but only a breathing.

§ 114. *The system of Mutes*.—As the classification of the *vowels* of the English Language is less important than that of the consonants, no cognizance is taken of them, except so far as certain incidental notices of some of their properties are required.

On the other hand the system of the consonants commands our attention—the *Mutes* most especially.

The *th* in *thin* is a simple single sound, different from the *th* in *thine*. It may be expressed by the sign þ.

The *th* in *thine* is a simple single sound, different from the *th* in *thin*. It may be expressed by the sign ð.

The *sh* in *shine* is a simple single sound, and it may be expressed by the sign σ* (Greek σῆμα).

* This by no means implies that such was the power of σ, ζ, γ, κ in Greek. They are merely convenient symbols.

The *z* in *azure*, *glazier* (French *j*) is a simple single sound, and it may be expressed by the sign ζ (Greek ζῆτα).

In the Lap, and possibly in many other languages, there are two peculiar sounds, different from any in English, German, and French, &c. They may respectively be expressed by the sign *κ* and the sign *γ* (Greek κάππα and γάμμα).

With these preliminary notices we may exhibit the system of the sixteen mutes; having previously determined the meaning of two fresh terms, and bearing in mind what was said concerning the words *sharp* and *flat*, *continuous* and *explosive*.

Lene and aspirate.—From the sound of *p* in *pat*, the sound of *f* in *fat* differs in a certain degree. This difference is not owing to a difference in their sharpness or flatness. Each is sharp. Neither is it owing to a difference in their continuity or explosiveness; although *f* is continuous, whilst *p* is explosive. This we may ascertain by considering the position of *s*. The sound of *s* is *continuous*; yet *s*, in respect to the difference under consideration, is classed not with *f* the continuous sound, but with *p* the explosive one. This difference, which has yet to be properly elucidated, is expressed by a particular term; and *p* is called *lene*, *f* is called *aspirate*.

As *f* is to *p* so is *v* to *b*.

As *v* is to *b* so is *þ* to *t*.

As *þ* is to *t* so is *ð* to *d*.

As *ð* is to *d* so is *κ* to *k*.

As *κ* is to *k* so is *γ* to *g*.

As *γ* is to *g* so is *σ* to *s*.

As *σ* is to *s* so is ζ to *z*.

Hence *p, b, t, d, k, g, s, z*, are *lene*: *f, v, þ, ð, κ, γ, σ, ζ*, are *aspirate*. Also *p, f, t, þ, k, κ, s, σ*, are *sharp*, whilst *b, v, d, ð, g, γ, z, ζ*, are *flat*; so that there is a double series of relationship capable of being expressed as follows:—

Lene.		Aspirate.		Sharp.		Flat.	
Sharp.	Flat.	Sharp.	Flat.	Lene.	Aspirate.	Lene.	Aspirate.
<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>v</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>v</i>
<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>þ</i>	<i>ð</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>þ</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>ð</i>
<i>k</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>γ</i>	<i>k</i>	<i>x</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>γ</i>
<i>s</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>σ</i>	<i>ζ</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>σ</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>ζ</i>

All the so-called aspirates are continuous; and, with the exception of *s* and *z*, all the lenes are explosive.

I believe that in the fact of each mute appearing in a four-fold form (*i. e.* sharp, or flat, lene, or aspirate), lies the essential character of the mutes as opposed to the liquids.

§ 115. *Y* and *w*.—These sounds, respectively intermediate to *γ* and *i* (the *ee* in *feet*), and to *v* and *u* (*oo* in *book*), form a transition from the vowels to the consonants.

§ 116. The French word *roi*, and the English words *oil*, *house*, are specimens of a fresh class of articulations; *viz.* of compound vowel sounds or diphthongs. The diphthong *oi* is the vowel *o* + the semivowel *y*. The diphthongal sound in *roi* is the vowel *o* + the semivowel *w*. In *roi* the semivowel element precedes, in *oil* it follows.

The diphthongs in English are four; *ow* as in *house*, *ew* as in *new*, *oi* as in *oil*, *i* as in *bite*, *fight*.

§ 117. *Chest*, *jest*.—Here we have compound consonantal sounds. The *ch* in *chest* = *t* + *sh*; the *j* in *jest* = *d* + *zh*. I believe that in these combinations one or both the elements, *viz.* *t* and *sh*, *d* and *zh*, are modified; but I am unable to state the exact nature of this modification.

§ 118. *Ng*.—The sound of the *ng* in *sing*, *king*, *throng*, when at the end of a word, or of *singer*, *ringing*, &c., in the middle of a word, is not the natural sound of the combination *n* and *g*, each letter retaining its natural power and sound; but a simple single sound, for which the combination *ng* is a conventional mode of expression. *Ng*, however, is no true consonant, but a vowel of a peculiar character, *i. e.* a nasal vowel, formed by the passage of air through the *nostrils* instead of the lips.

§ 119. *System of Consonants.*

Liquids.	Mutes.				Semivowels.
	Lens.		Aspirate.		
	Sharp.	Flat.	Sharp.	Flat.	
m	p	b	f	v	w
n	t	d	þ	ð	.
l	k	g	* κ	* γ	y
r	s	z	* χ	* ζ	.

§ 120. *Certain combinations of articulate sounds are incapable of being pronounced.*—The following rule is one that, in the forthcoming pages, will frequently be referred to. *Two mutes, of different degrees of sharpness and flatness, are incapable of coming together in the same syllable.* For instance, *b, v, d, g, z, &c.*, being flat, and *p, f, t, k, s, &c.*, being sharp, such combinations as *abt, avt, apd, afd, agt, akd, atz, ads, &c.*, are unpronounceable. *Spelt*, indeed, they may be; but all attempts at *pronunciation* end in a *change* of the combination. In this case either the flat letter is really changed to its sharp equivalent (*b* to *p*, *d* to *t*, &c.) or *vice versâ* (*p* to *b*, *t* to *d*). The combinations *abt* and *agt*, in order to be pronounced, must become either *apt* or *abd*, or else *akt* or *agd*.

The word *mutes* in the third sentence of this section must be dwelt on. It is only with the *mutes* that there is an impossibility of pronouncing the heterogeneous combinations above-mentioned. The liquids and the vowels are flat; but the liquids and vowels, although flat, may be followed by a sharp consonant. If this were not the case, the combinations *ap, at, alp, all, &c.*, would be unpronounceable.

The semivowels, also, although flat, admit of being followed by a sharp consonant.

§ 121. *Unstable combinations.*—That certain sounds in

* These signs are only provisional until real letters of a satisfactory form (a result not easily brought about, and, as yet, not approached) are invented.

combination with others have a tendency to undergo further changes, may be collected from the observation of our own language, as we find it spoken by those around us, or by ourselves. The diphthong *ew* is a sample of what may be called an unsteady or *unstable* combination. There is a natural tendency to change it either into *oo* or *yoo*; perhaps also into *yew*. Hence *new* is sometimes sounded *noo*, sometimes *nyoo*, and sometimes *nyew*.

§ 122. *Effect of the semivowel y on certain letters when they precede it.*—Taken by itself the semivowel *y*, followed by a vowel (*ya, yee, yo, you, &c.*), forms a stable combination. Not so, however, if it be preceded by a consonant, of the series *t* or *s*, as *tya, tyo*; *dya, dyo*; *sya, syo*. There then arises an unstable combination. *Sya* and *syo* we pronounce as *sha* and *sho*; *tya* and *tyo* we pronounce as *cha* and *ja* (*i. e. tsh, dzh*). This we may verify from our pronunciation of words like *sure, picture, verdure* (*shoor, pictshoor, verdzhoor*), having previously remarked that the *u* in those words is not sounded as *oo* but as *yoo*. The effect of the semivowel *y*, taken with the instability of the combination *ew*, accounts for the tendency to pronounce *dew* as if written *jew*.

§ 123. *Double consonants rare.*—It cannot be too clearly understood that in words like *pitted, stabbing, massy, &c.*, there is no real reduplication of the sounds of *t, b, and s*, respectively. Between the words *pitted* (as with the small-pox) and *pitied* (as being an object of pity) there is a difference in spelling only. In speech the words are identical. *The reduplication of the consonant is, in English and the generality of languages, a conventional mode of expressing in writing the shortness or dependence of the vowel preceding.*

Real reduplications of consonants, *i. e.* reduplications of their *sound*, are, in all languages, extremely rare. In English they occur only under one condition. In *compound* and *derived* words, where the original root *ends*, and the superadded affix *begins* with the same letter, there is a reduplication of the sound and not otherwise.

In the following words, all of which are compounds, we have true specimens of the doubled consonant.

<i>n</i>	is doubled in	<i>unnatural, innate, oneness.</i>
<i>l</i>	—	<i>soulless, civil-list, palely.</i>
<i>k</i>	—	<i>book-case.</i>
<i>t</i>	—	<i>seaport-town.</i>

It must not, however, be concealed, that, in the mouths even of correct speakers, one of the doubled sounds is often dropped.

§ 124. *True aspirates rare.*—The criticism applied to words like *pitted*, &c., applies also to words like *Philip, thin, thine*, &c. There is therein no sound of *h*. How the so-called aspirates differ from their corresponding lenes has not yet been determined. That it is *not* by the addition of *h* is evident. *Ph* and *th* are conventional modes of spelling simple single sounds, which might better be expressed by simple single signs.

In our own language the *true* aspirates, like the true reduplications, are found only in compound words; and there they are often slurred in the pronunciation.

	We find <i>p</i> and <i>h</i> in the words <i>haphazard, upholder.</i>	
	— <i>b</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>abhorrent, cub-hunting.</i>
	— <i>f</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>knife-handle, offhand.</i>
	— <i>v</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>stave-head.</i>
	— <i>d</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>adhesive, childhood.</i>
	— <i>t</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>nuthook.</i>
	— <i>th</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>withhold.</i>
	— <i>k</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>inkhorn, bakehouse.</i>
	— <i>g</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>gig-horse.</i>
	— <i>s</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>race-horse, falsehood.</i>
ℳ	— <i>z</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>exhibit, exhort.</i>
	— <i>r</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>perhaps.</i>
	— <i>l</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>wellhead, foolhardy.</i>
	— <i>m</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>Amherst.</i>
	— <i>n</i> and <i>h</i>	— <i>unhinge, inherent, unhappy.</i>

CHAPTER II.

ON QUANTITY AND ACCENT.

§ 125. *Quantity*.—Certain vowels, like the *a* in *fat*, *i* in *fit*, *u* in *but*, *o* in *not*, have the character of being uttered with rapidity, so that they pass quickly in the enunciation, the voice not resting on them. This rapidity of utterance becomes more evident when we contrast with them the prolonged sounds of the *a* in *fate*, *ee* in *feet*, *oo* in *book*, or *o* in *note*; wherein the utterance is retarded, and wherein the voice rests, delays, or is prolonged. The *f* and *t* of *fate* are separated by a longer interval than the *f* and *t* of *fat*; and the same is the case with *fit*, *feet*, &c.

Let the *n* and the *t* of *not* be each as 1, the *o* also being as 1; then each letter, consonant or vowel, shall constitute $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole word.

Let, however, the *n* and the *t* of *not* be each as 1, the *o* being as 2. Then, instead of each consonant constituting $\frac{1}{3}$ of the whole word, it shall constitute but $\frac{1}{4}$.

Upon the comparative extent to which the voice is prolonged, the division of vowels and syllables into *long* and *short* has been established: the *o* in *note* being long, the *o* in *not* being short. And the longness or shortness of a vowel or syllable is said to be its *quantity*.

§ 126. Attention is directed to the word *vowel*. The longness or shortness of a *vowel* is one thing. The longness or shortness of a *syllable* another. This difference is important in prosody; especially in comparing the English with the classical metres.

The vowel in the syllable *see* is long ; and long it remains, whether it stands as it is, or be followed by a consonant, as in *see-n*, or by a vowel, as in *see-ing*.

The vowel in the word *sit* is short. If followed by a vowel it becomes unpronounceable, except as the *ea* in *seat* or the *i* in *sight*. By a consonant, however, it *may* be followed. Such is the case in the word quoted—*sit*. Followed by a *second* consonant, it still retains its shortness, *e. g.* *sits*. Whatever the comparative length of the *syllables*, *see* and *seen*, *sit* and *sits*, may be, the length of their respective *vowels* is the same.

Now, if we determine the character of the syllable by the character of the vowel, all syllables are short wherein there is a short vowel, and all are long wherein there is a long one. Hence, measured by the quantity of the vowel, the word *sits* is short, and the syllable *see-* in *seeing* is long.

§ 127. But it is well known that this view is not the view commonly taken of the syllables *see* (in *seeing*) and *sits*. It is well known, that in the eyes of a classical scholar, the *see* (in *seeing*) is short, and that in the word *sits* the *i* is long.

The Classic differs from the Englishman thus,—*He measures his quantity, not by the length of the vowel, but by the length of the syllable taken altogether.* The perception of this distinction enables us to comprehend the following statements.

a. That vowels long by nature may *appear* to become short by position, and *vice versâ*.

b. That, by a laxity of language, the *vowel* may be said to have changed its quantity, whilst it is the *syllable* alone that has been altered.

c. That if one person measure his quantities by the vowels, and another by the syllables, what is short to the one, shall be long to the other, and *vice versâ*. The same is the case with nations.

d. That one of the most essential differences between the English and the classical languages is, that the quantities of the first are measured by the vowel, those of the latter by the syllable. To a Roman, the word *monument* consists of two

short syllables and one long one; to an Englishman it contains three short syllables.

§ 128. *Accent*.—In the word *tyrant* there is an emphasis, or stress, upon the first syllable. In the word *presume* there is an emphasis, or stress, on the second syllable. This emphasis, or stress, is called *accent*. The circumstance of a syllable bearing an accent is sometimes expressed by a mark ('); in which case the word is said to be accentuated, *i. e.* to have the accent signified in writing.

Words accented on the last syllable—*Brigáde, preténce, harpoón, reliève, detér, assúme, besóught, beréft, befóre, abroáð, abóde, abstrúse, intérmix, superádd, cavalíér.*

Words accented on the last syllable but one.—*An'chor, ar'gue, hásten, fáther, fóxes, smítting, húsbánd, márket, vápour, bárefoot, archángel, bespátter, disáble, terrífic.*

Words accented on the last syllable but two.—*Reg'ular, an'tidote, for'tify, suscéptible, incontrovértible.*

Words accented on the last syllable but three (rare).—*Ré-ceptacle, régulating, tálkativeness, ábsolutely, lúminary, in-évitable, &c.*

§ 129. *Distinctive accents*.—A great number of words are distinguished by the difference of accent alone.

An <i>á</i> tribute	To <i>o</i> tribute.
The month <i>A</i> ugust.	An <i>o</i> ugust person.
A <i>o</i> m'pact.	<i>o</i> mpáct (close).
To <i>o</i> n'jure (magically).	<i>o</i> njúre (enjoin)
<i>o</i> des'ert, wilderness.	<i>o</i> desért, merit.
<i>o</i> nválid, not valid.	<i>o</i> nvalid, a sickly person.
<i>o</i> minute, 60 seconds.	<i>o</i> minúte, small.
<i>o</i> supine, part of speech.	<i>o</i> supine, careless, &c.

§ 130. *Emphasis*.—In *tyrant* and *presúme*, we deal with single words; and in each *word* we determine which *syllable* is accented. Contrasted with the sort of accent that follows, this may be called a *verbal* accent.

In the line,

Better for *us*, perhaps, it might appear,—

POPE.

the pronoun *us* is strongly brought forward. An especial stress or emphasis is laid upon it, denoting that *there are other beings to whom it might not appear*, &c. This is collected from the context. Here there is a *logical* accent. “When one word in a sentence is distinguished by a stress, as more important than the rest, we may say that it is *emphatical*, or that an *emphasis* is laid upon it. When one syllable in a word is distinguished by a stress, and more audible than the rest, we say that it is accented, or that an accent is put upon it. Accent, therefore, is to syllables what emphasis is to sentences; it distinguishes one from the crowd, and brings it forward to observation.”—Nares’ “*Orthöepy*,” Part ii. Chap. 1.

CHAPTER III.

ORTHÖEPEY AND ORTHOGRAPHY.

§ 131. ORTHÖEPEY, a word derived from the Greek *orthon* (*upright*), and *epos* (*a word*), signifies the right utterance of words. Orthöepy determines words, and deals with a language as it is *spoken*; *orthography* determines the correct spelling of words, and deals with a language as it is *written*. This latter term is derived from the Greek words *orthos* (*upright*), and *graphé*, or *grafæ* (*writing*). Orthography is less essential to language than orthöepy; since all languages are spoken, whilst but a few languages are written. Orthography presupposes orthöepy. Orthography addresses itself to the eye, orthöepy to the ear. Orthöepy deals with the articulate sounds that consti-

tute syllables and words; orthography treats of the signs by which such articulate sounds are expressed in writing. A *letter* is the *sign* of an articulate (and, in the case of *h* of an inarticulate) sound.

§ 182. *Principle of a perfect orthography.*—A full and perfect system of orthography consists in two things:—1. The possession of a sufficient and consistent alphabet. 2. The right application of such an alphabet. This position may be illustrated more fully.

§ 183. First, in respect to a sufficient and consistent *alphabet*.—Let there be in a certain language, simple single articulate sounds, to the number of forty, whilst the simple single signs, or letters, expressive of them, amount to no more than *thirty*. In this case the alphabet is insufficient. It is not full enough: since ten of the simple single articulate sounds have no corresponding signs whereby they may be expressed.

An alphabet, however, may be sufficient, and yet imperfect. It may err on the score of *inconsistency*. Let there be in a given language two simple single sounds (for instance), the *p* in *pate*, and the *f* in *fate*. Let these sounds stand in a given relation to each other. Let a given sign, for instance \mathfrak{P} (as is actually the case in Hebrew), stand for the *p* in *pate*; and let a second sign be required for the *f* in *fate*. Concerning the nature of this latter sign, two views may be taken. One framer of the alphabet, perceiving that the two sounds are mere modifications of each other, may argue that no new sign (or letter) is at all necessary, but that the sound of *f* in *fate* may be expressed by a mere modification of the sign (or letter) \mathfrak{P} , and may be written thus \mathfrak{P} , or thus \mathfrak{P}' or \mathfrak{P}'' , &c.; upon the principle that like sounds should be expressed by like signs. The other framer of the alphabet, contemplating the difference between the two sounds, rather than the likeness, may propose, not a mere modification of the sign \mathfrak{P} , but a letter altogether new, such as *f*, or ϕ , &c., upon the principle that sounds of a given degree of dissimilitude should be expressed by signs of a different degree of dissimilitude.

Hitherto the expression of the sounds in point is a matter of convenience only. No question has been raised as to its consistency or inconsistency. This begins under conditions like the following:—Let there be in the language in point the sounds of the *t* in *tin*, and of the *th* in *thin*; which (it may be remembered) are precisely in the same relation to each other as the *p* in *pate* and the *f* in *fate*. Let each of these sounds have a sign, or letter, expressive of it. Upon the nature of these signs, or letters, will depend the nature of the sign or letter required for the *f* in *fate*. If the letter expressing the *th* in *thin* be a mere modification of the letter expressing the *t* in *tin*, then must the letter expressive of the *f* in *fate* be a mere modification of the letter expressing the *p* in *pate*, and *vice versâ*. If this be not the case, the alphabet is inconsistent.

In the English alphabet we have the following inconsistency:—The sound of the *f* in *fate*, in a certain relation to the sound of the *p* in *pate*, is expressed by a totally distinct sign; whereas, the sound of the *th* in *thin* (similarly related to the *t* in *tin*) is expressed by no new sign, but by a mere modification of *t*; viz. *th*.

A third element in the faultiness of an alphabet is the fault of *erroneous representation*. The best illustration of this we get from the Hebrew alphabet, where the sounds of א and ב mere *varieties* of each other, are represented by distinct and dissimilar signs, whilst א and א, sounds *specifically* distinct, are expressed by a mere modification of the same sign, or letter.

The right application of an alphabet.—An alphabet may be both sufficient and consistent, accurate in its representation of the alliances between articulate sounds, and in no wise redundant; and yet, withal, it may be so wrongly applied as to be defective. Of defect in the use or application of the letters of an alphabet, the three main causes are the following:—

a. Unsteadiness in the power of letters.—Of this there are two kinds. In the first, there is one sound with two (or more).

ways of expressing it. Such is the sound of the letter *f* in English. In words of Anglo-Saxon origin it is spelt with a single simple sign, as in *fill*; whilst in Greek words it is denoted by a combination, as in *Philip*. The reverse of this takes place with the letter *g*; here a single sign has a double power; in *gibbet* it is sounded as *j*, and in *gibberish* as *g* in *got*.

b. The aim at secondary objects.—The natural aim of orthography, of spelling, or of writing, is to express the *sounds* of a language. Syllables and words it takes as they meet the ear, it translates them by appropriate signs, and so paints them, as it were, to the eye. That this is the natural and primary object is self-evident; but beyond this natural and primary object there is, with the orthographical systems of most languages, a secondary one, *viz.* the attempt to combine with the representation of the sound of a given word, the representation of its history and origin.

The sound of the *c*, in *city*, is the sound that we naturally spell with the letter *s*, and if the expression of this sound were the *only* object of our orthographists, the word would be spelt accordingly (*sity*). The following facts, however, traverse this simple view of the matter. The word is a derived word; it is transplanted into our own language from the Latin, where it is spelt with a *c* (*civitas*); and to change this *c* into *s* conceals the origin and history of the word. For this reason the *c* is retained, although, as far as the mere expression of sounds is concerned, the letter is a superfluity. In cases like the one adduced the orthography is bent to a secondary end, and is traversed by the etymology.

c. Obsolescence.—It is very evident that modes of spelling which at one time may have been correct, may, by a change of pronunciation, become incorrect; so that orthography becomes obsolete whenever there takes place a change of speech without a correspondent change of spelling.

From the foregoing remarks we arrive at the theory of a full and perfect alphabet and orthography, of which a few (amongst many others) of the chief conditions are as follow:—

1. That for every simple single sound, incapable of being represented by a combination of letters, there be a simple single sign.

2. That sounds within a determined degree of likeness be represented by signs within a determined degree of likeness; whilst sounds beyond a certain degree of likeness be represented by distinct and different signs, *and that uniformly.*

3. That no sound have more than one sign to express it.

4. That no sign express more than one sound.

5. That the primary aim of orthography be to express the sounds of words, and not their histories.

6. That changes of speech be followed by corresponding changes of spelling.

With these principles in our mind we may measure the imperfections of our own and of other alphabets.

§ 134. Previous to considering the sufficiency or insufficiency of the English alphabet, it is necessary to enumerate the elementary articulate sounds of the language. The vowels belonging to the English language are the following *twelve* :—

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1. That of <i>a</i> in <i>father.</i> | 7. That of <i>e</i> in <i>bed.</i> |
| 2. — <i>a</i> — <i>fat.</i> | 8. — <i>i</i> — <i>pit.</i> |
| 3. — <i>a</i> — <i>fate.</i> | 9. — <i>ee</i> — <i>feet.</i> |
| 4. — <i>aw</i> — <i>bawl</i> | 10. — <i>u</i> — <i>bull.</i> |
| 5. — <i>o</i> — <i>not.</i> | 11. — <i>oo</i> — <i>fool.</i> |
| 6. — <i>o</i> — <i>note.</i> | 12. — <i>u</i> — <i>duck.</i> |

The diphthongal sounds are *four.*

- | | | | |
|------------|-----------|----|---------------|
| 1. That of | <i>ou</i> | in | <i>house.</i> |
| 2. — | <i>ew</i> | — | <i>new.</i> |
| 3. — | <i>oi</i> | — | <i>oil.</i> |
| 4. — | <i>i</i> | — | <i>bits.</i> |

This last sound being most incorrectly expressed by the single letter *i*.

The consonantal sounds are, (1.) two semivowels; (2.) four

liquids; (3.) fourteen mutes; (4.) *ch* in *chest*, and *j* in *jest*, compound sibilants; (5.) *ng*, as in *king*; (6.) the aspirate *h*. In all, twenty-four.

1. <i>w</i>	as in	<i>wet</i> .	18. <i>th</i>	as in	<i>thin</i> .
2. <i>y</i>	—	<i>yet</i> .	14. <i>th</i>	—	<i>thine</i> .
3. <i>m</i>	—	<i>man</i> .	15. <i>g</i>	—	<i>gun</i> .
4. <i>n</i>	—	<i>not</i> .	16. <i>k</i>	—	<i>kind</i> .
5. <i>l</i>	—	<i>let</i> .	17. <i>s</i>	—	<i>sin</i> .
6. <i>r</i>	—	<i>run</i> .	18. <i>z</i>	—	<i>zeal</i>
7. <i>p</i>	—	<i>pate</i> .	19. <i>sh</i>	—	<i>shine</i> .
8. <i>b</i>	—	<i>ban</i> .	20. <i>z</i>	—	<i>azure, glazier</i> .
9. <i>f</i>	—	<i>fan</i> .	21. <i>ch</i>	—	<i>chest</i> .
10. <i>v</i>	—	<i>van</i> .	22. <i>j</i>	—	<i>jest</i> .
11. <i>t</i>	—	<i>tin</i> .	23. <i>ng</i>	—	<i>king</i> .
12. <i>d</i>	—	<i>din</i> .	24. <i>h</i>	—	<i>hot</i> .

The vowels being twelve, the diphthongs four, and the consonantal sounds twenty-four, we have altogether as many as forty sounds, some being so closely allied to each other as to be mere modifications, and others being combinations rather than simple sounds; all, however, agreeing in requiring to be expressed by letters or by combinations of letters, and to be distinguished from each other. This enables us to appreciate—

§ 135. *The insufficiency of the English alphabet—*

a. In respect to the vowels.—Notwithstanding the fact that the sounds of the *a* in *father*, *fate*, and *fat*, and of the *o* and the *aw* in *note*, *not*, and *bawl*, are modifications of *a* and *o* respectively, we have still *six* vowel sounds specifically distinct, for which (*y* being a consonant rather than a vowel) we have but *five* signs. The *u* in *duck*, specifically distinct from the *u* in *bull*, has no specifically distinct sign to represent it.

b. In respect to the consonants.—The *th* in *thin*, the *th* in *thine*, the *sh* in *shine*, the *z* in *azure*, and the *ng* in *king*, five sounds specifically distinct, and five sounds perfectly simple, require corresponding signs, which they have not.

§ 136. *Its inconsistency.*—The *f* in *fan*, and the *v* in *van*,

sounds in a certain degree of relationship to *p* and *b*, are expressed by sounds as unlike as *f* is unlike *p*, and as *v* is unlike *b*. The sound of the *th* in *thin*, the *th* in *thine*, the *sh* in *shine*, similarly related to *t*, *d*, and *s*, are expressed by signs as like *t*, *d*, and *s*, respectively, as *th* and *sh*.

The compound sibilant sound of *j* in *jest* is spelt with the single sign *j*, whilst the compound sibilant sound in *chest* is spelt with the combination *ch*.

§ 137. *Erroneousness*.—The sound of the *ee* in *feet* is considered the long sound of the *e* in *bed*; whereas it is the long sound of the *i* in *pit*.

The *i* in *bite* is considered as the long sound of the *i* in *pit*; whereas it is a diphthongal sound.

The *u* in *duck* is looked upon as a modification of the *u* in *bull*; whereas it is a specifically distinct sound.

The *ou* in *house* and the *oi* in *oil* are looked upon as the compounds of *o* and *i* and of *o* and *u* respectively; whereas the latter element of them is not *i* and *u*, but *y* and *w*.

The *th* in *thin* and the *th* in *thine* are dealt with as one and the same sound; whereas they are sounds specifically distinct.

The *ch* in *chest* is dealt with as a modification of *c* (either with the power of *k* or of *s*); whereas its elements are *t* and *sh*.

§ 138. *Redundancy*.—As far as the representation of sounds is concerned the letter *c* is superfluous. In words like *citizen* it may be replaced by *s*; in words like *cat* by *k*. In *ch*, as in *chest*, it has no proper place. In *ch*, as in *mechanical*, it may be replaced by *k*.

Q is superfluous, *cw* or *kw* being its equivalent.

X also is superfluous, *ks*, *gz*, or *z*, being equivalent to it.

The diphthongal forms *æ* and *œ*, as in *Æneas* and *Cræsus*, except in the way of etymology, are superfluous and redundant.

§ 139. *Unsteadiness*.—Here we have, 1. The consonant *c* with the double power of *s* and *k*; 2. *g* with its sound in *gun*, and also with its sound in *gin*; 3. *x* with its sounds in *Alexander*, *apoplexy*, *Xenophon*.

In the foregoing examples a single sign has a double power; in the words *Philip* and *fillip*, &c., a single sound has a double sign.

In respect to the degree wherein the English orthography is made subservient to etymology, it is sufficient to repeat the statement that as many as three forms, *c*, *œ*, and *æ* are retained for *etymological purposes only*.

§ 140. The defects noticed in the preceding sections are *absolute* defects, and would exist, as they do at present, were there no language in the world except the English. This is not the case with those that are now about to be noticed; for them, indeed, the word *defect* is somewhat too strong a term. They may more properly be termed inconveniences.

Compared with the languages of the rest of the world the use of many letters in the English alphabet is *singular*. The letter *i* (when long or independent) is, with the exception of England, generally sounded as *ee*. With Englishmen it has a diphthongal power. The inconvenience of this is the necessity that it imposes upon us, in studying foreign languages, of unlearning the sound which we give it in our own, and of learning the sound which it bears in the language studied. So it is (amongst many others) with the letter *j*. In English this has the sound of *dzh*, in French of *zh*, and in Germany of *y*. From singularity in the use of letters arises inconvenience in the study of foreign tongues.

In using *j* as *dzh* there is a second objection. It is not only inconvenient, but it is theoretically incorrect. The letter *j* was originally a modification of the vowel *i*. The Germans, who use it as the semivowel *y*, have perverted it from its original power less than the English have done, who sound it *dzh*.

With these views we may appreciate in the English alphabet and orthography—

Its convenience or inconvenience in respect to learning foreign tongues.—The sound given to the *a* in *fate* is singular. Other nations sound it as *a* in *father*.

The sound given to the *e*, long (or independent), is singular. Other nations sound it as *a* in *fate* (there or thereabouts).

The sound given to the *i* in *bite* is singular. Other nations sound it as *ee* in *feet*.

The sound given to the *oo* in *fool* is singular. Other nations sound it as the *o* in *note* (there or thereabouts).

The sound given to the *u* in *duck* is singular. Other nations sound it as the *u* in *bull*.

The sound given to the *ou* in *house* is singular. Other nations, more correctly, represent it by *au* or *aw*.

The sound given to the *w* in *wet* is somewhat singular, but it is also correct and convenient. With many nations it is not found at all, whilst with those where it occurs it has the sound (there or thereabouts) of *v*.

The sound given to *y* is somewhat singular. In Danish it has a vowel power. In German the semivowel sound is spelt with *j*.

The sound given to *z* is not the sound which it has in German and Italian; but its power in English is convenient and correct.

The sound given to *ch* in *chest* is singular. In other languages it has generally a guttural sound; in French that of *sh*. The English usage is more correct than the French, but less correct than the German.

The sound given to *j* is singular.

§ 141. *The historical propriety or impropriety of certain letters.*—The use of *i* with a diphthongal power is not only singular and inconvenient, but also *historically incorrect*. The Greek *iota*, from whence it originates, has the sound of *i* and *ee*, as in *pit* and *feet*.

The *y*, sounded as in *yet*, is historically incorrect. It grew out of the Greek *υ*, a vowel, and no semivowel. The Danes still use it as such, that is, with the power of the German *ü*.

The use of *j* for *dzh* is historically incorrect.

The use of *c* for *k* in words derived from the Greek as *mechanical*, *ascetic*, &c., is historically incorrect.

§ 142. *On certain conventional modes of spelling.*—In the Greek language the sounds of *o* in *not* and of *o* in *note* (although allied) are expressed by the unlike signs (or letters) *o* and *ω*, respectively. In most other languages the difference between the sounds is considered too slight to require for its expression signs so distinct and dissimilar. In some languages the difference is neglected altogether. In many, however, it is expressed, and that by some modification of the original letter.

Let the sign (˘) denote that the vowel over which it stands is long, or independent, whilst the sign (˙) indicates shortness, or dependence. In such a case, instead of writing *not* and *note*, like the Greeks, we may write *nōt* and *nōt*, the sign serving for a fresh letter. Herein the expression of the nature of the sound is natural, because the natural use of (˘) and (˙) is to express length or shortness, dependence or independence. Now, supposing the broad sound of *o* to be already represented, it is very evident that, of the other two sounds of *o*, the one must be long (independent), and the other short (dependent); and as it is only necessary to express one of these conditions, we may, if we choose, use the sign (˘) alone; its presence denoting length, and its absence shortness (independence or dependence).

As signs of this kind, one mark is as good as another; and instead of (˘) we may, if we choose, substitute such a mark as (') and write *nót* = *nōt*—*nwt* = *nōte*; provided only that the sign (') expresses no other condition or affection of a sound. This use of the mark ('), as a sign that the vowel over which it is placed is long (independent), is common in many languages. But is this use of (') natural? For a reason that the reader has anticipated, it is not natural, but conventional. Neither is it convenient. It is used elsewhere not as the sign of *quantity*, but as the sign of *accent*; consequently, being placed over a letter, and being interpreted according to its natural meaning,

it gives the idea, not that the syllable is long, but that it is emphatic or accented. Its use as a sign of quantity, then, would be an orthographic expedient, or an inconvenient conventional mode of spelling.

The English language abounds in orthographic expedients; the modes of expressing the quantity of the vowels being particularly numerous. To begin with these:—

The reduplication of a vowel where there is but one syllable (as in *feet*, *cool*), is an orthographic expedient. It merely means that the syllable is long.

The juxtaposition of two different vowels, where there is but one syllable, as in *plain*, *moan* (whatever may have been its origin), is an orthographic expedient. It generally means the same as the reduplication of a vowel, *i. e.* that the syllable is long.

The addition of the *e* mute, as in *plane*, *whale* (whatever may have been its origin), is, at present, but an orthographic expedient. It denotes the lengthening of the syllable.

The reduplication of the consonant after a vowel, as in *spotted*, *torrent*, is in most cases but an orthographic expedient. It merely denotes that the preceding vowel is short.

The use of *ph* for *f* in *Philip*, is an orthographic expedient, founded upon etymologic reasons.

The use of *th* for the simple sound of the first consonant in *thin* and *thine*, is an orthographic expedient. The combination must be dealt with as a single letter.

Caution.—The letters *x* and *q* are not orthographic expedients. They are orthographical *compendiums*, *x = ks*, and *q = kw*.

Remarks.—The previous sketch of the theory of a full and perfect alphabet has shown how far the English alphabet falls short of such a standard; and, above all, it has exhibited some of the conventional modes of spelling which the insufficiency of alphabets combined with other causes, has engendered. It is, chiefly, by the *history* of our alphabet, that these defects are *accounted for*. These defects, it may be

said, once for all, the English alphabet shares with those of the rest of the world ; although, with the doubtful exception of the French, it possesses them in a higher degree than any.

§ 143. With few, if any exceptions, *all the modes of writing in the world originate*, directly or indirectly, from the Phœnician.

At a certain period the alphabet of Palestine, Phœnicia, and the neighbouring languages of the Semitic tribes, consisted of *twenty-two* separate and distinct letters.

In this state it was imported into Greece. Now, as it rarely happens that any two languages have precisely the same elementary articulate sounds, so it rarely happens that an alphabet can be transplanted from one tongue to another, and be found to suit. When such is the case, alterations are required. The extent to which these alterations are made at all, or (if made) made on a right principle, varies with different languages. Some *adapt* an introduced alphabet well: others badly.

§ 144. The Greeks adapted the Phœnician alphabet well, or, at any rate, tolerably. But it was the *Roman* alphabet which served as the basis to the English.

And it is in the changes which the Phœnician alphabet underwent in being accommodated to the Latin language that we must investigate the chief peculiarities of the present alphabet and orthography of Great Britain and America.

Now respecting the Roman alphabet, we must remember that it was *not taken directly* from the Phœnician ; in this important point differing from the Greek.

Nor yet was it taken, *in the first instance*, from the Greek.

It had a *double* origin. It was Old Italian and Etruscan in the first instance, Greek afterwards.

The principles which determined the form of the Roman alphabet were, upon the whole, correct ; and hence the Roman alphabet, although not originally meant to express an Italian tongue at all, expressed the language to which it was applied tolerably.

On the other hand, there were both omissions and alterations

which have had a detrimental effect upon the orthography of those numerous other tongues to which the Latin has supplied the alphabet. Thus—

a. It is a matter of regret, that the differences which the Greeks drew between the so-called *long* and *short e* and *o*, was neglected by the Latins; in other words, that *ω* was omitted entirely, and *η* changed in power. Had this not been the case, all the orthographical expedients by which we have to express the difference between the *o* in *not*, and the *o* in *note*, would have been prevented—*not, note, moat—bed, bead, heel, glide, &c.*

b. It is a matter of regret, that such an unnecessary *compendium* as *q = cu*, or *cw*, should have been retained from the old Greek alphabet; and, still more so, that the equally superfluous *x = cs*, or *ks*, should have been re-admitted.

c. It is a matter of regret, that the Greek *θ* was not treated like the Greek *ζ*. Neither was wanted at first, both afterwards. The manner, however, of their subsequent introduction was different. *Zeta* came in as a simple single letter, significant of a simple single sound. *Theta*, on the contrary, although expressive of an equally simple sound, became *th*. This was a combination rather than a letter; and the error which it engendered was great.

It suggested the idea, that a simple sound was a compound one—which was wrong.

It further suggested the idea, that the sound of *θ* differed from that of *τ*, by the addition of *h*—which was wrong also.

The Greek language had a system of sounds different from the Phœnician; and the alphabet required modifying accordingly.

The Roman language had a system of sounds different from the Greek, and the alphabet required modifying accordingly.

§ 145. This leads us to certain questions concerning the Anglo-Saxon. Had *it* a system of sounds different from the Roman? If so, what modifications did the alphabet require? Were such modifications effected? If so, how? Sufficiently or insufficiently? The answers are unsatisfactory.

The Anglo-Saxon had, even in its earliest stage, the follow-

ing sounds, for which the Latin alphabet had no equivalent signs or letters—

1. The sound of the *th* in *thin*.
2. The sound of the *th* in *thine*.

It had certainly these: probably others.

Expressive of these, two new signs were introduced, *viz.* þ = *th* in *thin*, and ð = *th* in *thine*.

W, also, evolved out of *u*, was either an original improvement of the Anglo-Saxon orthographists, or a mode of expression borrowed from one of the allied languages of the Continent.

This was, as far as it went, correct, so that the Anglo-Saxon alphabet, although not originally meant to express a Gothic tongue at all, answered the purpose to which it was applied tolerably.

§ 146. Change, however, went on; and the orthography which suited the earlier Anglo-Saxon would not suit the later; at any rate, it would not suit the language which had become, or was becoming, *English*; wherein the sounds for which the Latin alphabet had no equivalent signs increase. Thus there is at present—

1. The sound of the *sh* in *shine*.
2. The sound of the *z* in *azure*.

How are these to be expressed? The rule has hitherto been to denote simple single sounds, by simple single signs, and where such signs have no existence already, to *originate new ones*.

To *combine existing letters*, rather than to coin new ones, has only been done rarely. The Latin substitution of the combination *th* for the simple single *θ*, was exceptionable. It was a precedent, however, which now begins to be followed generally.

It is this precedent which accounts for the absence of any letter in English expressive of either of the sounds in question.

Furthermore, our alphabet has not only not increased in

proportion to our sound-system, but it has *decreased*. The Anglo-Saxon þ = the *th* in *thin*, and ð = the *th* in *thine*, have become obsolete ; and a difference in pronunciation, which our ancestors expressed, we overlook.

The same precedent is at the bottom of this ; a fact which leads us to—

§ 147. *The Anglo-Norman alphabet*.—The Anglo-Saxon language was *Gothic* ; the alphabet, *Roman*.

The Anglo-Norman language was *Roman* ; the alphabet, *Roman* also.

The Anglo-Saxon took his speech from one source ; his writing from another.

The Anglo-Norman took both from the same.

In adapting a Latin alphabet to a Gothic language, the Anglo-Saxon allowed himself more latitude than the Anglo-Norman. We have seen that the new signs þ and ð were Anglo-Saxon.

Now, the sounds which these letters represent did not occur in the Norman-French, consequently the Norman-French alphabet neither had nor needed to have signs to express them ; until after the battle of Hastings, *when it became the Anglo-Norman of England*.

Then, the case became altered. The English language influenced the Norman orthography, the Norman orthography the English language ; the result being that the simple single correct and distinctive signs of the Anglo-Saxon alphabet became replaced by the incorrect and indistinct combination *th*.

This was a loss, both in the way of theoretical correctness and perspicuity.

Such is the general view of the additions, ejections, changes of power, and changes of order in the English alphabet ; changes which well account for many of its defects.

PART III.

PROSODY.

§ 148. THE word *Prosody* is derived from a Greek word (*prosodia*) signifying *accent*. It is used by Latin and English grammarians in a wider sense, and includes not only the doctrines of accent and quantity, but also the laws of metre and versification.

§ 149. Observe the accents in the following lines :—

Then fare thee wéll, mine ówn dear lóve,
The wórld hath nów for ús
No greater griéf, no páin abóve
The pain of párting thús.

MOORE.

Here the syllables accented are the 2nd, 4th, 6th, 8th, 10th, 12th, 14th, 16th, 18th, 20th, 22nd, 24th, 26th, 28th; that is, every other syllable.—Again,

At the clóse of the dáy, when the hámlét is stíll,
And the mórtals the sweéts of forgétfulness próve,
And when nóught but the tórrént is héárd on the híll,
And there 's nóught but the níghtingale's sóng in the gróve.

BEATTIE.

Here the syllables accented are the 3rd, 6th, 9th, 12th, 15th, 18th, 21st, 24th, 27th, 30th, 33rd, 36th, 39th, 42nd, 45th, 48th; that is, every third syllable.

Metre, in English Prosody, is a general term for the recurrence within certain intervals of syllables similarly affected.

§ 150. *Measures.*—For every accented syllable in the following line, write the letter *a*, and for every unaccented one the letter *x*, so that *a* may stand for an accent, *x* for the absence of one—

The wáy was lóng, the wind was cöld.

SCOTT.

Or expressed symbolically,

x a x a x a x a,

where *x* coincides with *the*, *a* with *way*, &c.

Determine the length of the line in question.—It is plain that this may be done in two ways. We may either measure by the syllables, and say that the line consists of eight syllables; or by the accents, and say that it consists of four accents. In this latter case we take the accented syllable with its corresponding unaccented one, and, grouping the two together, deal with the pair at once. Now, a group of syllables thus taken together is called a *measure*. In the line in question *the way* (*x a*) is one measure, *was lóng* (*x a*) another, and so on throughout; the line itself consisting of four measures.

§ 151. *Trisyllabic measures.*—The number of measures consisting of two syllables, or dissyllabic measures, is necessarily limited to two, expressed by *a x* and *x a* respectively. But beyond these there are in the English language measures of three syllables, or trisyllabic measures. The number of these is necessarily limited to three.

The first of these is exhibited in the word *merrily* (*a x x*).

Merrily, merrily shall I live now,

U'nder the blóssom that hángs on the bóugh.

SHAKSPEARE.

The second is exhibited by the word *disáble* (*x a x*).

But vainly thou wárrést,
 For this is alóne in
 Thy pówer to decláre,
 That in the dim fórest
 Thou héárd'st a low móaning,
 And sáw'st a bright lády surpássingly fáir.

COLERIDGE.

The third is exhibited by the word *cavaliér* (*x x a*).

There 's a beauty for éver unfádingly bright,
 Like the lóng ruddy lápse of a súmer-day's night.

MOORE.

When grouped together according to certain rules, measures form lines and verses; and lines and verses, regularly arranged, constitute couplets, triplets, and stanzas, &c.

The expression of measures, lines, &c., by such symbols as *a x, x a*, &c., is *metrical notation*.

§ 152. *Rhyme*.—We can have English verse without *rhyme*. We cannot have English verse without *accent*. Hence accent is an *essential*, rhyme an *accessory* to metre.

Analysis of a pair of rhyming syllables.—Let the syllables *told* and *bold* be taken to pieces, and let the separate parts of each be compared. Viewed in reference to metre, they consist of three parts or elements: 1. the vowel (*o*); 2. the part *preceding* the vowel (*t* and *b* respectively); 3. the parts *following* the vowel (*ld*). Now the vowel (*o*) and the parts following the vowel (*ld*) are alike in both words (*old*); but the part preceding the vowel is different in the different words (*told, bold*). This difference between the parts preceding the vowels is essential; since, if it were not for this, the two words would be identical, or rather there would be but one word altogether. This is the case with *I* and *eye*. Sound for sound (although different in spelling) the two words are identical, and, consequently, the rhyme is faulty.

Again—compared with the words *bold* and *told*, the words

teeth and *breeze* have two of the elements necessary to constitute a rhyme. The vowels are alike (*ee*), whilst the parts preceding the vowels are different (*br* and *t*); and, as far as these two matters are concerned, the rhyme is a good one, *tee* and *bree*. Notwithstanding this, there is anything rather than a rhyme; since the parts following the vowel (*th* and *ze*) instead of agreeing, differ. *Breathe* and *beneath* are in the same predicament, because the *th* is not sounded alike in the two words.

Again—the words *feel* and *mill* constitute only a false and imperfect rhyme. Sound for sound, the letters *f* and *m* (the parts preceding the vowel) are different. This is as it should be. Also, sound for sound, *l* and *ll* (the parts following the vowel) are identical; and this is as it should be also; but *ee* and *i* (the vowels) are different, and this difference spoils the rhyme. *None* and *own* are in the same predicament; since one *o* is sounded as *o* in *note*, and the other as the *u* in *but*.

From what has gone before we get the notion of true and perfect rhymes as opposed to false and imperfect ones. For two (or more) words to rhyme to each other, it is necessary,

- a. That the vowel be the same in both.
- b. That the parts following the vowel be the same.
- c. That the parts preceding the vowel be different.

Beyond this it is necessary that the syllables, to form a full and perfect rhyme, should be accented syllables. *Sky* and *lie* form good rhymes, but *sky* and *merrily* bad ones, and *merrily* and *silly* worse. Lines like the second and fourth of the following stanza are slightly exceptionable on this score: indeed, many readers sacrifice the accent in the word *merrily* to the rhyme, and pronounce it *merrily'*.

The wíth she héld the háir in her hánd,
 The réd flame blázed hígh;
 And róund abóut the cáldron stóut,
 They dánced right mérrily.

KIRKE WHITE.

Note.—In matters of rhyme the letter *h* counts as nothing. *High* and *I*, *hair* and *air*, are imperfect rhymes, because *h* (being no articulate sound) counts as nothing, and so the parts before the vowel *i* and *a* are not different (as they ought to be) but identical.

Whose generous children narrow'd not their hearts
With commerce, giv'n alone to arms and arts.

BYRON.

Note.—Words where the letters coincide, but the sounds differ, are only rhymes to the eye. *Breath* and *beneath* are both in this predicament; so also are *cease* and *ease* (*eaze*).

In the fat age of pleasure, wealth, and ease,
Sprang the rank weed, and thrived with large increase.

POPE.

§ 153. *Single rhymes.*—An accented syllable standing by itself, and coming under the conditions given above, constitutes a single rhyme.

'Tis hard to say if greater want of *skill*
Appear in writing or in judging *ill*;
But, of the two, less dangerous is the *offence*
To tire the patience than mislead the *sense*.
Some few in that, but thousands err in *this*;
Ten censure wrong, for one that writes *amiss*.

POPE.

Double rhymes.—An accented syllable followed by an unaccented one, and coming under the conditions given above, constitutes a double rhyme.

The meeting points the sacred hair *dissever*
From her fair head for ever and for *ever*.

POPE.

An accented syllable followed by two unaccented ones, and

coming under the conditions given above, constitutes a treble rhyme.

Beware that its fatal *ascéndancy*
 Do not tempt thee to mope and repine ;
 With a humble and hopeful *depéndency*
 Still await the good pleasure divine.
 Success in a higher *beátitude*,
 Is the end of what's under the Pole ;
 A philosopher takes it with *grátitude*,
 And believes it the best on the whole.

BYRON.

§ 154. Metres where there is no rhyme are called Blank metres.

Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
 Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
 Brought death into the world and all our woe,
 With loss of Eden, till one greater Man
 Restore us, and regain the blissful seat,
 Sing, Heavenly Muse !

MILTON.

§ 155. The chief metres in English are of the formula *x a*. It is only a few that are known by fixed names. These are as follows:—

1. *Gay's stanza*.—Lines of three measures, *x a*, with alternate rhymes ; the odd (*i. e.* the 1st and 3rd) rhymes being double.

'T was when the seas were roaring
 With hollow blasts of wind,
 A damsel lay deploring,
 All on a rock reclined.

2. *Common octosyllabics*.—Four measures, *x a*, with rhyme, and (unless the rhymes be double) eight syllables (*octo syllabæ*).—Butler's *Hudibras*, Scott's poems, *The Giaour*, and other poems of Lord Byron.

3. *Elegiac octosyllabics*.—Same as the last, except that

the rhymes are regularly alternate, and the verses arranged in stanzas.

And on her lover's arm she leant,
 And round her waist she felt it fold,
 And far across the hills they went,
 In that new world which now is old :
 Across the hills and far away,
 Beyond their utmost purple rim,
 And deep into the dying day
 The happy princess followed him.

TENNYSON.

4. *Octosyllabic triplets*. — Three rhymes in succession. Generally arranged as stanzas.

I blest them, and they wander'd on ;
 I spoke, but answer came there none :
 The dull and bitter voice was gone.

TENNYSON.

5. *Blank verse*.—Five measures, *x a*, without rhyme, Paradise Lost, Young's Night Thoughts, Cowper's Task.

6. *Heroic couplets*.—Five measures, *x a*, with pairs of rhymes. Chaucer, Denham, Dryden, Waller, Pope, Goldsmith, Cowper, Byron, Moore, Shelley, &c. This is the common metre for narrative, didactic, and descriptive poetry.

7. *Heroic triplets*.—Five measures, *x a*. Three rhymes in succession. Arranged in stanzas.

8. *Elegiacs*.—Five measures, *x a* ; with regularly alternate rhymes, and arranged in stanzas.

The curfew tolls the knell of parting day,
 The lowing herds wind slowly o'er the lea,
 The ploughman homewards plods his weary way,
 And leaves the world to darkness and to me.

GRAY.

9. *Rhymes royal*.—Seven lines of heroics, with the last two rhymes in succession, and the first five recurring at intervals.

This Troilus, in gift of curtesie,
 With hawk on hond, and with a huge rout
 Of knightes, rode, and did her company,
 Passing all through the valley far about;
 And further would have ridden out of doubt.
 Full faine and woe was him to gone so sone;
 But turn he must, and it was eke to doen.

CHAUCER.

This metre was common with the writers of the earlier part of Queen Elizabeth's reign. It admits of varieties according to the distribution of the first five rhymes.

10. *Ottava rima*.—A metre with an Italian name, and borrowed from Italy, where it is used generally for narrative poetry. The *Morgante Maggiore* of Pulci, the *Orlando Innamorato* of Bojardo, the *Orlando Furioso* of Ariosto, the *Gierusalemme Liberata* of Tasso, are all written in this metre. Besides this, the two chief epics of Spain and Portugal respectively are thus composed. Hence it is a form of poetry which is Continental rather than English, and naturalized rather than indigenous. The stanza consists of eight lines of heroics, the six first rhyming alternately, the last two in succession.

Arrived there, a prodigious noise he hears,
 Which suddenly along the forest spread;
 Whereat from out his quiver he prepares
 An arrow for his bow, and lifts his head;
 And, lo! a monstrous herd of swine appears,
 And onward rushes with tempestuous tread,
 And to the fountain's brink precisely pours,
 So that the giant's join'd by all the boars.

Morgante Maggiore (LD. BYRON'S Translation).

11. *Terza rima*.—Like the last, borrowed both in name

and nature from the Italian, and scarcely yet naturalized in England.

The Spirit of the fervent days of old,
 When Words were things that came to pass, and Thought
 Flash'd o'er the future, bidding men behold
 Their children's children's doom already brought
 Forth from the abyss of Time which is to be,
 The chaos of events where lie half-wrought
 Shapes that must undergo mortality :
 What the great seers of Israel wore within,
 That Spirit was on them and is on me ;
 And if, Cassandra-like, amidst the din
 Of conflicts, none will hear, or hearing heed
 This voice from out the wilderness, the sin
 Be theirs, and my own feelings be my meed,
 The only guerdon I have ever known.

12. *Alexandrines*.—Six measures, *x a*, generally (perhaps always) with rhyme. The name is said to be taken from the fact that early romances upon the deeds of Alexander of Macedon, of great popularity, were written in this metre. One of the longest poems in the English language is in the Alexandrines, *viz.* Drayton's *Poly-olbion*, quoted above.

13. *Spenserian stanza*.—A stanza consisting of nine lines, the first eight heroics, the last an Alexandrine.

It hath been through all ages ever seen,
 That with the prize of arms and chivalrie
 The prize of beauty still hath joined been,
 And that for reason's special privitie ;
 For either doth on other much rely.
 For he meseems most fit the fair to serve
 That can her best defend from villanie ;
 And she most fit his service doth deserve,
 That fairest is, and from her faith will never swerve.

SPENSER.

Childe Harold and other important poems are composed in the Spenserian stanza.

14. *Service metre*.—Couplets of seven measures, *x a*. This is the common metre of the Psalm versions. It is also called Common measure, or Long measure. In this metre there is always a pause after the fourth measure, and many grammarians consider that with that pause the line ends. According to this view, the Service metre does not consist of two long lines with seven measures each; but of four short ones, with four and three measures each alternately. The Psalm versions are printed so as to exhibit this pause or break.

The Lord descended from above, | and bow'd the heavens most high,
 And underneath his feet He cast | the darkness of the sky.
 On Cherubs and on Seraphim | full royally He rode,
 And on the wings of mighty winds | came flying all abroad.

STERNHOLD AND HOPKINS.

In this matter the following distinction is convenient. When the last syllable of the fourth measure (*i. e.* the eighth syllable in the line) in the one verse *rhymes* with the corresponding syllable in the other, the long verse should be looked upon as broken up into two short ones; in other words, the couplets should be dealt with as a stanza. Where there is no rhyme except at the seventh measure, the verse should remain undivided. Thus:

Turn, gentle hermit of the glen, | and guide thy lonely way
 To where yon taper cheers the vale | with hospitable ray—

constitute a single couplet of two lines, the number of rhymes being two. But,

Turn, gentle hermit of the dale,
 And guide thy lonely way
 To where yon taper cheers the vale
 With hospitable ray—

(GOLDSMITH)

constitute a stanza of four lines, the number of rhymes being four.

15. *Ballad stanza*.—Service metre broken up in the way just indicated. Goldsmith's Edwin and Angelina, &c.

16. *Poulterer's measure*.—Alexandrines and service metre alternately. Found in the poetry of Henry the Eighth's time.

QUESTIONS.

1. Explain the terms *sharp*, *explosive*, *true aspirate*, *apparent aspirate*, *vowel*, *mute*.

2. Exhibit the difference between the quantity of *syllables* and the quantity of *vowels*.

3. Accentuate the following words,—*attribute* (adjective), *survey* (verb), *August* (the month).

4. Under what conditions is the *sound* of consonants doubled?

5. Exhibit, in a tabular form, the system of the mutes, underlining those which do not occur in English.

6. What is the power of *ph* in *Philip*? what in *haphazard*? Illustrate the difference fully.

7. Investigate the changes by which the words *picture*, *nature*, derived from the Latin *pictura* and *natura*, are sounded *pictshur* and *natshur*.

8. How do you sound the combination *apd*? Why?

9. In what points is the English alphabet *insufficient*, *redundant*, and *inconsistent*?

10. Give the metrical notation of the *Ballad Stanza*, *Service Metre*, *Common Octosyllabics*, and *Elegiacs*.

PART IV.
ETYMOLOGY.

CHAPTER I.

ON THE PROVINCE OF ETYMOLOGY.

§ 156. THE word etymology has a double meaning. At times it is used in a wide, and at times in a restricted, sense.

If we take such a word as *fathers*, we can divide it into two parts, or reduce it into two elements. By comparing it with *father*, we see that the *s* is neither part nor parcel of the original word. *Fathers* is capable of being analysed: *father* being the original primitive word, and *s* the secondary super-added termination. From the word *father*, the word *fathers* is derived, deduced, or descended. What has been said of this may also be said of *fatherly*, *fatherlike*, *fatherless*, &c. Now, from the word *father*, all these words (*fathers*, *fatherly*, *fatherlike*, and *fatherless*) differ in form, and in meaning. To become such a word as *fathers*, &c., the word *father* is changed.

Of changes of this sort, it is the province of etymology to take cognizance.

Compared with the form *fathers*, the word *father* is the older form of the two. The word *father* is a word current in this the nineteenth century. The same word was current in the first century, although under a different form, and in a different language. Thus, in the Latin language, the form was *pater*; and in the Greek *πατήρ*. Now, just as the word *father*, compared with *fathers*, is original and primitive, so is

pater, compared with *father*, original and primitive also. The difference is, that in respect to *father* and *fathers*, the change that takes place, takes place within the same language, whilst the change that takes place between *pater* and *father* takes place within different languages.

Of changes of this latter kind it is the province of etymology to take cognizance.

In its widest signification, etymology takes cognizance of *the changes of the form of words*. However, as the etymology that compares the forms *fathers* and *father* is different from the etymology that compares *father* and *pater*, we have, of etymology, two sorts: one dealing with the changes of form that words undergo in one and the same language (*father*, *fathers*), the other dealing with the changes that words undergo in passing from one language to another (*pater*, *father*).

The first of these sorts may be called etymology in the limited sense of the word, or the etymology of the grammarian. In this case it is opposed to orthöepy, orthography, syntax, and the other parts of grammar. This is the etymology of the ensuing pages.

The second may be called etymology in the wide sense of the word, historical etymology, or comparative etymology.

It must be again repeated that the two sorts of etymology agree in one point, viz. in taking cognizance of the *changes of form that words undergo*. Whether the change arise from grammatical reasons, as *father*, *fathers*, or from a change of language taking place in the lapse of time, as *pater*, *father*, is a matter of indifference.

In the Latin *pater*, and in the English *father*, we have one of two things, either two words descended or derived from each other, or two words descended or derived from a common original source.

In *fathers* we have a formation deduced from the radical word *father*.

In *fatherlike* we have a compound word capable of being analysed into the two primitive words, 1. *father*; 2. *like*.

With these preliminaries we may appreciate (or criticise) Dr. Johnson's explanation of the word etymology.

“ETYMOLOGY, *n. s.* (*etymologia*, Lat.) ἔτυμος (*etymos*) true, and λόγος (*logos*) a word.

“1. *The descent or derivation of a word from its original; the deduction of formations from the radical word; the analysis of compounds into primitives.*

“2. *The part of grammar which delivers the inflections of nouns and verbs.*”

CHAPTER II.

COMPOSITION.

§ 157. IN the following words, amongst many others, we have palpable and indubitable specimens of composition. *Day-star, vine-yard, sun-beam, apple-tree, ship-load, silver-smith, &c.* The words *palpable* and *indubitable* have been used, because, in many cases, as will be seen hereafter, it is difficult to determine whether a word be a true compound or not.

Now, in each of the compounds quoted above, it may be seen that it is the second word which is qualified or defined, by the first, and that it is not the first which is qualified or defined, by the second. Of *yards, beams, trees, loads, smiths*, there may be many sorts, and, in order to determine what particular sort of *yard, beam, tree, load, or smith*, may be meant, the words *vine, sun, apple, ship, and silver*, are prefixed. In compound words it is the *first* term that defines or particularises the second.

That the idea given by the word *apple-tree* is not referable to the words *apple* and *tree*, irrespective of the order in which they occur, may be seen by reversing the position of them. The word *tree-apple*, although not existing in the language,

is as correct a word as *thorn-apple*. In *tree-apple*, the particular sort of *apple* meant is denoted by the word *tree*, and if there were in our gardens various sorts of plants called *apples*, of which some grew along the ground and others upon trees, such a word as *tree-apple* would be required in order to be opposed to *earth-apple*, or *ground-apple*, or some word of the kind.

In the compound words *tree-apple* and *apple-tree*, we have the same elements differently arranged. However, as the word *tree-apple* is not current in the language, the class of compounds indicated by it may seem to be merely imaginary. Nothing is further from being the case. A *tree-rose* is a rose of a particular sort. The generality of roses being on *shrubs*, this grows on a *tree*. Its peculiarity consists in this fact, and this particular character is expressed by the word *tree* prefixed. A *rose-tree* is a *tree* of a particular sort, distinguished from *apple-trees*, and *trees* in general (in other words, particularised or defined), by the word *tree* prefixed.

A *ground-nut* is a *nut* particularised by growing in the ground. A *nut-ground* is a *ground* particularised by producing nuts.

A *finger-ring*, as distinguished from *ear-rings*, and from *rings* in general (and so particularised), is a *ring* for the *finger*. A *ring finger*, as distinguished from *fore-fingers*, and from *fingers* in general (and so particularised), is a *finger* whereon *rings* are worn.

At times this rule seems to be violated. The words *spitfire* and *daredevil* seem exceptions to it. At the first glance it seems, in the case of a *spitfire*, that what he (or she) *spits* is *fire*; and that, in the case of a *daredevil*, what he (or she) *dares* is the *devil*. In this case the initial words *spit* and *dare*, are particularised by the final ones *fire* and *devil*. The true idea, however, confirms the original rule. A *spitfire* voids his fire by spitting. A *daredevil*, in meeting the fiend, would not shrink from him, but would defy him. A *spitfire* is not one who spits fire, but one whose fire is *spit*. A *daredevil*

is not one who dares even the devil, but one by whom the devil is even dared.

§ 158. Of the two elements of a compound word, which is the most important? In one sense the latter, in another sense the former. The latter word is the most *essential*; since the general idea of *trees* must exist before it can be defined or particularised; so becoming the idea which we have in *apple-tree*, *rose-tree*, &c. The former word, however, is the most *influential*. It is by this that the original idea is qualified. The latter word is the staple original element: the former is the superadded influencing element. Compared with each other, the former element is active, the latter passive. Etymologically speaking, the former element, in English compounds, is the most important.

Before we come to the details of the composition of words, it is necessary to, 1, define the meaning of the term composition; 2, explain the nature of some obscure compounds.

§ 159. Composition is the joining together, *in language*, of two *different words*, and *treating the combination as a single term*. Observe the words in italics.

In Language.—A great number of our compounds, like the word *merry-making*, are divided by the sign -, or the hyphen. It is very plain that if all words *spelt* with a hyphen were to be considered as compounds, the formation of them would be not a matter of speech or language, but one of writing or spelling. This distinguishes compounds in language from mere printers' compounds.

Different.—In Old High-German we find the form *sēlp-sēlpo*. Here there is the junction of two words, but not the junction of two *different* ones. This distinguishes composition from gemination.

Words.—In *father-s*, *clear-er*, *four-th*, &c., there is the addition of a letter or a syllable, and it may be even of the part of a word. There is no addition, however, of a whole word. This distinguishes composition from derivation.

Treating the combination as a single term.—In determining,

in certain cases, between derived words and compound words, there is an occasional perplexity; the perplexity, however, is far greater in determining between a compound word and *two words*. In the eyes of one grammarian the term *mountain height* may be as truly a compound word as *sunbeam*. In the eyes of another grammarian it may be no compound word, but two words, just as *Alpine height* is two words; *mountain* being dealt with as an adjective. It is in the determination of this that the accent plays an important part.

§ 160. The attention of the reader is drawn to the following line, slightly altered, from Churchill:—

“Then rést, my friénd, *and spare* thy précious bréath.”

On each of the syllables *rest*, *friend*, *spare*, *prec-*, *breath*, there is an accent. Each of these syllables must be compared with the one that precedes it; *rest* with *then*, *friend* with *my*, and so on throughout the line. Compared with the word *and*, the word *spare* is not only accented, but the accent is conspicuous and prominent. There is so little on *and*, and so much on *spare*, that the disparity of accent is very manifest.

Now, if in the place of *and*, there was some other word, a word not so much accented as *spare*, but still more accented than *and*, this disparity would be diminished, and the accents of the two words might be said to be at *par*, or nearly so. As said before, the line was slightly altered from Churchill, the real reading being—

Then rést, my friénd, *spare, spare* thy précious breath.—

In the true reading we actually find what had previously only been supposed. In the words *spare, spare*, the accents are nearly at *par*. Such is the difference between accent at *par* and disparity of accent.

Good illustrations of the parity and disparity of accent may be drawn from certain names of places. Let there be such a sentence as the following: *the lime house near the new port*. Compare the parity of accent on the separate words *lime* and *house, new* and *port*, with the disparity of accent in the

compound words *Limehouse* and *Néuport*. The separate words *beef steak*, where the accent is nearly at *par*, compared with the compound word *sweepstakes*, where there is a great disparity of accent, are further illustrations of the same difference.

The difference between a compound word and two words is greatest where the first is an adjective. This we see in comparing such terms as the following: *bláck bírd*, meaning a *bird that is black*, with *bláckbird* = the Latin *merula*; or *blúe béll*, meaning a *bell that is blue*, with *blúebell*, the flower. Expressions like a *shárp edgéd instrument*, meaning *an instrument that is sharp and has edges*, as opposed to a *shárp-edged instrument*, meaning *an instrument with sharp edges*, further exemplify this difference.

Subject to a few exceptions, it may be laid down, that, in the English language, *there is no composition unless there is either a change of form or a change of accent.*

The reader is now informed, that unless, in what has gone before, he has taken an exception to either a statement or an inference, he has either seen beyond what has been already laid down by the author, or else has read him with insufficient attention. This may be shown by drawing a distinction between a compound form and a compound idea.

In the words *a red house*, each word preserves its natural and original meaning, and the statement is *that a house is red*. By a parity of reasoning, *a mad house* should mean a *house that is mad*; and, provided that each word retain its natural meaning and its natural accent, such is the fact. Let a *house* mean, as it often does, a *family*. Then the phrase, *a mad house*, means that the *house, or family, is mad*, just as *a red house* means that the *house is red*. Such, however, is not the current meaning of the word. Every one know that *a mad house* means *a house for mad men*; in which case it is treated as a compound word, and has a marked accent on the first syllable, just as *Limehouse* has. Now, compared with the words *red house*, meaning a house of a *red colour*, and compared with the words *mad house*, meaning

a *deranged family*, the word *mádhouse*, in its common sense, expresses a compound idea; as opposed to two ideas, or a double idea. The word *beef steak* is evidently a compound idea; but, as there is no disparity of accent, it is not a compound word. Its sense is compound; its form is not compound, but double. This indicates the objection anticipated, which is this: viz. that a definition, which would exclude such a word as *beef steak* from the list of compounds, is, for that very reason, exceptionable. I answer to this, that the term in question is a compound idea, and not a compound form; in other words, that it is a compound in logic, but not a compound in etymology. Now etymology, taking cognizance of forms only, has nothing to do with ideas, except so far as they influence forms.

Such is the commentary upon the words, “*treating the combination as a single term;*” in other words, such the difference between a compound word and two words.

§ 161. *On certain words wherein the fact of their being compound is obscured.*—Composition is the addition of a word to a word, derivation is the addition of letters or syllables to a word. In a compound form each element has a separate and independent existence; in a derived form, only one of the elements has such. Now it is very possible that in an older stage of a language two words may exist, may be put together, and may so form a compound; at the time in point each word having a separate and independent existence: whilst, in a later stage of language, only one of these words may have a separate and independent existence, the other having become obsolete. In this case a compound word would take the appearance of a derived one, since but one of its elements could be exhibited as a separate and independent word. Such is the case with, amongst others, the word *bishopric*. In the present language the word *ric* has no separate and independent existence. For all this, the word is a true compound, since, in Anglo-Saxon, we have the noun *ríce* as a separate, independent word, signifying *kingdom* or *domain*.

Again, without becoming obsolete, a word may alter its form. This is the case with most of our adjectives in *-ly*. At present they appear derivative; their termination *-ly* having no separate and independent existence. The older language, however, shows that they are compounds; since *-ly* is nothing else than *-lic*, Anglo-Saxon; *-lih*, Old High-German; *-leiks*, Mæso-Gothic; = *like*, or *similis*, and, equally with it, an independent separate word.

For the following words a separate independent root is presumed rather than shown. It is presumed, however, on grounds that satisfy the etymologist.

Mis-, as in *misdeed*, &c.—Mæso-Gothic, *missó* = *in turns*; Old Norse, *á mis* = *alternately*; Middle High-German, *misse* = *mistake*. The original notion *alternation*, thence *change*, thence *defect*. Compare the Greek ἄλλωϋ.

Dom, as in *wisdom*, &c.—the substantive *dóm* presumed.

Hood, and *head*, as in *Godhead*, *manhood*, &c.—The substantive *háuds* = *person*, *order*, *kind*, presumed. Nothing to do with the word *head*.

Ship, as in *friendship*.—Anglo-Saxon, *-scipe* and *-sceäft*; German, *-schaft*; Mæso-Gothic, *gaskafts* = *a creature*, or *creation*. The substantive *skafts* or *skap* presumed. The *-skip* or *-scape* in *landskip* is only an older form.

Less, as in *sleepless*, &c., has nothing to do with *less*. Derived from *láus*, *lós*, *destitute of* = Latin *expers*.

§ 162. *Peacock*, *peahen*, &c.—If these words be rendered masculine or feminine by the addition of the elements *-cock* and *-hen*, the statements made in the beginning of the present chapter are invalidated; since, if the word *pea-* be particularised, qualified, or defined by the words *-cock* and *-hen*, the second term defines or particularises the first, which is contrary to rule. The truth, however, is, that the words *-cock* and *-hen* are defined by the prefix *pea-*. Preparatory to the exhibition of this, let us remember that the word *pea* (although now found in composition only) is a true and independent substantive, the name of a species of fowl, like *pheasant*, *partridge*, or any other

appellation. It is the Latin *pavo*, German *pfau*. Now, if the word *peacock* mean a *pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*) that is a male, then do *wood-cock*, *black-cock*, and *bantam-cock*, mean *woods*, *blacks*, and *bantams* that are male. Or if the word *peahen* mean a *pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*) that is female, then do *moorhen* and *guineahen* mean *moors* and *guineas* that are female. Again, if a *peahen* mean a *pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*) that is female, then does the compound *pheasant-hen* mean the same as *hen-pheasant*; which is not the case. The fact is that *peacock* means a *cock that is a pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*); *peahen* means a *hen that is a pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*); and, finally, *peafowl* means a *fowl that is a pea* (*pfau* or *pavo*). In the same way *moorfowl* means, not a *moor that is connected with a fowl*, but a *fowl that is connected with a moor*.

§ 163. It must be clear, *ex vi termini*, that in every compound word there are two parts; *i. e.* the whole or part of the original, and the whole or part of the superadded, word. In the most perfect forms of inflection there is a third element, *viz.* a vowel, consonant, or syllable that joins the first word with the second.

In the older forms of all the Gothic languages the presence of this third element was the rule rather than the exception. In the present English it exists in but few words.

a. The *-a-* in *black-a-moor* is possibly such a connecting element.

b. The *-in-* in *night-in-gale* is most probably such a connecting element. Compare the German form *nacht-i-gall*, and remember the tendency of vowels to take the sound of *-ng* before *g*.

§ 164. *Improper compounds.*—The *-s-* in words like *Thurs-day*, *hunt-s-man*, may be one of two things—

a. It may be the sign of the genitive case, so that *Thursday* = *Thoris dies*. In this case the word is an improper compound, since it is like the word *pater-familias* in Latin, in a common state of syntactic construction.

b. It may be a connecting sound, like the *-i-* in *nacht-i-gall*. Reasons for this view occur in the following fact:—

In the modern German languages the genitive case of feminine nouns ends otherwise than in *-s*. Nevertheless, the sound of *-s* occurs in composition equally, whether the noun it follows be masculine or feminine. This fact, as far as it goes, makes it convenient to consider the sound in question as a connective rather than a case. Probably, it is neither one nor the other exactly, but the effect of a false analogy.

§ 165. *Decomposites*.—"Composition is the joining together of *two* words."

Compound radicals, like *midship* and *gentleman*, in *midshipman* and *gentleman-like*, are, for the purposes of composition, single words. Compounds wherein one element is compound are called decomposites.

§ 166. There is a number of words which are never found by themselves; or, if so found, have never the same sense that they have in combination. Mark the word combination. The terms in question are points of combination, not of composition: since they form not the part of words, but the parts of phrases. Such are the expressions *time and tide—might and main—rede me my riddle—pay your shot—rhyme and reason*, &c. These words are evidently of the same class, though not of the same species, with *bishopric*, *colewort*, *spillikin*, *gossip*, *mainswearer*, &c. These last-mentioned terms give us obsolete words preserved in composition. The former give us obsolete words preserved in combination.

§ 167. By attending to the following sections we shall see in what way the different parts of speech are capable of being put together by composition.

Substantives preceded by Substantives.—A large and important class. *Day-star*, *morning-star*, *evening-star*, *land-slip*, *watch-house*, *light-house*, *rose-tree*, *oak-tree*, *fir-tree*, *harvest-time*, *goose-grass*, *sea-man*, *collar-bone*, *shoulder-blade*, *ground-nut*, *earth-nut*, *hazel-nut*, *wall-nut*, *fire-wood*, *sun-light*, *moon-light*, *star-light*, *torch-light*, &c.

Substantives preceded by Adjectives.—(1.) Proper Names.—*Good-man*, *New-man*, *North-humberland*, *South-hampton*. (2.)

Common Names.—*Blind-worm, free-man, free-thinker, half-penny, grey-beard, green-sward, white-thorn, black-thorn, mid-day, mid-summer, quick-silver, holy-day, &c.*

Substantives preceded by Verbs.—*Turn-spit, spit-fire, dare-devil, whet-stone, kill-cow, sing-song, turn-coat, &c.*

Substantives preceded by the Present Participle.—*Turning-lathe, sawing-mill.*

Substantives preceded by the Past Participle of the Strong form.—None.

Substantives preceded by the Past Participle of the Weak form.—None.

Adjectives preceded by Substantives.—*Sin-ful, thank-ful, and other words ending in -ful. Blood-red, eye-bright, coal-black, snow-white, nut-brown, heart-whole, ice-cold, foot-sore, &c.*

Adjectives preceded by Adjectives.—*All-mighty, two-fold, many-fold, &c.*

Adjectives preceded by Verbs.—*Stand-still, live-long.* Very rare.

Adjectives preceded by Present Participles.—None.

Adjectives preceded by Past Participles of the Strong form.—None.

Adjectives preceded by Past Participles of the Weak form.—None.

Verbs preceded by Substantives.—*God-send.* Rare, and doubtful.

Verbs preceded by Adjectives.—*Little-heed, rough-hew.* Rare, and doubtful.

Verbs preceded by Verbs.—*Hear-say.* Rare.

Verbs preceded by Present Participles.—None.

Verbs preceded by Past Participles of the Strong form.—None.

Verbs preceded by Past Participles of the Weak form.—None.

Present Participles preceded by Adjectives.—*All-seeing, all-ruling, soft-flowing, fast-sailing, merry-making.*

Past Participles of the Strong form preceded by an Adjective.—*New-born, free-spoken.*

Present Participles preceded by Substantives.—*Fruit-bearing, music-making.*

Past Participles of the Strong form preceded by Substantives.—*Heaven-born, bed-ridden.*

Past Participles of the Weak form preceded by Substantives.—*Blood-stained.*

Past Participles of the Weak form preceded by an Adjective.—*Dear-bought, fresh-made, new-made, new-laid.*

Verbal Substantives preceded by Substantives.—*Man-eater, woman-eater, kid-napper, horn-blower.*—Numerous.

Verbal Substantives preceded by Adjectives.—None.

Verbal Substantives preceded by Verbs.—None.

Verbal Substantives preceded by Participles.—None.

Verbal Substantives preceded by Verbals.—None.

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Substantives.—*Mop-headed, chicken-hearted.*

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Adjectives.—*Cold-hearted, flaxen-haired, hot-headed, curly-pated.*

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Verbs.—None.

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Participles.—None.

Verbal Adjectives preceded by Verbals.—None.

Adverbs entering into composition are of two sorts:—

1st. Those that can be separated from the word with which they combine, and, nevertheless, appear as independent words; as *over, under, well, &c.* These are called Separable Adverbs.

2nd. Those that, when they are separated from the verb with which they combine, have no independent existence as separate words; *e. g.* the syllable *un-* in *unloose*. These are called Inseparable Adverbs.

Words preceded by Separable Adverbs.—*Over-do, under-go, well-beloved, &c.* Numerous.

Words preceded by Inseparable Adverbs.

Words preceded by the Inseparable Adverb be-.—*Be-hove, be-fit, be-seem, be-believe, be-lie, be-spat, be-smear, be-get, be-labour, be-do, be-gin (on-ginnan in A. S.), be-gird, be-hold, be-mourn, be-*

—*th* is a true word; *fowl* or *fugel*—*l* is no true word. If I believe these latter words to be derivations at all, I do it because I find in words like *handle*, &c., the *-l* as a derivational addition. Yet, as the fact of a word being sometimes used as a derivational addition does not preclude it from being at other times a part of the root, the evidence that the words in question are not simple, but derived, is not cogent. In other words, it is evidence of the second degree.

II. *According to the effect.*—The syllable *-en* in the word *whiten* changes the noun *white* into a verb. This is its effect. We may so classify as to arrange combinations like *-en* (whose effect is to give the idea of the verb) in one order; whilst combinations like *th* (whose effect is, as in the word *strength*, to give the idea of abstraction) form another order.

III. *According to the form.*—Sometimes the derivational element is a vowel (as the *-ie* in *doggie*); sometimes a consonant combined: sometimes a syllable (as the *-en* in *whiten*); sometimes a change of vowel without any addition (as the *i* in *tip*, compared with *top*); sometimes a change of consonant without any addition (as the *z* in *prize*, compared with *price*). Sometimes, too, it is a change of *accent*, like *a súrvey*, compared with *to survéy*. To classify derivations in this manner is to classify them according to their form

IV. *According to the historical origin of the derivational elements.*

V. *According to the number of the derivational elements.*—In *fisher*, as compared with *fish*, there is but one derivational affix. In *fishery*, as compared with *fish*, the number of derivational elements is two.

§ 170. Forms like *tip*, from *top*, *price* and *prize*, &c., are of importance in general etymology. Let it be received as a theory (as with some philologists is really the case) that fragmentary sounds like the *-en* in *whiten*, the *-th* in *strength*, &c., were once *words*; or, changing the expression, let it be considered that all derivation was once composition. Let this view be opposed. The first words that are brought to militate

against it are those like *tip* and *prise*, where, instead of any *addition*, there is only a *change*; and, consequently, no vestige of an older *word*. This argument, good as far as it goes, is rebutted in the following manner. Let the word *top* have attached to it a second word, in which second word there is a small vowel. Let this small vowel act upon the full one in *top*, changing it to *tip*. After this, let the second word be ejected. We then get the form *tip* by the law of accommodation, and not as an immediate sign of derivation. The *i* in *chick* (from *cock*) may be thus accounted for, the *-en* in *chicken* being supposed to have exerted, first, an influence of accommodation, and afterwards to have fallen off.

§ 171. *Derivation by means of the addition of a Vowel.*—The* only vowel sound that in English constitutes by itself a form of derivation is that of the *ee* in *feet*, expressed for the most part by the letter *y*. It occurs with two very distinct powers.

1. As a Diminutive; *babe, bab-y*. In Lowland Scotch it is far more common, and is spelt *-ie*; as *dogg-ie, lass-ie, ladd-ie, mous-ie, wif-ie*, = *little* (or *dear*) *dog, lass, lad, mouse, wife*. In the word *baby* its power as a diminutive is obsolete.

2. After certain words ending in *-r*; as *fish-er-y, rook-er-y, brav-er-y, fool-er-y, prud-er-y, slav-er-y, witch-er-y, nurs-er-y, stitch-er-y*, and a few others. Respecting these latter words it must be remembered—

a. That they are Double Derivatives;

b. That the *-r* is probably the same as the *-r* in *children*;

c. That the vowel sound is not of Saxon or even Gothic origin. It originates from the *-y* in words like *astronom-y, histor-y, prophec-y, necromanc-y, &c.*, all of which are words derived, not from any Gothic language, but from the Latin or Greek. The original forms of these endings was *-ia*, as *astronom-i-a, histor-i-a, &c.* Hence words like *fish-er-y, &c.*, are improperly formed.

* The *-y* in words like *might-y* originated in *-ig*; as *miht-ig*, A. S.

Derivation by means of the addition of the liquid L.—1. Substantives.—Gird-le, kern-el.

2. Adjectives.—Litt-le, mick-le.

3. Verbs.—Spark-le.

Derivation by means of the addition of the liquid R.—Substantives.—Words that in A. S. ended in -er, and were (or would have been) of the masculine gender—laugh-t-er, slaught-er.

Words that in A. S. ended in -er, and were (or would have been) of the neuter gender—*lay-er, lai-r* (A. S. læg-er), *fodd-er* (from the root of *feed*).

Substantives that in A. S. ended in -ere, and were (or would have been) of the masculine gender.—These form a numerous and important class. They are almost all the names of agents, and, if we subtract from almost any of them the ending -er, the remainder is either a verb or a word that can be used as such; e. g. a *bak-er* performs the act of *baking*, and (as such) is an agent (or one who acts or does), so that the word *bak-er* is the name of an agent. Subtract -er, and the remainder is *bake*, a word that can be used as a verb, e. g. *to bake, I bake, &c.*—*read-er, sinn-er, harp-er, full-er, begy-er* (or *beggar*), *hunt-er, lend-er, borrow-er, reap-er, mow-er, sow-er, plough-er, fish-er, deal-er, wander-er, writ-er, lead-er, steer-er, look-er, heal-er, cobbl-er, li-ar, robb-er, sail-or, teach-er, help-er, los-er, hear-er, buy-er, sell-er, shap-er, leap-er, runn-er, walk-er, jump-er, murder-er, slaughter-er, fiddl-er, giv-er, work-er, rid-er, kill-er, slay-er, slumber-er, sleep-er, keep-er, dream-er, tell-er, bak-er, brew-er, thatch-er, weaver, spinn-er, wait-er, eat-er, drink-er, din-er, rov-er, lov-er, mov-er, flatter-er, mill-er, glov-er, hatt-er.*

Substantives that in A. S. ended in -ra, and were (or would have been) masculine—*gander* (A. S. *gand-ra*).

Verbs.—Hind-er, low-er.

Derivation by means of the addition of the liquid M.—Few or none.

Derivations by means of the addition of the liquid N.—Sub-

statives.—*Maid-en, gamn-on (game), mai-n* (as in *might and main*). That the *-n* is no part of the original word in *mai-n*, we see from the word *may*. The idea in both *may* and *mai-n* is that of *power*.

Adjectives.—1. Words where the *-n* is preceded in the Old High-German and the Old Saxon by *-a = an*; e. g. *eik-an* (*own*), O. H. G.; *ég-an* (*own*), O. S.—*ow-n, op-en*.

2. Words where the *-n* is preceded in Mæso-Gothic by *-ei-*, in Old High-German by *-i-*, and in Old Saxon by *-i-*; e. g. *þáurn-ein-s* (*thorny*), M. G.; *trd-in* (*earthen*), O. H. G.; *bóm-in* (*woody, i. e. made of beams*), O. S. Words of this sort express in English the circumstance of the object to which they are applied being *made of the material of which* the radical part of the derivative is the name: thus, *gold-en* is a derivative from *gold*; *gold* is the radical part of the derivative *gold-en*; the radical word *gold* is the name of a material of which certain objects (such as *guineas, &c.*) may be made. When we say *golden guinea* we apply the word *golden* to the object *guinea*, and express the circumstance of *guineas* being made of *gold*, or (in other words) of that material of which *gold* (the radical part of the derivative word *gold-en*) is the name. *Oak-en, ash-en, beech-en, braz-en, flax-en, gold-en, lead-en, silk-en, wood-en, wooll-en, twigg-en* (obsolete), *hemp-en, wheat-en, oat-en, wax-en*.

Derivations formed by the addition of the mute letter P.—None.

Derivations formed by the addition of the mute letter B.—None.

Derivations formed by the addition of the mute letter F.—None.

Derivations formed by the addition of the mute letter V.—In the present stage of the current English language, none.

Derivations formed by the addition of the sound of the semi-vowel W.—In the present stage of the current English, none.

Derivations formed by the addition of the sound of the vowel

O, originating in *-ow* or *-ov*, and spelt in the present English *-ow*.—Although it is proper in all cases of grammar to consider the sound rather than the spelling of words, the derivatives in question are more fitly connected with **O** than **V**. By comparison with *shade* and *mead*, the forms *shad-ow* and *mead-ow* are shown to be derivative; whilst the following forms prove that the *-ow*, although now sounded as the vowel *-o* (*shadd-o*, *medd-o*), originated in *-w* or *-v*: *skad-v-j-an* = to *sha-dow*, M. G.; *scead-uw-es* = *shadow's*, A. S.; *scead-ew-an* = to *sha-dow*, A. S.

Derivation by means of the addition of the mute consonant T.—1. *Substantives.*—Words which in A. S. ended in *-t*, *gif-t*, *shrif-t*, *thef-t*, *wef-t* (*weave*), *rif-t*, *drif-t*, *thrif-t*, *fros-t* (*freeze*), *gris-t* (*grind*), *fligh-t*, *sigh-t*, *draugh-t* (*draw*), *weigh-t*.

2. Words which in A. S. ended in *-ta*. The compounds of the word *wright* (from the root *work*); such as *cart-wright-t*, *wheel-wright-t*, *mill-wright-t*, &c.

Adjective.—*Tigh-t* (*tie*).

Derivations by means of the addition of the mute consonant D.—*Substantives.*—*Bran-d* (*burn*, *brenn*, obsolete), *floo-d* (*flow*), *mai-d* (*may* in Lowland Scotch), *see-d* (*sow*), *bur-d-en* (*bear*).

Adjectives.—*Dea-d* (*die*), *col-d* (*cool*). In the word *thir-d*, from *three*, the *d* stands for *th* (as in *fif-th*, &c.), in order to avoid the occurrence of the sound of *th* twice within the same syllable.

Derivation by means of the addition of TH (A. S. þ) *as sounded in thin.*—*Substantives.*—The following words ending in *-th* are the names of abstract ideas; *dea-th*, *bir-th* (*bear*), *heal-th*, *leng-th*, *bread-th*, *heigh-th*, *dep-th*, *mir-th*, *tru-th* (*traw*, Lowland Scotch), *weal-th*, *fil-th*, *til-th* (*tillage*, or *tilled ground*), *ki-th* (as in the phrase *kith and kin*).

Adjectives.—The syllable *-cou-th* in the compound word *un-cou-th*. This word originally meant *unknown*, originating in the word *ken* = to *know*. This we see from the following forms, *kun-þ-s*, in the Mæso-Gothic, and *chun-t*, in the Old High-German, signifying *known* (*kenned*).

Derivatives by means of the addition of TH (A. S. ȝ) as sounded in thine.—*Bear-th-en*, derived from *bear*.

Derivatives by means of the addition of the sound of the mute consonant S, sounded as in sin.—*Substantives.*—In the word *goose* (*goo-se*) the *-s* is no part of the original word, in which also a *-n* and a *-d* have been lost. Compare the German word *gan-s*, and the English word *gand-er*. The *-s* in *goo-se* is derivative.

Derivatives by means of the addition of the sound of the Z in zeal and the S in flags (flagz).—*Verbs.*—*Clean-se* (*clenz*), from *clean*. In A. S. *clæn-s-i-an*.

Derivatives by means of the addition of the sound of the SH in shine.—Few or none.

Derivation by means of the addition of the sound of the Z in azure.—None.

Derivation by means of the addition of the mute letter K.—*Hill-ock*.

Derivation by means of the addition of the mute letter G.—None.

Derivations formed by the addition of the sound of the vowel E (as in feet), originating in -ig, and spelt in the present English -y.—All the derivative adjectives that now end in *-y*, ended in A. S. in *ig*; as *blood-y*, *craft-y*, *drear-y*, *might-y*, *mist-y*, *mood-y*, *merr-y*, *worth-y*, of which the A. S. forms were *blôd-ig*, *craft-ig*, *dreór-ig*, *miht-ig*, *mist-ig*, *môd-ig*, *myr-ig*, *worth-ig*. Although it is proper in all cases of grammar to consider the sound rather than the spelling of words, the derivatives in question are more fitly placed in the present section than elsewhere.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -ing.—*Farth-ing* ($\frac{1}{4}$), *rid-ing** ($\frac{1}{2}$, a corruption from *thrith-ing*). Also *clean-s-ing*, *dawn-ing*, *morn-ing*. In these words the *-ing* was originally *-ung*; as *clæn-s-ung*, *dag-ung*, A. S. It is clear that forms like *cleansing* from the A. S. *clæns-ung*, are different in origin from the participles in *-ing*, as *cleans-ing*. This double origin of words in *-ing* should be remembered.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -l-ing.—

As the *three ridings of Yorkshire*.

Gos-l-ing (little goose), *duck-l-ing* (little duck), *dar-l-ing* (little dear), *hire-l-ing*, *found-l-ing*, *fond-l-ing*, *nest-l-ing*, &c. The words of this class are generally diminutives, or words expressive of smallness. The word *diminutive* is derived from the Latin word *diminuo* = to *diminish*.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -kin.—*Lamb-kin* (little lamb), *mann-i-kin* (little man). Words ending in *-kin* are chiefly diminutives.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -rel.—*Cock-erel* (little cock), *pick-erel* (little pike). Diminutives.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -ard.—*Drunk-ard*, *stink-ard*.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -old.—*Threshold*.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -ern.—*East-ern*, *west-ern*, *north-ern*, *south-ern*.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -ish.—*Child-ish*, *Engl-ish*, *self-ish*, *whit-ish*. This class comprises several adjectives. It must not be thought that the forms in *-ish* are examples of the sound of the *sh* in *shine* being used in derivation; since the original form was *-isk*; *cild-isc* (*child-ish*), *Engl-isc* (*Engl-ish*), A. S. This softening down of the sound of *-sk* (or *-sc*) into that of the *sh* in *shine* occurs in many languages.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -ness.—*Good-ness*, *bad-ness*, *wicked-ness*, *bright-ness*, *dark-ness*, *weariness*, *dreari-ness*, &c. These form a numerous and important class. The fact to be here noticed is, that the *-n* is, most probably, no part of the original form. This was simply *-ass*—or *-uss*—as in words like *fil-ussi* (*a crowd*) in the Mæso-Gothic; and hence the proper way of showing the structure of the words in question is to write them as follows:—*good-n-ess*, *bad-n-ess*, *dark-n-ess*, &c. The origin of the *-n* has not been satisfactorily determined.

Derivation by means of the addition of the syllable -ster.—*Song-ster*, *pun-ster*. Originally words in *-str-* were limited to

the names of females, and were opposed to the substantives in *-er*, the names of male agents. Thus, in A. S.—

Sångere, a male singer	} were opposed to	Sængestre, a female singer.
Bæcere, a male baker		Bæcestre, a female baker.
Fidelere, a male fiddler		Fidelestre, a female fiddler.
Webbere, a male weaver		Webbestre, a female weaver.
Rædere, a male reader		Rædestre, a female reader.
Seamere, a male seamer		Seamestre, a female seamer (or seamstress).

The single word *spin-ster*, still retains its feminine force.

Derivation by means of changing the sound of a consonant.—

*Price, prize; cloth, clothe; * use, use (pronounced uze); grass, graze; grease (pronounced greace), grease (pronounced greaze).* In each of the pairs of words given above, the former is a substantive, and the latter a verb.

The verb is formed from the substantive by changing the sharp mute into its corresponding flat one.

Derivation by means of changing the sound of a vowel.—*Rise, raise; lie, lay; fall, fell; sit, set.* The generality of these words are verbs. There are, however, a few nouns, as *top, tip; cat, kit.*

Derivation by means of transposing the accent.—Thus: *I take a súrvey; but I survéy.* This takes place only with words not of Anglo-Saxon origin.

Certain words have the appearance of being derived when they are really compound. This takes place when they alter in form, and no longer look like original independent words. The adjectives and adverbs ending in *-ly* are of this kind; such as *man-ly, bright-ly.* In the present language the syllable *-ly* has not, by itself, any meaning at all, and, consequently, is no separate independent word. Originally, however, it *was* a separate and independent word; in A. S. *-lic*, in O. H. G. *-lih*, in M. S. *-leik*. In other words, it was neither more nor less than the word *like*.

* Pronounced *clodhe*.

The same is the case with words ending in *-ric* (as *bishop-ric*), with words ending in *-ship* (as *friend-ship*), with words ending in *-hood* (as *man-hood*), and with words ending or beginning with *miss-* (as *a-miss*, *mis-take*), and with several others. In some older stages of language the words *-ric*, *-ship*, *-hood*, *miss-* (or *-miss*), were separate independent words with separate independent meanings. The precise meaning, however, is not always easily ascertained.

Certain words have the appearance of being compounds when they are really derived. This is the case with words like *up-most* (see chapter on Superlatives), where combinations like those of the sound of *-m* and *-ost*, take the appearance of separate independent words.

§ 172. *Current and obsolete processes.*—The present is a proper time for exhibiting the difference between the current and the obsolete processes of a language.

By adding the sound of the *s* in *seal* to the word *father*, we change it into *father-s*. Hence the addition of the sound in question is the process by which the word *father* is changed into *fathers*. Such is the nature of a process in language. The process by which *ox* is changed into *ox-en* is the addition of the sound of the syllable *-en*. The words *father* and *ox* are said to be affected by a certain process; and, as they are affected, the language, of which they form a part, is affected also.

In all languages there are two sorts of processes, those that are in operation at a certain period, and those that have ceased to operate.

In illustration of this, let us suppose that, from the Latin, Greek, French, or some other language, a new word was introduced into the English; and that this word was a substantive of the singular number. Suppose the word was *tek*, and that it meant a sort of *dwelling-house*. In the course of time it would be necessary to use this word in the plural; and the question would arise as to the manner in which that number should be formed.

Now there are three simple forms of the plural in English,

and consequently three processes by which a singular may be converted into a plural :

1. The addition of *-s*, *-z*, or *-es* (*es*).
2. The change of vowel.
3. The addition of *-n*.

Notwithstanding this, it is very certain that the plural of a new word would *not* be formed in *-en* (like *oxen*), nor yet by a change of vowel (like *feet*) ; but by addition of the sound of *s*, *z*, or *es* (like *stack-z*, *dog-z*, *loss-es*, spelt *stack-s*, *dog-s*, *loss-es*).

This shows that the process by which *ox* is changed into *ox-en*, *foot* into *feet*, and *child* into *children*, is no longer in operation ; in other words, that it is *obsolete* ; whilst the process that changes *father* into *father-s* is still in operation ; in other words, *current*.

With each and all of the forms in grammar, as they successively present themselves, we should ask whether they were brought about by a current process, or by an obsolete one.

CHAPTER IV.

DIMINUTIVES AND AUGMENTATIVES.

§ 173. COMPARED with the words *lamb*, *man*, and *hill*, the words *lambkin*, *mannikin*, and *hillock* convey the idea of comparative smallness or diminution. Now, as the word *hillock* = *a little hill* differs in form from *hill*, we have in English a series of diminutive forms, or diminutives.

The English diminutives may be arranged according to a variety of principles. Amongst others :—

1. *According to the form*.—The word *hillock* is derived from *hill*, by the addition of a syllable. The word *tip* is derived from *top*, by the change of a vowel.

2. *According to their meaning.*—In the word *hillock* there is the simple expression of comparative smallness in size. In the word *doggie* for *dog*, *lassie* for *lass*, the addition of the *-ie* makes the word not so much a diminutive as a term of tenderness or endearment. The idea of smallness, accompanied, perhaps, with that of neatness, generally carries with it the idea of approbation. The word *clean* in English, means, in German, *little = kleine*. The feeling of protection which is extended to small objects engenders the notion of endearment.* In Middle High-German we have *vaterlîn = little father*, *mütterlîn = little mother*. In Middle High-German there is the diminutive *sunnelîn*; and the French *soleil* is from the Latin form *sollus*.

The Greek word *μείωσις (meiōsis)* means diminution; the Greek word *ὑποκόρισμα* means an endearing expression. Hence we get names for the two kinds of diminutives; viz. the term *meiotic* for the true diminutives, and the term *hypocoristic* for the diminutives of endearment.

3. *According to their historical origin.*—The syllable *-ock*, as in *hillock*, is of Anglo-Saxon and Gothic origin. The *-et*, as in *lancet*, is of French and classical origin.

4. *According as they affect proper names or common names.*—*Hawkin, Perkin, Wilkin, &c.* In these words we have the diminutives of *Hal, Peter, Will, &c.*

The diminutive forms of Gothic origin are the first to be considered.

1. *Those formed by a change of vowel.*—*Tip*, from *top*. The relation of the feminine to the masculine is allied to the ideas conveyed by many diminutives. Hence in the word *kit*, from *cat*, it is doubtful whether there be meant a female cat or a little cat. *Kid* is a diminutive form of *goat*.

2. *Those formed by the addition of a letter or letters.*—Of the diminutive characteristics thus formed the commonest, beginning from the simpler forms, are—

* As *klein* is to *clean* in German and English, so is *petitus* (*sought, desired*) to *petit* (*small*) in Latin and French.

Ie.—Almost peculiar to the Lowland Scotch; as *daddie*, *lassie*, *minnie*, *wifie*, *mousie*, *doggie*, *boatie*, &c.

Ock.—*Bullock*, *hillock*.

Kin.—*Lambkin*, *mannikin*, *ladikin*, &c. As is seen above, common in proper names.

En.—*Chicken*, *kitten*, from *cock*, *cat*. The notion of diminution, if indeed that be the notion originally conveyed, lies not in the *-en*, but in the vowel. In the word *chicken*, from *cock*, observe the effect of the small vowel on the *c*.

The consideration of words like *duckling* and *gosling* is purposely deferred.

The chief diminutive of classical origin is—

Et, as in *trumpet*, *lancet*, *pocket*; the word *pock*, as in *meal-pock* = a meal bag, being found in the Scottish. From the French *-ette*, as in *caissette*, *poulette*.

The forms *-rel*, as in *cockerel*, *pickerel*, and *-let*, as in *streamlet*, require a separate consideration. The first has nothing to do with the Italian forms *acquerella* and *coserella*—themselves, perhaps, of Gothic, rather than of classical origin.

In the Old High-German there are a multitude of diminutive forms in *-l*; as *ouga* = an eye, *ougili* = a little eye, *lied* = a song, *liedel* = a little song. “In Austria and Bavaria are the forms *mannel*, *weibel*, *hundel*, &c., or *mannl*, *weibl*, *hundl*, &c. In some districts there is an *r* before the *l*, as *madarl* = a little maid, *muadarl* = a little mother, *briadarl* = a little brother, &c. This is occasioned by the false analogy of the diminutives of the derived form in *r*.”—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. p. 674. This indicates the nature of words like *cockerel*.

Even in English the diminutive power of *-el* can be traced in the following words:—

Soare = a deer in its third year. *Sor-rel* = a deer in its second year.—See *Love's Labour's Lost*, with the note.

Tiercel = a small sort of hawk, one-third less (*tierce*) than the common kind.

Kantle = small corner, from *cant* = corner.—*Henry IV.*

Hurdle; in Dutch, *horde*; German, *hurde*. *Hording*, without the *-l*, is used in an allied sense by builders in English.

In two of the words in point we must assume an earlier form, *cocker* and *piker*, to which the diminutive form *-el* is affixed. If this be true, we have, in English, representatives of the diminutive form *-l*, so common in the High-Germanic dialects. *Wolfer* = a wolf, *hunker* = a haunch, *fitcher* = a fitch, *teamer* = a team, *fresher* = a frog,—these are north country forms of the present English.*

The termination *-let*, as in *streamlet*, seems to be double, and to consist of the Gothic diminutive *-l*, and the French diminutive *-t*.

§ 174. *Augmentatives*.—Compared with *capello* = a hat, the Italian word *capellone* = a great hat is an augmentative. The augmentative forms, pre-eminently common in the Italian language, often carry with them a depreciating sense.

The termination *-rd* (in Old High-German *-hart*), as in *drunkard*, *braggart*, *laggard*, *stinkard*, carries with it this idea of depreciation. In *buzzard*, and *reynard*, the name of the fox, it is simply augmentative. In *wizard*, from *witch*, it has the power of a masculine form.

The termination *-rd*, taken from the Gothic, appears in the modern languages of classical origin: French, *vieillard*; Spanish, *codardo*. From these we get at, second-hand, the word *coward*.

The word *sweetheart* is a derived word of this sort, rather than a compound word; since in Old High-German and Middle High-German, we have the corresponding form *liebhart*. Now the form for *heart* is in German not *hart*, but *herz*.

Words like *braggadocio*, *trombone*, *balloon*, being words of foreign origin, prove nothing as to the further existence of augmentative forms in English.

* Guest, ii. 192.

CHAPTER V.

PATRONYMICS.

§ 175. IN the Greek language the notion of lineal descent, in other words, the relation of the son to the father, is expressed by a particular termination; as, Πηλεὺς (*Peleus*), Πηλείδης (*Peleidæ*), the son of Peleus. It is very evident that this mode of expression is very different from either the English form *Johnson*, or Gaelic *MacDonald*. In these last-named words, the words *son* and *Mac* mean the same thing; so that *Johnson* and *MacDonald* are not derived, but compound words. This Greek way of expressing descent is peculiar, and the words wherein it occurs are classed together by the peculiar name *patronymic*, from *pater* = *father*, and *onoma* = *a name*. Is there anything in English corresponding to the Greek patronymics? It was for the sake of this question that the consideration of the termination *-ling*, as in *duckling*, &c., was deferred.

The termination *-ling*, like the terminations *-rel* and *-let*, is compound. Its simpler form is *-ing*. This, from being affixed to the derived forms in *-l*, has become *-ling*.

In Anglo-Saxon the termination *-ing* is as truly patronymic as *-ιδης* is in Greek. In the Bible-translation the son of Elisha is called *Elising*. In the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle occur such genealogies as the following:—*Ida was Eopping, Eoppa Eising, Eisa Inging, Inga Angenviting, Angenvit Alocing, Aloc Beonocing, Beonoc Branding, Brand Bældæging, Bældæg, Vódening, Vóden Friðowulfing, Friðowulf Finning, Finn Godwulfing, Godwulf Geating* = *Ida was the son of Eoppa, Eoppa of Eising, Eising of Inga, Inga of Angenvit, Angenvit of Aloc, Aloc of Beonoc, Beonoc of Brand, Brand of Bældæg, Bældæg of Woden, Woden of Friðowulf, Friðowulf of Finn, Finn of*

Godwulf, Godwulf of Geat.—In Greek, "Ἴδα ἢν Ἑσπερίδης, Ἑσπερα Ἑσπείδης, Ἡσα Ἰγγείδης, Ἰγγα Ἀγγενφειδης, &c. In the plural number these forms denote the race of; as *Scyldingas* = the *Scyldings*, or the race of *Scyld*, &c. Edgar Atheling means Edgar of the race of the nobles. The primary of *-ing* and *-ling* is descent or relationship; from these comes the idea of youth and endearment, and thence the true diminutive idea. In *darling*, *stripling*, *duckling*, *gosling* (pr. *gesling*), *kitling* (pr. *kitten*), *nestling*, *yearling*, *chickling*, *fatling*, *fledgling*, *firstling*, the idea of descent still remains. In *hireling* the idea of diminution is accompanied with the idea of contempt. In *changeling* we have a Gothic termination and a classical root.

CHAPTER VI.

GENTILE FORMS.

§ 176. THE only word in the present English that requires explanation is the name of the principality *Wales*.

1. The form is plural, however much the meaning may be singular; so that the *-s* in *Wale-s* is the *-s* in *fathers*, &c.

2. It has grown out of the Anglo-Saxon from *wealhas* = *foreigners*, the name by which the Welsh are spoken of by the Germans of England, just as the Italians are called Welsh by the Germans of Germany. *Wal-nuts* = *foreign nuts*.

3. The transfer of the name of the *people* inhabiting a certain country to the *country* so inhabited, was one of the commonest processes in both Anglo-Saxon and Old English.

CHAPTER VII.

ON GENDER.

§ 177. THE nature of gender is best exhibited by reference to those languages wherein the distinction of gender is most conspicuous. Such a language, amongst others, is the Latin.

How far is there such a thing as gender in the English language? This depends upon the meaning that we attach to the word.

In the Latin language, where there are confessedly genders, we have the words *taurus*, meaning a *bull*, and *vacca*, meaning a *cow*. Here the natural distinction of sex is expressed by *wholly* different words. With this we have corresponding modes of expression in English: *e. g.*—

<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>		<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>
Bachelor	Spinster.		Horse	Mare.
Boar	Sow.		Ram	Ewe.
Boy	Girl.		Son	Daughter.
Brother	Sister.		Uncle	Aunt.
Buck	Doe.		Father	Mother, &c.

The mode, however, of expressing different sexes by *wholly* different words is not a matter of gender. The words *boy* and *girl* bear no *etymological* relation to each other; neither being derived from the other, nor in way connected with it.

Neither are words like *cock-sparrow*, *man-servant*, *he-goat*, &c., as compared with *hen-sparrow*, *maid-servant*, *she-goat*, &c., specimens of gender. Here a difference of sex is indicated by the addition of a fresh term, from which is formed a compound word.

In the Latin words *genitrix* = a *mother*, and *genitor* = a *father*, we have a nearer approach to gender. Here the difference of sex is expressed by a difference of termination;

the words *genitor* and *genitrix* being in a true etymological relation, *i. e.* either derived from each other, or from some common source. With this we have, in English, corresponding modes of expression: *e. g.*—

<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>	<i>Male.</i>	<i>Female.</i>
Actor	Actress.	Lion	Lioness.
Arbiter	Arbitress.	Peer	Peeress.
Baron	Baroness.	Poet	Poetess.
Benefactor	Benefactress.	Sorcerer	Sorceress.
Count	Countess.	Songster	Songstress.
Duke	Duchess.	Tiger	Tigress.

This, however, in strict grammatical language, is an approach to gender rather than gender itself. Its difference from true grammatical gender is as follows:—

Let the Latin words *genitor* and *genitrix* be declined:—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Genitor	Genitrix.
	<i>Gen.</i>	Genitor- <i>is</i>	Genitric- <i>is</i> .
	<i>Dat.</i>	Genitor- <i>i</i>	Genitric- <i>i</i> .
	<i>Acc.</i>	Genitor- <i>em</i>	Genitric- <i>em</i> .
	<i>Voc.</i>	Genitor	Genitrix.
<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Genitor- <i>es</i>	Genitric- <i>es</i> .
	<i>Gen.</i>	Genitor- <i>um</i>	Genitric- <i>um</i> .
	<i>Dat.</i>	Genitor- <i>ibus</i>	Genitric- <i>ibus</i> .
	<i>Acc.</i>	Genitor- <i>es</i>	Genitric- <i>es</i> .
	<i>Voc.</i>	Genitor- <i>es</i>	Genitric- <i>es</i> .

The syllables in italics are the signs of the cases and numbers. Now these signs are the same in each word, the difference of meaning (or sex) not affecting them.

Contrast, however, with the words *genitor* and *genitrix* the words *domina* = *a mistress*, and *dominus* = *a master*.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Nom.</i>	Domin- <i>a</i>	Domin- <i>us</i> .
	<i>Gen.</i>	Domin- <i>æ</i>	Domin- <i>i</i> .
	<i>Dat.</i>	Domin- <i>æ</i>	Domin- <i>o</i> .
	<i>Acc.</i>	Domin- <i>am</i>	Domin- <i>um</i> .
	<i>Voc.</i>	Domin- <i>a</i>	Domin- <i>s</i> .

<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Nom.</i> Domin-æ	Domin-i.
	<i>Gen.</i> Domin-arum	Domin-orum.
	<i>Dat.</i> Domin-abus	Domin-is.
	<i>Acc.</i> Domin-as	Domin-os.
	<i>Voc.</i> Domin-æ	Domin-i.

Here the letters in italics, or the signs of the cases and numbers, are different, the difference being brought about by the difference of gender. Now it is very evident that, if *genitrix* be a specimen of gender, *domina* is something more.

As terms, to be useful, must be limited, it may be laid down as a sort of definition, that *there is no gender where there is no affection of the declension*: consequently, that, although we have, in English, words corresponding to *genitrix* and *genitor*, we have no true genders until we find words corresponding to *dominus* and *domina*.

Again, let us add to some substantive some such word as *good, bad, brave, &c., &c.*; in other words, some adjective; and say *a good father, a good mother, a brave boy, a brave girl, a fierce lion, a fierce lioness, a good actor, a good actress*. Having done this, we remark that the words *good, bad, brave, &c., &c.*, whether joined to words like *actor* and *lion* (the names of male objects), or to words like *actress* or *lioness* (the names of female objects), are precisely the same. We use the words *good* and *bold* in speaking of males, and we use the same words in speaking of females. Now, although this is the case in English, it is not the case with all languages. In many languages the word *bold*, or *good*, would take one form when it was used to denote males, and another to denote females. In the Latin language *vir* means *man* (the name of a male object), *mulier* means *woman* (the name of a female object), and *bon* means *good*. Now, if the Latin language were like the English, they would say *bon vir = good man; bon mulier = good woman*. But, as the Latin is unlike the English, they do not say so. The Latin phrase is *bon-us vir = good man, bon-a mulier = good woman*; that is, the letter *-a* is added if the substantive be the name of a female, and the letters *-us* are added if it be

the name of a male. Again, if the English language were the same in this respect as the Latin, we should say, *good-us man* = *good man* (*bonus vir*), *good-a woman* (*bona mulier*).

§ 178. The second element in the notion of gender, although I will not venture to call it an essential one, is the following:—In the words *domina* and *dominus*, *mistress* and *master*, there is a *natural* distinction of sex; the one being masculine, or male, the other feminine, or female. In the words *sword* and *lance* there is *no natural* distinction of sex. Notwithstanding this, the word *hasta*, in Latin, is as much a feminine gender as *domina*, whilst *gladius* = *a sword*, is, like *dominus*, a masculine noun. From this we see that, in languages wherein there are true genders, a fictitious or conventional sex is attributed even to inanimate objects. Sex is a natural distinction, gender a grammatical one.

§ 179. “Although we have, in English, words corresponding to *genitrix* and *genitor*, we have no true genders until we find words corresponding to *dominus* and *domina*.”—The sentence was intentionally worded with caution. Words like *dominus* and *domina*, that is, words where the declension is affected by the sex, are to be found.

The pronoun *him*, from the Anglo-Saxon and English *he*, as compared with the pronoun *her*, from the Anglo-Saxon *hæð*, is affected in its declension by the difference of sex, and is a true, though fragmentary, specimen of gender: for be it observed, that as both words are in the same case and number, the difference in form must be referred to a difference of sex expressed by gender. The same is the case with the form *his* as compared with *her*.

The pronoun *it* (originally *hit*), as compared with *he*, is a specimen of gender. It is the *neuter* gender of which *t* is the sign—*He*, *hi-t*, *i-t*.

The relative *what*, as compared with the masculine *who*, is a specimen of gender. It is the *neuter* gender of which *t* is the sign—*Who*, *wha-t*.

Who and *what*, *it* (for *hit*) and *he*, are as much genders as *hic*

and *hæc*, and the forms *hic* and *hæc* are as much genders as *dominus* and *domina*.

The formation of the neuter gender by the addition of *-t*, in words like *wha-t*, *i-t*, and *tha-t*, occurs in other Indo-European languages. The *-t* in *tha-t* is the *-d* in *istu-d*, Latin, and the *-t* in *ta-t*, Sanskrit.

Which, as seen below, is *not* the neuter of *who*.

§ 180. Just as there are, in English, fragments of a gender modifying the declension, so are there, also, fragments of the second element of gender; viz. the attribution of sex to objects naturally destitute of it. *The sun in his glory, the moon in her wane*, are examples of this. A sailor calls his ship *she*. A husbandman, according to Mr. Cobbett, does the same with his *plough* and working implements:—"In speaking of a *ship* we say *she* and *her*. And you know that our country-folks in Hampshire call almost everything *he* or *she*. It is curious to observe that country labourers give the feminine appellation to those things only which are more closely identified with themselves, and by the qualities or conditions of which their own efforts, and their character as workmen, are affected. The mower calls his *scythe* a *she*, the ploughman calls his *plough* a *she*: but a prong, or a shovel, or a harrow, which passes promiscuously from hand to hand, and which is appropriated to no particular labourer, is called a *he*."—*English Grammar*, Letter V.

Now, although Mr. Cobbett's statements may account for a sailor calling his ship *she*, they will not account for the custom of giving to the sun a masculine, and to the moon a feminine, pronoun, as is done in the expressions quoted at the head of this section; still less will it account for the circumstance of the Germans reversing the gender, and making the *sun* feminine, and the *moon* masculine.

The explanation here is different.

Let there be a period in the history of a nation wherein the sun and moon are dealt with, not as inanimate masses of matter, but as animated divinities. Let there, in other words,

be a period in the history of a nation wherein dead things are personified, and wherein there is a mythology. Let an object like the *sun* be deemed a male, and an object like the *moon* a female, deity.

The Germans say the *sun* in her *glory*; the *moon* in his *wane*. This difference between the usage of the two languages, like so many others, is explained by the influence of the classical languages upon the English.—“*Mundilfori had two children; a son, Máni (Moon), and a daughter, Sól (Sun).*”—Such is an extract taken out of an Icelandic mythological work, viz. the prose Edda. In the classical languages, however, *Phæbus* and *Sol* are masculine, and *Luna* and *Diana* feminine. Hence it is that, although in Anglo-Saxon and Old Saxon the *sun* is *feminine*, it is in English masculine.

§ 181. *Philosophy, charity, &c.*, or the names of abstract qualities personified, take a conventional sex, and are feminine from their being feminine in Latin.

As in these words there is no change of form, the consideration of them is a point of rhetoric, rather than of etymology.

§ 182. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to miscellaneous remarks upon the true and apparent genders of the English language.

With the false genders, like *baron, baroness*, it is a general rule that the feminine form is derived from the masculine, and not the masculine from the feminine; as *peer, peeress*. The words *widower, gander, and drake* are exceptions.

The termination *-ess*, in which so large a portion of our feminine substantives terminate, is not of Saxon but of classical origin, being derived from the termination *-ix, genitrix*.

The words *shepherdess, huntress, and hostess* are faulty; the radical part of the word being German, and the secondary part classical: indeed, in strict English grammar, the termination *-ess* has no place at all. It is a classical, not a German, element.

The termination *-inn*, so current in German, as the equivalent to *-ess*, and as a feminine affix (*freund* = a friend; *freundinn* = a female friend), is found only in a very few words in English. One of these is *vixen*, a true feminine derivative from *fox*—German *füchsinn*.

Words like *margravine* and *landgravine* prove nothing, being scarcely naturalised.

The termination *-str*, as in *webster*, *songster*, and *baxter*, was originally a feminine affix. Thus, in Anglo-Saxon,—

Sangere, a male singer	} were opposed to {	Sangëstre, a female singer.
Bäcere, a male baker		Bacestre, a female baker.
Fiðelere, a male fiddler		Fiðelstre, a female fiddler.
Vebbere, a male weaver		Vëbbëstre, a female weaver.
Bædere, a male reader		Rædestre, a female reader.
Seamere, a male seamer		Seamestre, a female seamer.

The same is the case in the present Dutch of Holland: *e. g.* *spookster* = a female fortune-teller; *bakster* = a baking-woman; *waschster* = a washerwoman. The word *spinster* still retains its original feminine force.

The words *songstress* and *seamstress*, besides being, as far as concerns the intermixture of languages, in the predicament of *shepherdess*, have, moreover, a double feminine termination; 1st. *-str*, of Germanic, 2nd. *-ess*, of classical, origin.

In the word *heroine* we have a Greek termination, just as *-ix* is a Latin, and *-inn* a German, one. It must not, however, be considered as derived from *hero*, by any process of the English language, but be dealt with as a separate importation from the Greek language.

The form *deaconess* is not wholly unexceptionable; since the termination *-ess* is of Latin, the root *deacon* of Greek, origin: this Greek origin being rendered all the more conspicuous by the spelling, *deacon* (from *diaconos*), as compared with the Latin *decanus*.

The circumstance of *prince* ending in the sound of *s*, works a change in the accent of the word. As *s* is the final letter, it

is necessary, in forming the plural number, and the genitive case, to add, not the simple letter *s*, as in *peers*, *priests*, &c., but the syllable *-es*. This makes the plural number and genitive case the same as the feminine form. Hence the feminine form is accented *princéss*, while *peéress*, *priestess*, &c., carry the accent on the first syllable. *Princéss* is remarkable as being the only word in English where the accent lies on the subordinate syllable.

Goose, gander.—One peculiarity in this pair of words has already been indicated. In the older forms of the word *goose*, such as $\chi\eta\nu$, Greek; *anser*, Latin; *gans*, German, as well as in the derived form *gander*, we have the proofs that, originally, there belonged to the word the sound of the letter *n*. In the forms $\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\varsigma$, $\acute{\omicron}\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Greek; *dens*, *dentis*, Latin; *zahn*, German; *tooth*, English, we find the analogy that accounts for the ejection of the *n*, and the lengthening of the vowel preceding. With respect, however, to the *d* in *gander*, it is not easy to say whether it is inserted in one word or omitted in the other. Neither can we give the precise power of the *-er*. The following forms (taken from Grimm, iii. p. 341) occur in the different Gothic dialects. *Gans*, fem.; *ganazzo*, masc., Old High-German—*gós*, f.; *gandra*, m., Anglo-Saxon—*gás*, Icelandic, f.; *gaas*, Danish, f.; *gassi*, Icelandic, m.; *gasse*, Danish, m.—*ganser*, *ganserer*, *gansart*, *gänserich*, *gander*, masculine forms in different New German dialects.

Observe, the form *gänserich* has a masculine termination. The word *täuberich*, in provincial New German, has the same form and the same power. It denotes a *male dove*; *taube*, in German, signifying a *dove*. In *gänserich* and *täuberich*, we find preserved the termination *-rich* (or *-rik*), with a masculine power. Of this termination we have a remnant, in English, preserved in the curious word *drake*. To *duck* the word *drake* has no etymological relation whatsoever. It is derived from a word with which it has but one letter in common; viz. the Latin *anas* = a *duck*. Of this the root is *anat-*, as seen in the genitive case *anatis*. In Old High-German we find the form

anetrëkho = a drake; in provincial New High German there is *enterich* and *üntrecht*, from whence come the English and Low-German form *drake*.

Peacock, peahen, bridegroom.—In these compounds, it is not the words *pea* and *bride* that are rendered masculine or feminine by the addition of *cock, hen, and groom*; but it is the words *cock, hen, and groom* that are modified by prefixing *pea* and *bride*. For an appreciation of this distinction, see the chapter on Composition.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE NUMBERS.

§ 183. IN the Greek language the word *patær* signifies a father, speaking of *one*, whilst *patere* signifies *two fathers*, speaking of a pair, and thirdly, *pateres* signifies *fathers*, speaking of any number beyond two. The three words, *patær, patere, and pateres*, are said to be in different numbers, the difference of meaning being expressed by a difference of form. These numbers have names. The number that speaks of *one* is the *singular*, the number that speaks of *two* is the *dual* (from the Latin word *duo* = *two*), and the number that speaks of *more than two* is the *plural*.

All languages have numbers, but all languages have not them to the same extent. The Hebrew has a dual, but it is restricted to nouns only (in Greek being extended to verbs). It has, moreover, this peculiarity; it applies, for the most part, only to things which are naturally double, as *the two eyes, the two hands, &c.* The Latin has no dual number at all, except the natural dual in the words *ambo* and *duo*.

The question presents itself,—to what extent have we num-

bers in English? Like the Greek, Hebrew, and Latin, we have a singular and a plural. Like the Latin, and unlike the Greek and Hebrew, we have no dual.

Different from the question, to what degree have we numbers? is the question,—over what extent of our language have we numbers? This distinction has already been foreshadowed or indicated. The Greeks, who said *τυττό* = *I beat*, *τυττον* = *ye two beat*, *τυττομεν* = *we beat*, had a dual number for their verbs as well as their nouns; while the Hebrew dual was limited to the nouns only. In the Greek, then, the dual number is spread over a greater extent of the language than in the Hebrew.

There is no dual in the present English. It has been seen, however, that in the Anglo-Saxon there *was* a dual. But the Anglo-Saxon dual, being restricted to the personal pronouns (*wit* = *we two*; *git* = *ye two*), was not co-extensive with the Greek dual.

There is no dual in the present German. In the ancient German there was one.

In the present Danish and Swedish there is no dual. In the Old Norse and in the present Icelandic a dual number is to be found.

From this we learn that the dual number is one of those inflections that languages drop as they become modern.

The numbers, then, in the present English are two, the singular and the plural. Over what extent of language have we a plural? The Latins say, *bonus pater* = *a good father*; *boni patres* = *good fathers*. In the Latin, the adjective *bonus* changes its form with the change of number of the substantive that it accompanies. In English it is only the substantive that is changed. Hence we see that in the Latin language the numbers were extended to adjectives, whereas in English they are confined to the substantives and pronouns. Compared with the Anglo-Saxon, the present English is in the same relation as it is with the Latin. In the Anglo-Saxon there were plural forms for the adjectives.

§ 184. The current rule is, that the plural number is formed from the singular by adding *s*, as *father*, *fathers*. However, if the reader will revert to the remarks upon the sharp and flat Mutes, where it is stated that mutes of different degrees of sharpness and flatness cannot come together in the same syllable, he will find occasion to take to the current rule a verbal exception. The letter added to the word *father*, making it *fathers*, is *s* to the eye only. To the ear it is *z*. The word sounds *fatherz*. If the *s* retained its sound, the spelling would be *fatherce*. In *stags*, *lads*, &c., the sound is *stagz*, *ladz*. The rule, then, for the formation of the English plurals, rigorously expressed, is as follows:—*The plural is formed from the singular, by adding to words ending in a vowel a liquid or flat mute, the flat lene sibilant (z); and to words ending in a sharp mute, the sharp lene sibilant (s): e. g. (the sound of the word being expressed), pea, peaz; tree, treez; day, dayz; hill, hillz; hen, henz; gig, gigz; trap, traps; pit, pits; stack, stacks.* Upon the formation of the English plural some further remarks are necessary.

1. In the case of words ending in *b*, *v*, *d*, the *th* in *thine* = ð , or *g*, a change either of the final flat consonant, or of the sharp *s* affixed, is not a matter of choice, but of necessity; the combinations *abs*, *avs*, *ads*, $a\text{ð}s$, *ags*, being unpronounceable.

2. Whether the first of the two mutes should be accommodated to the second (*aps*, *afs*, *ats*, *aps*, *asks*), or the second to the first (*abz*, *avz*, $a\text{ð}z$, *agz*), is determined by the habit of the particular language in question; and, with a few apparent exceptions (mark the word *apparent*), it is the rule of the English language to accommodate the second sound to the first, and not *vice versâ*.

3. Such combinations as *peas*, *trees*, *hills*, *hens*, &c. (the *s* preserving its original power, and being sounded as if written *peace*, *treece*, *hillce*, *hence*), being pronounceable, the change from *s* to *z*, in words so ending, is *not* a matter determined by

the necessity of the case, but by the habit of the English language.

4. Although the vast majority of our plurals ends, not in *s*, but in *z*, the original addition was not *z*, but *s*. This we infer from three facts: 1. From the spelling; 2. from the fact of the sound of *z* being either rare or non-existent in Anglo-Saxon; 3. from the sufficiency of the causes to bring about the change.

§ 185. It may now be seen that some slight variations in the form of our plurals are either mere points of orthography, or else capable of being explained on very simple euphonic principles.

Boxes, churches, judges, lashes, kisses, blazes, princes.—Here there is the addition, not of the mere letter *s*, but of the syllable *-es*. As *s* cannot be immediately added to *s*, the intervention of a vowel becomes necessary; and that all the words whose plural is formed in *-es* really end either in the sound of *s*, or in the allied sounds of *z*, *sh*, or *zh*, may be seen by analysis; since *x* = *ks*, *ch* = *tsh*, and *j* or *ge* = *dzh*, whilst *ce*, in *prince*, is a mere point of orthography for *s*.

Monarchs, heresiarchs.—Here the *ch* equals not *tsh*, but *k*, so that there is no need of being told that the words do not follow the analogy of *church*, &c.

Cargoes, echoes.—From *cargo* and *echo*, with the addition of *e*, an orthographical expedient for the sake of denoting the length of the vowel *o*.

Beauty, beauties; key, keys.—Like the word *cargoes*, &c., these forms are points, not of etymology, but of orthography.

§ 186. *Plural of certain words in f.*—The following words end in the sharp mute *f*—*loaf, half, wife, life, calf, leaf*. Now, according to § 184, their plurals should be formed by the addition of the sound of *s* in *seal*, and so be *loafs, halves, wives, lifes, calfs, leafs* (pronounced *loafce, halfce, wifce, lifce, calfce, leafce*). This, however, is not the case. Their plurals are formed by the addition of the sound of *z* in *zeal*, and are

loaves, halves, wives, lives, calves, leaves (pronounced *loavz, halvz, wivz, livz, calvz, leavz*); the sound of the *f* being changed into that of *v*. Respecting these words we must observe—

1. That the vowel before *f* is *long*. Words like *muff*, where the vowel is short, form their plurals by means of the sound of the *s* in *seal*; as *muff, muff-s* (pronounced *muffce*).

2. That they are all of Anglo-Saxon origin. In the words *mischiefs, chiefs, handkerchiefs, griefs, reliefs*, the plural is formed as in *muff*, that is, by the addition of the sound of *s*—*mischiefs, chiefs, &c.*

Putting these two facts together, we can use more general language, and say that—

When a word ends in the sound of *f*, preceded by a long vowel, and is of Anglo-Saxon origin, the plural is formed by the addition of the sound of the *z* in *zeal*.

To this rule there are two exceptions.

1. *Dwarf*; a word of Anglo-Saxon origin, but which forms its plural by means of the sound of *s*—*dwarfs* (pronounced *dwarfce*).

2. *Beef*; a word *not* of Anglo-Saxon origin, but which forms its plural by means of the sound of *z*—*beeves* (pronounced *beevz*).

If we ask the reason of this peculiarity in the formation of the plurals of these words in *-f*, we shall find reason to believe that it lies with the singular rather than the plural forms. In Anglo-Saxon, *f* at the end of a word was sounded as *v*; and it is highly probable that the original *singulars* were sounded *loav, halv, wive, calv, leav*.

Can this be explained? Perhaps it can. In the Swedish language the letter *f* has the sound of *v*; so that *staf* is sounded *stav*.

Again, in the allied languages the words in question end in the *flat* (not the *sharp*) mute,—*weib, laub, calb, halb, stab, &c.* = *wife, leaf, calf, half, staff*.

Hence, the *plural* is probably normal ; it being the *singular* form on which the irregularity lies.

§ 187. *Pence*.—The peculiarity of this word consists in having a *flat* liquid followed by the sharp sibilant *s* (spelt *ce*), contrary to the rule given above. In the first place, it is a contracted form from *pennies* ; in the second place, its sense is collective rather than plural ; in the third place, the use of the sharp sibilant lene distinguishes it from *pens*, sounded *penz*. That its sense is collective rather than plural (a distinction to which the reader's attention is directed), we learn from the word *sixpence*, which, compared with *sixpences*, is no plural, but a singular form.

Dice.—In respect to its form, peculiar for the reason that *pence* is peculiar. We find the sound of *s* after a vowel, where that of *z* is expected. This distinguishes *dice* for play, from *dies* (*diez*) for coining. *Dice*, perhaps, like *pence*, is collective rather than plural.

In *geese*, *lice*, and *mice*, we have, apparently, the same phenomenon as in *dice*, viz. a sharp sibilant (*s*) where a *flat* one (*z*) is expected. The *s*, however, in these words is not the sign of the plural, but the last letter of the original word.

§ 188. 1. *Alms*.—Some say, *these alms* are *useful* ; in which case the word *alms* is plural. Others say, *this alms* is *useful* ; in which case the word *alms* is singular. Now in the word *alms* the *-s* is no sign of the plural number, but part of the original singular, like the *s* in *goose* or *loss*. The Anglo-Saxon form was *almesse*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot say *alms-es* in the same way that we can say *loss-es*. Hence the word *alms* is, in respect to its original form, singular ; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural.

2. *Riches*.—Most writers say, *riches* are *useful* ; in which case the word *riches* is plural. Still there are a few who say, *riches* is *useful* ; in which case the word *riches* is singular. Now in the word *riches* the *-s* is no sign of the plural number, since there is no such *substantive* as *rich* ; on the contrary, it is

part of the original singular, like the *s* in *distress*. The form in the original French, from which language it was derived, was *richesse*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot say *richess-es* in the same way that we *can* say *distress-es*. Hence the word *riches* is, in respect to its original form, singular; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural, most frequently the latter.

3. *News*.—Some say, *this news is good*; in which case the word *news* is singular. More rarely we find the expression *these news are good*; in which case the word *news* is plural. Now in the word *news* the *-s* (unlike the *s* in *alms* and *riches*) is no part of the original singular, but the sign of the plural, like the *s* in *trees*. Notwithstanding this, we cannot subtract the *s*, and say *new*, in the same way that we *can* form *tree* from *trees*. Hence the word *news* is, in respect to its original form, plural; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural, most frequently the former.

4. *Means*.—Some say, *these means are useful*; in which case the word *means* is plural. Others say, *this means is useful*; in which case the word *means* is singular. Now in the word *means* the *-s* (unlike the *s* in *alms* and *riches*, but like the *s* in *news*) is no part of the original singular, but the sign of the plural, like the *s* in *trees*. The form in the original French, from which language the word is derived, is *moyen*, singular; *moyens*, plural. If we subtract from the word *means* the letter *s*, we say *mean*. Now as a singular form of the word *means*, with the sense it has in the phrase *ways and means*, there is, in the current English, no such word as *mean*, any more than there is such a word as *new* from *news*. But, in a different sense, there *is* the singular form *mean*; as in the phrase *the golden mean*, meaning *middle course*. Hence the word *means* is, in respect to its form, plural; in respect to its meaning, either singular or plural.

5. *Pains*.—Some say, *these pains are well-taken*; in which case the word *pains* is plural. Others say, *this pains is well-taken*; in which case the word *pains* is singular. The form in

the original French, from which language the word is derived, is *peine*. The reasoning that has been applied to the word *means* is closely applicable to the word *pains*.

6. The same also applies to the word *amends*. The form in French is *amende*, without the *s*.

7, 8, &c. *Mathematics, metaphysics, politics, ethics, optics, physics*.—The following is an exhibition of my hypothesis respecting these words, to which I invite the reader's criticism. All the words in point are of Greek origin, and all are derived from a Greek adjective. Each is the name of some department of study, of some art, or of some science. As the words are Greek, so also are the sciences which they denote either of Greek origin, or else such as flourished in Greece. Let the arts and sciences of Greece be expressed, in Greek, rather by a substantive and an adjective combined, than by a simple substantive; for instance, let it be the habit of the language to say *the musical art*, rather than *music*. Let the Greek for *art* be a word in the feminine gender; e. g. τέχνη (*tekhne*), so that the *musical art* be ἡ μουσική τέχνη (*hæ mousikæ tekhne*). Let, in the progress of language (as was actually the case in Greece), the article and substantive be omitted, so that, for the *musical art*, or for *music*, there stand only the feminine adjective, μουσική. Let there be, upon a given art or science, a series of books, or treatises; the Greek for *book*, or *treatise*, being a neuter substantive, βιβλίον (*biblion*). Let the substantive meaning *treatise* be, in the course of language, omitted, so that whilst the science of physics is called φυσική (*fysikæ*), *physic*, from ἡ φυσική τέχνη, a series of treatises (or even chapters) upon the science shall be called φύσικα (*fysika*) or *physics*. Now all this was what happened in Greece. The science was denoted by a feminine adjective singular, as φυσική (*fysikæ*), and the treatises upon it, by the neuter adjective plural, as φύσικα (*fysika*). The treatises of Aristotle are generally so named. To apply this, I conceive that, in the middle ages, a science of Greek origin might have its name drawn from two sources, viz. from the name of the art or

science, or from the name of the books wherein it was treated. In the first case it had a singular form, as *physic, logic*; in the second place a plural form, as *mathematics, metaphysics, optics*.

In what number these words, having a collective sense, require their verbs to be, is a point of syntax.

§ 189. The plural form *children (child-er-en)* requires particular notice.

In the first place it is a double plural: the *-en* being the *-en* in *oxen*, whilst the simpler form *child-er* occurs in the Old English, and in certain provincial dialects.

Now, what is the *-er* in *child-er*?

In Icelandic, no plural termination is commoner than that in *-r*; as *geisl-ar* = *flashes*, *tung-ur* = *tongues*, &c. Nevertheless, it is not the Icelandic that explains the plural form in question.

Besides the word *childer*, we collect from the other Gothic tongue the following forms in *-r*:—

Hus-er,	<i>Houses.</i>	Old High-German.
Chalp-ir,	<i>Calves.</i>	ditto.
Lemp-ir,	<i>Lambs.</i>	ditto.
Plet-ir,	<i>Blades of grass.</i>	ditto.
Eig-ir,	<i>Eggs.</i>	ditto.

and others, the peculiarity of which is the fact of their all being *of the neuter gender*. The particular Gothic dialect wherein they occur most frequently is the Dutch of Holland.

Now, the theory respecting this form, as propounded by Grimm (*D. G.* iii. p. 270), is as follows:—

1. The *-r* represents an earlier *-s*.

2. Which was, originally, no sign of a plural number, but merely a neuter derivative affix, common to the singular as well as to the plural number.

3. In this form it appears in the Mæso-Gothic: *ag-is* = *fear* (whence *ague* = *shivering*), *hat-is* = *hate*, *rigv-is* = *smoke (reek)*. In none of these words is the *-s* radical, and in none is it limited to the singular number.

It should be added, that the reason why a singular derivational affix should become the sign of the plural number, lies, most probably, in the *collective* nature of the words in which it occurs:—*Husir* = a collection of houses, *eigir* = a collection of eggs, *eggery* or *eyry*. For further observations on the power of *-r*, and for reasons for believing it to be the same as in the words *Jew-r-y*, *yeoman-r-y*, see a paper of Mr. Guest's, *Philol. Trans.*, May 26, 1843. There we find the remarkable form *lamb-r-en*, from Wicliffe, Joh. xxi. *Lamb-r-en* : *lamb* :: *child-r-en* : *child*.

§ 190. *The form in -en.*—In the Anglo-Saxon no termination of the plural number is more common than *-n* : *tungan*, tongues; *steorran*, stars.

In the present English the word *oxen* is the only specimen of this form in current use. In the old and middle English stages of our language the number of words in *-en* was much greater than at present.

<i>hos-en</i>	=	hose or stockings
<i>shoo-n</i>	=	shoe- <i>s</i>
<i>ey-en</i>	=	eye- <i>s</i>
<i>bischop-en</i>	=	bishop- <i>s</i>
<i>eldr-en</i>	=	elder- <i>s</i>
<i>arw-en</i>	=	arrow- <i>s</i>
<i>scher-en</i>	=	shire- <i>s</i>
<i>doghtr-en</i>	=	daughter- <i>s</i>
<i>sustr-en</i>	=	sister- <i>s</i>
<i>uncl-en</i>	=	uncle- <i>s</i>
<i>tre-en</i>	=	tree- <i>s</i>
<i>souldr-en</i>	=	soldier- <i>s</i> .

§ 191. *Men, feet, teeth, mice, lice, geese.*—In these we have some of the oldest words in the language. If these were, to a certainty, true plurals, we should have an appearance somewhat corresponding to the weak and strong tenses of verbs; viz. one series of plurals formed by a change of the vowel, and another by the addition of the sibilant. The word *kye*, used in Scotland for *cows*, is of the same class. The list in Anglo-Saxon

of words of this kind is different from that of the present English.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	
Fréond . .	Frynd . .	<i>Friends.</i>
Féond . .	Fynd . .	<i>Foes.</i>
Niht . .	Niht . .	<i>Nights.</i>
Bóc . .	Béc . .	<i>Books.</i>
Burh . .	Byrig . .	<i>Burghs.</i>
Bróc . .	Bréc . .	<i>Breeches.</i>
Turf . .	Týrf . .	<i>Turves.</i>

Brethren.—Here there are two changes. 1. The alteration of the vowel. 2. The addition of *-en*. Mr. Guest quotes the forms *brethre* and *brothre* from the Old English. The sense is collective rather than plural.

Peasen = pulse.—As *children* is a double form of one sort (*r + en*), so is *peasen* a double form of another (*s + en*); *pea*, *pea-s*, *pea-s-en*. Wallis speaks to the *singular* power of the form in *-s*:—"Dicunt nonnulli a *pease*, pluraliter *peasen*; at melius, singulariter a *pea*, pluraliter *pease*."—P. 77. He might have added, that, theoretically, *pease* was the proper singular form; as shown by the Latin *pis-um*.

Pullen = poultry.

Lussurioso—What? three-and-twenty years in law?

Vendice.—I have known those who have been five-and-fifty, and all about *pullen* and pigs.—*Revenger's Tragedy*, iv. 1.

If this were a plural form, it would be a very anomalous one. The *-en*, however, is no more a sign of the plural than is the *-es* in *rich-es* (*richesse*). The proper form is in *-ain* or *-eyn*.

A false theefe,

That came like a false fox, my *pullain* to kill and mischeefe.

Gammer Gurton's Needle, v. ii.

Chickens.—A third variety of the double inflection (*en + s*), with the additional peculiarity of the form *chicken* being used, at present, almost exclusively in the singular number, although, originally, it was, probably, the plural of *chick*. So Wallis

considered it:—"At olim etiam per *-en* vel *-yn* formabant pluralia; quorum pauca admodum adhuc retinemus. Ut, *an ox*, a *chick*, pluraliter *oxen*, *chicken* (sunt qui dicunt in singulari *chicken*, et in plurali *chickens*)."—P. 77. *Chick*, *chick-en*, *chick-en-s*.

Fern.—According to Wallis the *-n* in *fer-n* is the *-en* in *oxen*, in other words, a plural termination:—"A *fere* (*filiæ*) pluraliter *fern* (verum nunc plerumque *fern* utroque numero dicitur, sed et in plurali *ferns*); nam *fere* et *feres* prope obsoleta sunt."—P. 77. Subject to this view, the word *fer-n-s* would exhibit the same phenomenon as the word *chicke-n-s*. It is doubtful, however, whether Wallis's view be correct. A reason for believing the *-n* to be radical is presented by the Anglo-Saxon form *fearn*, and the Old High-German, *varam*.

Women.—Pronounced *wimmen*, as opposed to the singular form *woomman*.

Houses.—Pronounced *houz-ez*. The same peculiarity in the case of *s* and *z*, as occurs between *f* and *v* in words like *life*, *lives*, &c.

Paths, youths.—Pronounced *padhz*, *yoodhz*. The same peculiarity in the case of *þ* and *ð*, as occurs between *s* and *z* in the words *house*, *houses*. "Finita in *f* plerumque alleviantur in plurali numero, substituendo *v*; ut *wife*, *wives*, &c. Eademque alleviatio est etiam in *s* et *th*, quamvis retento caractere, in *house*, *cloth*, *path*."—P. 79.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE CASES.

§ 192. THE extent to which there are, in the English language, cases, depends on the meaning which we attach to the word *case*. In the sentence *a house of a father*, the idea ex-

pressed by the words *of a father*, is an idea of a relation between them and the word *house*. This idea is an idea of property or possession. The relation between the words *father* and *house* may be called the possessive relation. This relation, or connection, between the two words is expressed by the preposition *of*.

In *a father's house* the idea is, there or thereabouts, the same; the relation or connection between the two words being the same. The expression, however, differs. In *a father's house* the relation, or connection, is expressed, not by a preposition, but by a change of form, *father* becoming *father's*.

He gave the house to a father.—Here the words *father* and *house* stand in another sort of relationship; the relationship being expressed by the preposition *to*. The idea *to a father* differs from the idea *of a father*, in being expressed in one way only; viz. by the preposition. There is no second mode of expressing it by a change of form, as was done with *father's*.

The father taught the child.—Here there is neither preposition nor change of form. The connection between the words *father* and *child* is expressed by the arrangement only.

Now if the relation alone between two words constitutes a case, the words or sentences, *child*; *to a father*; *of a father*; and *father's*, are all equally cases; of which one may be called the accusative, another the dative, a third the genitive, and so on.

Perhaps, however, the relationship alone does not constitute a case. Perhaps there is a necessity of either the addition of a preposition (as in *of a father*), or of a change in form (as in *father's*). In this case (although *child* be not so), *father's*, *of a father*, and *to a father*, are all equally cases.

Now it is a remark, at least as old as Dr. Beattie, that if the use of a preposition constitute a case, there must be as many cases in a language as there are prepositions, and that "*above a man, beneath a man, beyond a man, round about a man,*

with a man, *without* a man, shall be cases, as well as of a man, to a man, and *with* a man."—MURRAY'S Grammar, vol. i. p. 79.

For etymological purposes it is necessary to limit the meaning of the word case; and, as a sort of definition, it may be laid down that *where there is no change of form there is no case*. With this remark, the English language may be compared with the Latin.

	Latin.	English.
Sing. Nom.	<i>Pater</i>	. . . a father.
Gen.	<i>Patris</i>	. . . a father's.
Dat.	<i>Patri</i>	. . . to a father.
Acc.	<i>Patrem</i>	. . . a father.
Abl.	<i>Patre</i>	. . . from a father.

Here, since in the Latin language there are five changes of form, whilst in English there are but *two*, there are (as far, at least, as the word *pater* and *father* are concerned) three more cases in Latin than in English. It does not, however, follow that because in *father* we have but two cases, there may not be other words wherein there are more than two.

Neither does it follow that, because two words have the same form, they are in the same case, a remark which leads to the distinction between a *real* and an *accidental identity of form*.

In the language of the Anglo-Saxons the genitive cases of the words *smith* (*smið*), *end* (*ende*), and *day* (*dæg*), were, respectively, *smithes* (*smiðes*), *endes*, and *dayes* (*dæges*); whilst the nominative plurals were, respectively, *smithas*, (*smiðas*), *endas*, and *dayas* (*degas*). A process of change took place, by which the vowel of the last syllable in each word, was ejected. The result was, that the forms of the genitive singular and the nominative plural, originally different, became one and the same; so that the identity of the two cases is an accident.

This fact relieves the English grammarian from a difficulty. The nominative plural and the genitive singular are, in the present language of England, identical; the apostrophe in *father's* being a mere matter of orthography. However, there is once a difference. This modifies the previous statement,

which may now stand thus:—*for a change of case there must be a change of form existing or presumed.*

§ 193. *The number of our cases and the extent of language over which they spread.*—In the English language there is undoubtedly a *nominative* case. This occurs in substantives, adjectives, and pronouns (*father, good, he*) equally. It is found in both numbers.

Accusative.—Some call this the objective case. The words *him* (singular) and *them* (plural) (whatever they may have been originally) are now true accusatives. The accusative case is found in pronouns only. *Thee, me, us,* and *you* are, to a certain extent, true accusatives.

They are accusative thus far: 1. They are not derived from any other case. 2. They are distinguished from the forms *I, my,* &c. 3. Their meaning is accusative. Nevertheless, they are only imperfect accusatives. They have no sign of case, and are distinguished by negative characters only.

One word of English is probably a true accusative in the strict sense of the term, viz. the word *twain* = *two*. The *-n* in *twain* is the *-n* in *hine* = *him* and *hwome* = *whom*. This we see from the following inflection:—

	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
<i>N. and Ac.</i>	Twá,	Twégen,	Twá.
	~~~~~		
<i>Abl. and Dat.</i>	Twám,		Twæ'm.
<i>Gen.</i>	Twegra,		Twega.

Although nominative as well as accusative, I have little doubt as to the original character of *twégen* being accusative. The *-n* is by no means radical; besides which, it is the sign of an accusative case, and is *not* the sign of a nominative.

The words *him* and *them* are true accusatives in even a less degree than *thee, me, us,* and *you*. The Anglo-Saxon equivalents to the Latin words *eos* and *illos* were *hi* (or *hig*) and *þá* (or *þæge*); in other words, the sign of the accusative was other than the sound of *-m*. The case which really ended in *-m* was the so-called dative; so that the Anglo-Saxon forms *him* (or *þeom*) and *þám* = the Latin *is* and *illis*.

' This fact explains the meaning of the words, *whatever they may have been originally*, in a preceding sentence. It also indicates a fresh element in the criticism and nomenclature of the grammarian; viz. the extent to which the *history* of a form regulates its position as an inflection.

*Dative*.—In the antiquated word *whilom* (*at times*), we have a remnant of the old dative in *-m*. The *sense* of the word is adverbial; its form, however, is that of a dative case.

*Genitive*.—Some call this the possessive case. It is found in substantives and pronouns (*father's, his*), but not in adjectives. It is formed like the nominative plural, by the addition of the lene sibilant (*father, fathers; buck, bucks*); or, if the word end in *s*, by that of *es* (*boxes, judges, &c.*). It is found in both numbers: *the men's hearts; the children's bread*. In the plural number, however, it is rare; so rare, indeed, that wherever the plural ends in *s* (as it almost always does), there is no genitive. If it were not so, we should have such words as *fatherses, foxeses, princesseses, &c.*

*Instrumental*.—The following extracts from Rask's "Anglo-Saxon Grammar," teach us that there exist in the present English two powers of the word spelt *t-h-e*, or of the so-called definite article.

"The demonstrative pronouns are *þæt, se, seó* (*id, is, eu*), which are also used for the article; and *þis, þes, þeós* (*hoc, hic, hæc*). They are thus declined:—

	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
<i>Sing. N.</i>	þæt	se	seó	þis	þes	þeós.
<i>A.</i>	þæt	þone	þá	þis	þisne	þás.
<i>Abl.</i>		þý	þæ're		þise	þise.
<i>D.</i>		þám	þæ're		þisum	þise.
<i>G.</i>		þæs	þæ're		þises	þise.
<i>Plur. N. and A.</i>		þá			þás.	
<i>Abl. and D.</i>		þám			þisum.	
<i>G.</i>		þára			þiasa.	

"The indeclinable *he* is often used instead of *þæt* or *se* in

all cases, but especially with a relative signification, and, in later times, as an article. Hence the English article *the*.

"*þy* seems justly to be received as a proper *ablativus instrumenti*, as it occurs often in this character, even in the masculine gender; as, *mid þy ápe* = *with that oath* (Inæ Leges, 53). And in the same place in the dative, *on þæ'm ápe* = *in that oath.*"—Pp. 56, 57.

Hence the *the* that has originated out of the Anglo-Saxon *þy* is one word; the *the* that has originated out of the Anglo-Saxon *þe*, another. The latter is the common article: the former the *the* in expressions like *all the more*, *all the better* = *more by all that*, *better by all that*, and the Latin phrases *eo majus*, *eo melius*.

That *why* is in the same case with the instrumental *the* (= *þy*) may be seen from the following Anglo-Saxon inflection of the interrogative pronoun:—

	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>
<i>N.</i>	Hwæt	Hwá.
<i>A.</i>	Hwæt	Hwone (hwæne).
	⏟	
<i>Abl.</i>	<i>Hwi.</i>	
<i>D.</i>	Hwám (hwæ'm).	
<i>G.</i>	Hwæs.	

Hence, then, in *the* and *why* we have instrumental ablatives, or, simply, *instrumentals*.

§ 194. *The determination of cases.*—How do we determine cases? In other words, why do we call *him* and *them* accusatives rather than datives or genitives? By one of two means; viz. either by the sense or the form.

Suppose that in the English language there were ten thousand dative cases and as many accusatives. Suppose, also, that all the dative cases ended in *-m*, and all the accusatives in some other letter. It is very evident that, whatever might be the meaning of the words *him* and *them*, their form would be dative. In this case, the meaning being accusative, and the form dative, we should doubt which test to take.

My own opinion is, that it would be convenient to determine cases by the *form* of the word *alone*; so that, even if a word had a dative sense only once, where it had an accusative sense ten thousand times, such a word should be said to be in the dative case. Now, as stated above, the words *him* and *them* (to which we may add *whom*) were once dative cases; *-m* in Anglo-Saxon being the sign of the dative case. In the time of the Anglo-Saxons their sense coincided with their form. At present they are dative forms with an accusative meaning. Still, as the word *give* takes after it a dative case, we have, even now, in the sentence, *give it him, give it them*, remnants of the old dative sense. To say *give it to him, to them*, is unnecessary and pedantic: neither do I object to the expression, *whom shall I give it?* If ever the formal test become generally recognised and consistently adhered to, *him, them, and whom* will be called datives with a latitude of meaning; and then the approximate accusatives in the English language will be the forms *you, thee, us, me*, and the only true accusative will be the word *twain*.

*My*, an accusative form (*meh, me, mec*), has now a genitive sense. The same may be said of *thy*.

*Me*, originally an accusative form (both *me* and *my* can grow out of *mec* and *meh*), had, even with the Anglo-Saxons, a dative sense. *Give it me* is correct English. The same may be said of *thee*.

*Him*, a dative form, has now an accusative sense.

*Her*.—For this word, as well as for further details on *me* and *my*, see the chapters on the Personal and Demonstrative Pronouns.

When all traces of the original dative signification are effaced, and when all the dative cases in a language are similarly affected, an accusative case may be said to have originated out of a dative.

§ 195. *Analysis of cases*.—In the word *children's* we are enabled to separate the word into three parts. 1. The root *child*. 2. The plural signs *r* and *en*. 3. The sign of the

genitive case, *s*. In this case the word is said to be analysed, since we not only take it to pieces, but also give the respective powers of each of its elements; stating which denotes the case, and which the number. Although it is too much to say that the analysis of every case of every number can be thus effected, it ought always to be attempted.

§ 196. *The true nature of the genitive form in s*.—It is a common notion that the genitive form *father's* is contracted from *father his*. The expression in our liturgy, *for Jesus Christ his sake*, which is merely a pleonastic one, is the only foundation for this assertion. As the idea, however, is not only one of the commonest, but also one of the greatest errors in etymology, the following three statements are given for the sake of contradiction to it.

1. The expression the *Queen's Majesty* is not capable of being reduced to the *Queen his Majesty*.

2. In the form *his* itself, the *s* has precisely the power that it has in *father's*, &c. Now *his* cannot be said to arise out of *he + his*.

3. Even if the words *father his* would account for the English word *father's*, it would not account for the Sanskrit genitive *pad-as*, of a foot; the Zend *dughdhar-s*, of a daughter; the Lithuanic *dugter-s*; the Greek ὀδόντ-ος; the Latin *dent-is*, &c.

## CHAPTER X.

### ON CERTAIN FORMS IN -ER.

§ 197. WE now pass from the Cases and Numbers of Substantives to the Degrees of Comparison of Adjectives.

Preparatory, however, to the consideration of this part of Etymology, we must attend to certain phenomena connected with the forms in -ER—as *wheth-er*, *oth-er*, &c.

Let these serve as a text.

I. *First*, it may be stated of them that the idea which they express is not that of *one out of many*, but that of *one out of two*.

II. *Secondly*, it may be stated of them, that the termination *-er* is the same termination that we find in the comparative degree.

As the Sanskrit form *kataras* corresponds with the comparative degree, where there is the comparison of *two things with each other*, so the word *katamas* is a superlative form, and in the superlative degree lies the comparison of *many things with each other*.

Hence *other* and *whether* (to which may be added *either* and *neither*) are pronouns with the comparative form.

Let us now go to some other words. In the list come—

1. Certain pronouns, as *ei-th-er*, *n-ei-th-er*, *whe-th-er*, *o-th-er*.

2. Certain prepositions and adverbs, as *ov-er*, *und-er*, *af-t-er*.

3. Adjectives of the comparative degree; as *wis-er*, *strong-er*, *bett-er*, &c.

4. Certain adjectives, with the form of the comparative, but the power of the positive degree; as *upp-er*, *und-er*, *inn-er*, *out-er*, *hind-er*.

Now what is the idea common to all these words, which is expressed by the sign *-er*, and which connects the four divisions into one class? It is not the mere idea of comparison. Bopp, who has best generalised the view of these forms, considers the fundamental idea to be that of *duality*. In the comparative degree we have a relation between one object and *some* other object like it, or a relation between two single elements of comparison: *A is wiser than B*. In the superlative degree we have a relation between one object and *all* others like it, or a relation between one single and one complex element of comparison: *A is wiser than B, C, D, &c.*

The more important of the specific modifications of the



general idea involved in the comparison of two objects are,—

1. Contrariety; as in *inner, outer, under, upper, over*. In Latin the words for *right* and *left* end in *-er*,—*dexter, sinister*.

2. Choice in the way of an alternative; as *either, neither, whether, other*.

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE COMPARATIVE DEGREE.

§ 198. In the present English the Adjectives preserve the same form throughout both numbers, and in all genders. Consequently they are destitute of case; the objective, the nominative, and the possessive senses being expressed alike.—*A good man, a good woman, a good sword; the good men, the good women, the good swords; a good man's son, a good woman's son, a good sword's edge.*

The only mode in which adjectives change their form is in the case of the *Degrees of Comparison*.

The adjective in its simple form is called the Positive Adjective. From the adjective in its *Positive* form, are formed—1, the *Comparative*; 2, the *Superlative Degree*.

The sign of the Comparative Degree is equivalent in meaning to the word *more*. In the word *bright-er*, the syllable *-er* is the sign of the Comparative Degree. The word *bright-er* is equivalent in meaning to *more bright*.

The sign of the Superlative Degree is equivalent in meaning to the word *most*. In the word *bright-est*, the syllable *-est* is the sign of the Superlative Degree. Also, the word *bright-est* is equivalent in meaning to the words *most bright*.

The comparative degree is formed from the positive by the

addition of the syllable *-er*; as *cold, cold-er*; *rich, rich-er*; *dry, dry-er*; *low, low-er*. This is the manner in which the greater part of the English comparatives is formed.

§ 199. *Comparison of Adverbs.*—*The sun shines bright.*—Herein the word *bright* means *brightly*; and although the use of the latter word would have been the more elegant, the expression is not ungrammatical; the word *bright* being looked upon as an adjectival adverb.

*The sun shines to-day brighter than it did yesterday, and to-morrow it will shine brightest.*—Here also the sense is adverbial; from whence we get the fact, that adverbs take degrees of comparison.

§ 200. *Change of vowel.*—By reference to Rask's "Grammar" (§ 128), it may be seen that in the Anglo-Saxon there were, for the comparative and superlative degrees, two forms; viz. *-or* and *-re*, and *-ost* and *-este*, respectively.

The fulness or smallness of a vowel in a given syllable may work a change in the nature of the vowel in a syllable adjoining. In the Anglo-Saxon the following words exhibit a change of vowel:—

<i>Positive.</i>	<i>Comparative.</i>	<i>Superlative.</i>	
Lang,	Lengre,	Lengest.	<i>Long.</i>
Strang,	Strengre,	Strengest.	<i>Strong.</i>
Geong,	Gyngre,	Gyngest.	<i>Young.</i>
Sceort,	Scyrtre,	Scyrtest.	<i>Short.</i>
Heáh,	Hyrre,	Hyhst.	<i>High.</i>
Eald,	Yldre,	Yldest.	<i>Old.</i>

Of this change, the word last quoted is a still-existing specimen, as *old, elder* and *older, eldest* and *oldest*. Between the two forms there is a difference in meaning, *elder* being used as a substantive, and having a plural form, *elders*.

It has been stated above that in Anglo-Saxon there were two forms for the comparative and superlative degrees, one in *-re* and *-este*, the other in *-or* and *-ost*, respectively. Now the first of these was the form taken by adjectives; as *se*

*scearpe sweord* = the sharper sword, and *se scearpeste sweord* = the sharpest sword. The second, on the other hand, was the form taken by adverbs; as, *se sweord scyrð scearpor* = the sword cuts sharper, and *se sweord scyrð scearpost* = the sword cuts sharpest.

The adjectival form has, as seen above, a tendency to make the vowel of the preceding syllable small; *old, elder*.

The adverbial form has a tendency to make the vowel of the preceding syllable full.

Of this effect on the part of the adverbial form the adverbial comparative *rather* is a specimen. We pronounce the *a* as in *father*, or full. Nevertheless, the positive form is small, the *a* being pronounced as the *a* in *fate*.

The word *rather* means *quick, easy* = the classical root  $\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta$ - in  $\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ . What we do *quickly* and *willingly* we do *preferably*. Now if the word *rather* were an adjective, the vowel of the comparative would be sounded as the *a* in *fate*. As it is, however, it is adverbial, and as such is properly sounded as the *a* in *father*.

The difference between the action of the small vowel in *-re*, and of the full in *-or*, effects this difference.

§ 201. *Excess of expression*.—Of this two samples have already been given: 1. in words like *songstress*; 2. in words like *children*. This may be called *excess of expression*; the feminine gender, in words like *songstress*, and the plural number, in words like *children*, being expressed twice over. In the vulgarism *betterer* for *better*, and in the antiquated forms *worser* for *worse*, and *lesser* for *less*, we have in the case of the comparatives, as elsewhere, an excess of expression. In the Old High-German we have the forms *betsërôro, mërôro, êrërëra* = *better, more, ere*.

§ 202. *Difference between a sequence in logic and a sequence in etymology*.—The ideas or notions of *thou, thy, thee*, are ideas between which there is a metaphysical or logical connection. The train of such ideas may be said to form a sequence, and such a sequence may be called a logical one.

The forms (or words) *thou, thy, thee*, are forms or words between which there is a formal or an etymological connection. A train of such words may be called a sequence, and such a sequence may be called an etymological one.

In the case of *thou, thy, thee*, the etymological sequence tallies with the logical one.

The ideas of *I, my, and me* are also in a logical sequence: but the forms *I, my, and me* are not altogether in an etymological one.

In the case of *I, my, me*, the etymological sequence does *not* tally (or tallies imperfectly) with the logical one.

This is only another way of saying that between the words *I* and *me* there is no connection in etymology.

It is also only another way of saying, that, in the oblique cases, *I*, and, in the nominative case, *me*, are defective.

Now the same is the case with *good, better, bad, worse, &c.* *Good* and *bad* are defective in the comparative and superlative degrees; *better* and *worse* are defective in the positive; whilst between *good* and *better*, *bad* and *worse*, there is a sequence in logic, but no sequence in etymology.

§ 203. It is necessary to know that in the Mæso-Gothic the comparative degree was formed differently from the comparative degree in Anglo-Saxon, English, and the other allied languages. Instead of being formed by the addition of the sound of *-r*, it was formed by the addition of the sound of *-s* or *-z*.

<i>Positive.</i>	<i>Comparative.</i>	<i>English.</i>
ald,	ald-iza,	old, old-er.
sut,	sut-iza,	sweet, sweet-er.
blind,	blind-oza,	blind, blind-er.

In the latter stages of language this *s* became *r*.

In the word *worse* we may suppose that there is a remnant of the old comparative in *-s* or *-z*. The Mæso-Gothic form is *váirsiza*, the Anglo-Saxon *vyrsa*.

The following forms help to illustrate the history of the difficult word:—

Mæso-Gothic, *váirsiza* ; Old High-German, *wirsiro* ; Middle High-German, *wirser* ; Old Saxon, *wirso* ; Anglo-Saxon, *vyrsa* ; Old Norse, *vërri* ; Danish, *værre* ; and Swedish, *värre*. Such are the adjectival forms. The adverbial forms are—Mæso-Gothic, *vairs* ; Old High-German, *virs* ; Middle High-German, *wirs* ; Anglo-Saxon, *vyrs* ; Old Norse, *vërr* ; Danish, *værre* ; Swedish, *värre*.—GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 606. Whether the present form in English be originally adjectival or adverbial is indifferent ; since, as soon as the final *a* of *vyrsa* was omitted, the two words would be the same. The forms, however, *váirsiza*, *wirser*, *worse*, and *vërri*, make the word one of the most perplexing in the language.

If the form *worse* be taken without respect to the rest, the view of the matter is simply that in the termination *s* we have a remnant of the Mæso-Gothic forms, like *sutiza*, &c. ; in other words, the old comparative in *s*.

*Wirser* and *váirsiza* traverse this view. They indicate the likelihood of the *s* being no sign of the degree, but a part of the original word. Otherwise the *r* in *wirser*, and the *z* in *váirsiza*, denote an excess of expression.

The analogies of *songstress*, *children*, and *betsësróro* show that excess of expression frequently occurs.

The analogy of *má* and *bet* show that *worse* may possibly be a positive form.

The word *vërri* indicates the belief that the *s* is no part of the root.

Finally, the euphonic processes of the Scandinavian languages tell us that, even had there been an *s*, it would, in all probability, have been ejected. These difficulties verify the statement that the word *worse* is one of the most perplexing in the language.

*Much, more*.—Here, although the words be unlike each other, there is a true etymological relation. Mæso-Gothic, *mikils* ; Old High-German, *mihhil* ; Old Saxon, *mikil* ; Anglo-Saxon, *mycel* ; Old Norse, *mickill* ; Scotch, *muckle* and *mickle* (all ending in *l*) ; Danish, *megen*, m. ; *meget*, n. ; Swed-

ish, *mycken*, m.; *myckett*, n. (where no *l* is found). Such is the adjectival form of the positive, rarely found in the Modern Gothic languages, being replaced in German by *gross*, in English by *great*, in Danish by *stor*. The adverbial forms are *miök* and *miög*, Norse; *much*, English. It is remarkable that this last form is not found in Anglo-Saxon, being replaced by *säre*, Germ. *schr.*—GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 608.

The adverbial and the Norse forms indicate that the *l* is no part of the original word. Comparison with other Indo-European languages gives us the same circumstance: Sanskrit, *maha*; Latin, *mag-nus*; Greek, *μέγας* (*megas*).

There is in Mæso-Gothic the comparative form *máiza*, and there is no objection to presuming a longer form, *magiza*; since in the Greek form *μεῖζων*, compared with *μέγας*, there is a similar disappearance of the *g*. In the Old High-German we find *méro*, corresponding with *máiza*, Mæso-Gothic, and with *more*, English.

*Mickle* (replaced by *great*) expresses size; *much*, quantity; *many*, number. The words *more* and *most* apply equally to number and quantity. I am not prepared either to assert or to deny that *many*, in Anglo-Saxon *menig*, is from the same root with *much*. Of the word *má* notice has already been taken. Its later form, *moe*, occurs as late as Queen Elizabeth, with an adjectival as well as an adverbial sense.

*Little*, *less*.—Like *much* and *more*, these words are in an etymological relation to each other. Mæso-Gothic, *leitils*; Old High-German, *luzil*; Old Saxon, *luttil*; Anglo-Saxon, *lytel*; Middle High-German, *lützel*; Old Norse, *litill*. In these forms we have the letter *l*. Old High-German Provincial, *luzic*; Old Frisian, *litich*; Middle Dutch, *luttik*; Swedish, *liten*; Danish, *liden*.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 611. From these we find that the *l* is either no part of the original word, or one that is easily got rid of. In Swedish and Danish there are the forms *lille* and *liden*; whilst in the neuter form, *lidt*, the *d* is unpronounced. Even the word *liden* the Danes have a tendency to pronounce *leen*.

My own notion is, that these changes leave it possible for *less* to be derived from the root of *little*. According to Grimm, the Anglo-Saxon *lÿssa* is the Gothic *lasivôza*, the comparative of *lasivs* = *weak*.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 611. In Anglo-Saxon there was the adjectival form *lessa*, and the adverbial form *læs*. In either case we have the form *s*.

*Near, nearer*.—Anglo-Saxon, *neah*; comparative, *nearre*, *near*, *nyr*; superlative, *nyhst*, *nehst*. Observe, in the Anglo-Saxon positive and superlative, the absence of the *r*. This shows that the English positive *near* is the Anglo-Saxon comparative *nearre*, and that in the secondary comparative *nearer*, we have an excess of expression. It may be, however, that the *r* in *near* is a mere point of orthography, and that it is not pronounced. The fact that in the English language the words *father* and *farther* are, for the most part, pronounced alike, is the key to the forms *near* and *nearer*.

*Farther*.—Anglo-Saxon, *feor*, *fyrre*, *fyrrest*. The *th* seems euphonic, inserted by the same process that gives the  $\delta$  in  $\alpha\upsilon\delta\rho\omicron\varsigma$ .

*Further*.—Confounded with *farther*, although in reality from a different word, *fore*. Old High-German, *furdîr*; New High-German, *der vordere*; Anglo-Saxon, *fyrðre*.

*Former*.—A comparative formed from the superlative; *forma* being such. Consequently, an instance of excess of expression, combined with irregularity.

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE SUPERLATIVE DEGREE.

§ 204. THE comparative degree is formed from the positive by the addition of the syllable *-er*; as *dark*, *dark-er*; *cold*, *cold-er*; *rich*, *rich-er*; *dry*, *dry-er*; *low*, *low-er*.

The superlative degree is formed from the positive by the addition of the syllable *-est*; as *dark, dark-est*; *cold, cold-est*; *rich, rich-est*; *dry, dry-est*; *low, low-est*.

But the superlative may also be formed from the comparative by changing the *r* of the comparative into *s*, and adding *t*; as *dark-er, dark-es, dark-es-t*; *cold-er, cold-es, cold-es-t*; *rich-er, rich-es, rich-es-t*; *dry-er, dry-es, dry-es-t*; *low-er, low-es, low-es-t*.

To understand the reason why this complex and apparently unnecessary process has been noticed, we must remember what has been said concerning the Mæso-Gothic language, and the extent to which it preserves the *older* forms of the Gothic inflections.

*The Mæso-Gothic Comparative was not formed in r, but in s.*—*Ald-iza, bat-iza, sut-iza*, were the original forms of what became in Old High-German *alt-iro, bets-iro, suats-iro*, and in English, *old-er, bett-er, sweet-er*.

This is one fact. Another is, that *whilst many languages have a Comparative without a Superlative degree, few or none have a Superlative without a Comparative*. Hence, in the case of a Superlative in *-st*, two views may be taken. According to the one it is the Positive with the addition of *st*; according to the other, it is the old Comparative in *-s* with the addition only of *t*. Now, Grimm, and others, lay down as a rule, that the Superlative is formed, not *directly* from the *Positive*, but *indirectly* through the *Comparative*.

With the exception of *worse* and *less*, all the English Comparatives end in *r*; yet no Superlative ends in *rt*, the form being, not *wise, wiser, wisert*, but *wise, wiser, wisest*. This fact, without invalidating the notion just laid down, gives additional importance to the Comparative forms in *s*; since it is from these, before they have changed to *r*, that we must suppose the Superlatives to have been derived. This theory being admitted, we can, by approximation, determine the comparative antiquity of the Superlative degree. It was introduced into the languages allied to the English, *after* the establishment of the Comparative and before the change of *s* into *r*.



§ 205. Of the other English superlatives, the only ones that demand a detailed examination, are these that are generally despatched without difficulty; viz. the words in *most*; such as *midmost*, *foremost*, &c. The current view is, that they are compound words, formed from simple ones, by the addition of the superlative term *most*. Grimm's view is opposed to this. In appreciating Grimm's view, we must bear in mind the phenomena of *excess of expression*; at the same time we must not depart from the current theory without duly considering a fact stated by Rask; which is, that we have in Icelandic the forms *nærmeir*, *fjarreir*, &c., *nearer*, and *farther*, most unequivocally compounded of *near* and *more*, and of *far* and *more*.

The A. S. gives us the following forms:—

<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>
innema (inn-ema)	inmost
úttema (út-ema)	outmost
siðema (sið-ema)	latest
lættema (læt-ema)	latest
niðema (nið-ema)	nethermost
forma (for-ma)	foremost
æfttema (æft-ema)	aftermost
ufema (uf-ema)	utmost
hindema (hiud-ema)	hindmost
midema (mid-ema)	midmost.

Besides these, there are in the other allied languages, words like *fruma* = *first*, *aftuma* = *last*, *miduma* = *middle*.

Now the words in question show at once, that, as far as they are concerned, the *m* that appears in the last syllable of each has nothing to do with the word *most*.

Hence, from the words in question there was formed, in Anglo-Saxon, a regular superlative form in the usual manner; viz. by the addition of *st*; as *æfte-m-est*, *fyr-m-est*, *læte-m-est*, *sið-m-est*, *yfe-m-est*, *ute-m-est*.

And, hence, in the present English, the different parts of the syllable *most* (in words like *upmost*) come from different quar-

ters. The *m* is the *m* in the Anglo-Saxon words *innema*, &c.; whilst the *-st* is the common sign of the superlative. In separating such words as *midmost* into its component parts, we should write—

mid-m-ost	<i>not</i>	mid-most
ut-m-ost	—	ut-most
up-m-ost	—	up-most
fore-m-ost	—	fore-most
in-m-ost	—	in-most
hind-m-ost	—	hind-most
out-m-ost	—	out-most.

In certain words the syllable *m-ost* is added to a word already ending in *er*; that is, to a word already marked with the sign of the comparative degree.

neth-er-m-ost	hind-er-m-ost
utt-er-m-ost	out-er-m-ost
upp-er-m-ost	inn-er-m-ost.

Having accounted for the *m* in the words just mentioned, we can account for the *m* in the word *former*. *Former* (*for-m-er*) is a comparative from the Anglo-Saxon superlative *forma* (*for-m-a*).

The words *inmost*, *outmost*, *upmost*, *midmost*, *foremost*, *hindmost*, *utmost*, are *doubly* superlative.

The words *nethermost*, *uppermost*, *uttermost*, *undermost*, *outermost*, and *innermost*, are *trebly* superlative.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### THE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

§ 206. *I—we, us, me—thou—ye.*—These constitute the true personal pronouns. From *he, she, and it*, they differ in being destitute of gender.

These latter words are demonstrative rather than personal, so that there are in English true personal pronouns for the first two persons only.

In most other languages the current pronouns of the third person are, as in English, demonstrative rather than personal.

The usual declension of the personal pronouns is exceptional. *I* and *me*, *thou* and *ye*, stand in no etymological relations to each other. The true view of the words is, that they are not irregular but defective. *I* has no *oblique*, and *me* no nominative case. And so with respect to the rest.

*You*.—As far as the practice of the present mode of speech is concerned, the word *you* is a *nominative* form; since we say *you move*, *you are moving*, *you were speaking*.

Why should it not be treated as such? There is no absolute reason why it should not. All that can be said is, that the historical reason and the logical reason are at variance. The Anglo-Saxon form for *you* was *ew*, for *ye*, *ge*. Neither bear any sign of case at all, so that, form for form, they are equally and indifferently nominative and accusative, as the habit of language may make them. Hence it, perhaps, is more logical to say that a certain form (*you*) is used *either* as a nominative or accusative, than to say that the accusative case is used instead of a nominative. It is clear that *you* can be used instead of *ye* only so far as it is nominative in power.

*Ye*.—As far as the evidence of such expressions as *get on with ye* is concerned, the word *ye* is an accusative form.

*Me*.—Carrying out the views just laid down, and admitting *you* to be a nominative, or *quasi*-nominative case, we may extend the reasoning to the word *me*, and call it also a secondary nominative; inasmuch as such phrases as *it is me* = *it is I* are common.

Now to call such expressions incorrect English is to assume the point. No one says that *c'est moi* is bad French, and that *c'est je* is good. The fact is, that the whole question is a question of degree. Has or has not the custom been suffi-

ciently prevalent to have transferred the forms *me*, *ye*, and *you* from one case to another ?

At the same time it must be observed that the expression *it is me* = *it is I* will not justify the use of *it is him*, *it is her* = *it is he* and *it is she*. *Me*, *ye*, *you*, are what may be called *indifferent forms*, i. e. nominative as much as accusative, and accusative as much as nominative. *Him* and *her*, on the other hand, are not indifferent. The *-m* and *-r* are respectively the signs of cases other than the nominative.

Again: the reasons which allow the form *you* to be considered as a nominative plural, on the strength of its being used for *ye*, will not allow it to be considered a nominative singular on the strength of its being used for *thou*. It is submitted to the reader, that in phrases like *you are speaking*, &c., even when applied to a single individual, the idea is really plural; in other words, that the courtesy consists in treating *one* person as *more than one*, and addressing him as such, rather than in using a plural form in a singular sense. It is certain that, grammatically considered, *you* = *thou* is a plural, since the verb with which it agrees is plural. Thus we say, *you are speaking*; not *you art speaking*.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### ON THE TRUE REFLECTIVE PRONOUN IN THE GOTHIC LANGUAGES, AND ON ITS ABSENCE IN ENGLISH.

§ 207. A TRUE reflective pronoun is wanting in English. In other words, there are no equivalents to the Latin pronominal forms, *se*, *sibi*.

Nor yet are there any equivalents in English to the so-called adjectival forms *suus*, *sua*, *suum*: since *his* and *her* are

the equivalents to *ejus* and *illius*, and are not adjectives but genitive cases.

At the first view, this last sentence seems unnecessary. It might seem superfluous to state, that, if there were no such primitive form as *se* (or its equivalent), there could be no such secondary form as *suus* (or its equivalent).

Such, however, is not the case. *Suus* might exist in the language, and yet *se* be absent ; in other words, the derivative form might have continued whilst the original one had become extinct.

Such is really the case with the *Old Frisian*. The reflective personal form, the equivalent to *se*, is lost, whilst the reflective possessive form, the equivalent to *suus*, is found. In the *Modern Frisian*, however, both forms are lost.

## CHAPTER XV.

### THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS, &c.

§ 208. THE demonstrative pronouns are, 1. *He, it.* 2. *She.* 3. *This, that.* 4. *The.*

*He, she, and it,* generally looked on as personal, are here treated as demonstrative pronouns, for the following reasons.

1. The personal pronouns form an extremely natural class, if the pronouns of the two first persons be taken by themselves. This is not the case if they be taken along with *he, it,* and *she.* The absence of gender, the peculiarity in their declension, and their defectiveness, are marked characters wherein they agree with each other, but not with any other words.

2. The idea expressed by *he, it,* and *she* is naturally that of demonstrativeness. In the Latin language *is, ea, id ; ille, illa, illud ; hic, hæc, hoc,* are demonstrative pronouns in sense, as well as in declension.

3. The plural forms *they, them,* in the present English, are the plural forms of the root of *that,* a true demonstrative pro-

noun; so that even if *he*, *she*, and *it* could be treated as personal pronouns, it could only be in the singular number.

4. The word *she* has grown out of the Anglo-Saxon *seō*. Now *seō* was in Anglo-Saxon the feminine form of the definite article; the definite article being a demonstrative pronoun.

Compared with the Anglo-Saxon the present English stands as follows:—

*She*.—The Anglo-Saxon form *heō*, being lost to the language, is replaced by the feminine article *seō*.

*Her*.—This is a case, not of the present *she*, but of the Anglo-Saxon *heō*: so that *she* may be said to be defective in the oblique cases and *her* to be defective in the nominative.

*Him*.—A true dative form, which has replaced the Anglo-Saxon *hine*. When used as a dative, it was neuter as well as masculine.

*His*.—Originally neuter as well as masculine. Now, as a neuter, replaced by *its*—"et quidem ipsa vox *his*, ut et interrogativum *whose*, nihil aliud sunt quam *hee's*, *who's*, ubi omnino idem præstat quod in aliis possessivis. Similiter autem *his* pro *hee's* eodem errore quo nonnunquam *bin* pro *been*; item *whose* pro *who's* eodem errore quo *done*, *gone*, *knowne*, *growne*, &c., pro *doen*, *goen*, *knowen*, vel *do'n*, *go'n*, *know'n*, *grow'n*; utrobique contra analogiam linguæ; sed usu defenditur."—WALLIS, c. v.

*It*.—Changed from the Anglo-Saxon *hit*, by the ejection of *h*. The *t* is no part of the original word, but a sign of the neuter gender, forming it regularly from *he*. The same neuter sign is preserved in the Latin *id* and *illud*.

*Its*.—In the course of time the nature of the neuter sign *t*, in *it*, the form being found in but a few words, became misunderstood. Instead of being looked on as an affix, it passed for part of the original word. Hence was formed from *it* the anomalous genitive *its*, superseding the Saxon *his*. The same was the case with—

*Hers*.—The *r* is no part of the original word, but the sign of the dative case. These formations are of value in the history of cases.

*Theirs*.—In the same predicament with *hers* and *its*.

*Than* or *then*, and *there*.—Although now adverbs, they were once demonstrative pronouns, in a certain case and in a certain gender—*than* and *then* masculine accusative and singular, *there* feminine dative and singular.

§ 209. An exhibition of the Anglo-Saxon declension is the best explanation of the English. Be it observed, that the cases marked in italics are found in the present language.

## I.

*Se, seó.*

Of this word the Anglo-Saxon has two forms only, both of the singular number, and both in the nominative case; viz. masc. *se*; fem. *seó* (the). The neuter gender and the other cases of the article were taken from the pronoun *þæt*.

## II.

*þæt* (that, the), and *þis* (this).

	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
Sing. Nom.	<i>þæt</i>	—	—	<i>þis</i>	es	þeós.
Acc.	<i>þæt</i>	þone	þá	<i>þis</i>	þisne	þás.
Abl.	<i>þy</i>	<i>þy</i>	þæ're.	<i>þise</i>	þise	þisse.
Dat.	þám	þám	þæ're.	þisum	þisum	þisse.
Gen.	þæs	þæs	þæ're.	þises	þises	þisse.
~~~~~						
Plur. Nom. Acc.		þá.			þás.	
Abl. Dat.		þám.			þisum.	
Gen.		þára.			þissa.	

III.

Hit (it), *he* (he), *heó* (she).

Sing. Nom.	<i>hit</i>	<i>he</i>	heó.
Acc.	<i>hit</i>	hine	hí.
Dat.	<i>him</i>	<i>him</i>	<i>hire</i> .
Gen.	<i>his</i>	<i>his</i>	<i>hire</i> .

Plur. Nom. Acc.	hi.
Dat.	him (heom).
Gen.	hira (heora).

IV.

þe (the)—Undeclined, and used for all cases and genders.

§ 210. *These*.—Here observe—

1st. That the *s* is no inflection, but a radical part of the word, like the *s* in *geese*.

2nd. That the Anglo-Saxon form is *þás*.

These facts create difficulties in respect to the word *these*. Mr. Guest's view is, perhaps, the best; viz. that the plural element of the word is the letter *e*, and that this *-e* is the old English and Anglo-Saxon adjective plural; so that *thes-e* is formed from *thes*, as *gode* (= *boni*) is formed from *god* (= *bonus*).

The nominative plural in the Old English ended in *e*; as—

<i>Singular.</i>			<i>Plural.</i>		
<i>M.</i>	<i>F.</i>	<i>N.</i>	<i>M.</i>	<i>F.</i>	<i>N.</i>
<i>God,</i>	<i>god,</i>	<i>god.</i>	<i>gode.</i>		

In Old English MSS. this plural in *-e* is general. It occurs not only in adjectives and pronouns as a regular inflection, but even as a plural of the genitive *his*, that word being treated as a nominative singular; so that *hise* is formed from *his*, as *sui* from *suus*, or as *eji* might have been formed from *ejus*; provided that in the Latin language this last word had been mistaken for a nominative singular. The following examples are Mr. Guest's.

1. In these lay a gret multitude of *syke* men, *blinde*, crokid, and *drye*.
WICLIFFE, Jon. v.

2. In all the orders foure is non that can
So much of dalliance and faire language,
He hadde ymade ful many a marriage—
His tippet was ay farsed ful of knives,
And pinnes for to given *faire* wives.

CHAUCER, *Prolog.*

3. And *al* the cuntre of Judee wente out to him, and *alle* men of Jerusalem.—WICLIFFE, Mark i.

4. He ghyueth lif to *alle* men, and brething, and *alle* thingis; and made of von *al* kynde of men to inhabit on *al* the face of the erthe.

—WICLIFFE, *Dedis of Apostlis*, xvii.

5. That fadres sone which *alle* thinges wrought;
And *all*, that wrought is with a skilful thought,
The Gost that from the fader gan procede,
Hath souled hem.

CHAUCER, *The Second Nonnes Tale*.

6. And *alle* we that ben in this aray
And maken *all* this lamentation,
We losten *alle* our husbondes at that toun.

CHAUCER, *The Knightes Tale*.

7. A *good* man bryngeth forth *gode* thingis of *good* tresore.—
WICLIFFE, *Matt.* xii.

8. So every *good* tree maketh *gode* fruytis, but an yvel tree maketh yvel fruytes. A *good* tree may not make yvel fruytis, neither an yvel tree may make *gode* fruytis. Every tree that maketh not *good* fruyt schal be cut down.—WICLIFFE, *Matt.* vii.

9. Men loveden more darknessis than light for her werkes weren *yvele*, for ech man that doeth *yvel*, hateth the light.—WICLIFFE, *Jon.* iii.

10. And *othere* seedis felden among thornes wexen up and strangliden hem, and *othere* seedis fedden into good lond and gaven fruyt, sum an hundred fold, *another* sixty fold, an *other* thritty fold, &c.—WICLIFFE, *Matt.* xiii.

11. Yet the while he spake to the puple of *his* mother and *hise* brethren stonden withoute forth.—WICLIFFE, *Matt.* xii.

12. And *hise* disciples camen and token *his* body.—WICLIFFE, *Matt.* xiv.

13. Whan *thise* Bretons tuo were fled out of *this* lond
Ine toke his feaute of alle, &c.

ROB. BRUNE, p. 3.

14. *This* is thilk disciple that bereth witnessyng of *these* thingis, and wroot them.—WICLIFFE, *John* xxi.

15. Seye to us in what powers thou doist *these* thingis, and who is he that gaf to thee *this* power.—WICLIFFE, *Luke* xx.

§ 211. *Those*.—Perhaps the Anglo-Saxon *þá* with *s* added. Perhaps the *þás* from *þis* with its power altered. Rask, in his “Anglo-Saxon Grammar,” writes, “from *þis* we find, in the plural, *þæs* for *þás*. From which afterwards, with a distinction in signification, *these* and *those*.” The English form *they* is illustrated by the Anglo-Saxon form *ðage* = *þá*. The whole doctrine of the forms in question has yet to assume a satisfactory shape.

The present declension of the demonstrative pronouns is as follows:—

I.

The—Undeclined.

II.

She—Defective in the oblique cases.

III.

He.

	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
<i>Nom.</i>	He . .	It (from <i>hit</i>) .	—
<i>Acc.</i> v	Him . .	It	Her.
<i>Dat.</i>	Him . .	—	Her.
<i>Gen.</i>	His . .	—	Her.
<i>Secondary Gen.</i> t	— . .	Its	Hers.
	No plural form.		

IV.

That.

	<i>Neut.</i>	<i>Masc.</i>	<i>Fem.</i>
<i>Sing. Nom.</i> u	That . .	—	—
<i>Acc.</i>	That . .	Than,* then .	—
<i>Dat.</i> b	— . .	—	There.*
<i>Plur. Nom.</i> r	They.†	
<i>Acc.</i> n	Them.†	
<i>Gen.</i> j	Their.†	
<i>Secondary Gen.</i> y	<i>Gen.</i>	Theirs.†	

* Used as adverbs.

† Used as the plurals of *he*, *she*, and *it*.

V.

*Singular, This.**Plural, These.*

VI.

Those.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE RELATIVE, INTERROGATIVE, AND CERTAIN OTHER
PRONOUNS.

§ 212. IN the relative and interrogative pronouns, *who*, *what*, *whom*, *whose*, we have, expressed by a change of form, a neuter gender, *what*; a dative case, *whom*; and a genitive case, *whose*; the true power of the *s* (viz. as the sign of a case) being obscured by the orthographic addition of the *e* mute.

To these may be added, 1, the adverb *why*, originally the ablative form *hvi* (*quo modo? quâ vid?*). 2. The adverb *where*, a feminine dative, like *there*. 3. *When*, a masculine accusative (in Anglo-Saxon *hwæne*), and analogous to *then*.

§ 213. The following remarks (some of them not strictly etymological) apply to a few of the remaining pronouns.

Same.—Wanting in Anglo-Saxon, where it was replaced by the word *ylca*, *ylce*. Probably derived from the Norse.

Self.—In *myself*, *thysself*, *herself*, *ourselves*, *yourselves*, a substantive (or with a substantival power), and preceded by a genitive case. In *himself* and *themselves* an adjective (or with an adjectival power), and preceded by an accusative case. *Itself* is equivocal, since we cannot say whether its elements are *it* and *self*, or *its* and *self*; the *s* having been dropped in utterance. It is very evident that either the form like *himself*, or the form like *thysself*, is exceptionable; in other words, that the use of

the word is inconsistent. As this inconsistency is as old as the Anglo-Saxons, the history of the word gives us no elucidation. In favour of the forms like *myself* (*self* being a substantive), are the following facts:—

1. The plural word *selves*, a substantival, and not an adjectival form.

2. The Middle High-German phrases, *min lîp*, *dîn lîp*, *my body*, *thy body*, equivalent in sense to *myself*, *thyself*.

3. The circumstance that if *self* be dealt with as a substantive, such phrases as *my own self*, *his own great self*, &c., can be used; whereby the language is a gainer.

“Vox *self*, pluraliter *selves*, quamvis etiam pronomen a quibusdam censeatur (quoniam ut plurimum per Latinum *ipse* redditur), est tamen plane nomen substantivum, cui quidem vix aliquod apud Latinos substantivum respondet; proxime tamen accedet vox *persona* vel *propria persona*, ut *my self*, *thy self*, *our selves*, *your selves*, &c. (*ego ipse*, *tu ipse*, *nos ipsi*, *vos ipsi*, &c.), ad verbum *mea persona*, *tua persona*, &c. Fateor tamen *himself*, *itself*, *themselves*, vulgo dici pro *his-self*, *its-self*, *theirselves*; at (interposito *own*) *his own self*, &c., *ipsius propria persona*,” &c.—WALLIS, c. vii.

4. The fact that many persons actually say *hisself* and *theirselves*.

§ 214. *Whit*.—As in the phrase *not a whit*. This enters in the compound pronouns *aught* and *naught*.

One.—As in the phrase *one does so and so*. From the French *on*. Observe that this is from the Latin *homo*, in Old French *hom*, *om*. In the Germanic tongues *man* is used in the same sense: *man sagt* = *one says* = *on dit*. *One*, like *self* and *other*, is so far a substantive, that it is inflected. Gen. sing. *one's own self*: plural, *my wife and little ones are well*.

§ 215. *Derived pronouns*.—*Any*, in Anglo-Saxon, *ænig*. In Old High-German we have *eintc* = *any*, and *einac* = *single*. In Anglo-Saxon *ænega* means *single*. In Middle High-German *einec* is always *single*. In New High-German *einig* means, 1. *a certain person* (*quidam*), 2. *agreeing*; *einzig* meaning

single. In Dutch *énech* has both meanings. This indicates the word *án*, *one*, as the root of the word in question.—GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 9.

§ 216. *Compound pronouns*.—*Which*, as has been already stated more than once, is most incorrectly called the neuter of *who*. Instead of being a neuter, it is a compound word. The adjective *leiks*, *like*, is preserved in the Mæso-Gothic words *galeiks*, and *missaleiks*. In Old High-German the form is *lih*, in Anglo-Saxon *lic*. Hence we have Mæso-Gothic, *hvéleiks*; Old High-German, *huëlih*; Anglo-Saxon, *huilic* and *hvilc*; Old Frisian, *hwelik*; Danish, *hvilc-en*; German, *welch*; Scotch, *whilk*; English, *which*. (GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 47.) The same is the case with—

1. *Such*.—Mæso-Gothic, *svaleiks*; Old High-German, *sólth*; Old Saxon, *sulic*; Anglo-Saxon, *svilc*; German, *solch*; English, *such*. (GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 48.) Rask's derivation of the Anglo-Saxon *swilc* from *swa-ylc*, is exceptionable.

2. *Thilk*.—An old English word, found in the provincial dialects, as *thick*, *thuck*, *theck*, and hastily derived by Tyrwhitt, Ritson, and Weber, from *së ylca*, is found in the following forms: Mæso-Gothic, *þéleiks*; Norse, *þvilikr*. (GRIMM, iii. 49.)

3. *Ilk*.—Found in the Scotch, and always preceded by the article; *the ilk*, or *that ilk*, meaning *the same*. In Anglo-Saxon this word is *ylca*, preceded also by the article *se ylca*, *seó ylce*, *þæt ylce*. In English, as seen above, the word is replaced by *same*. In no other Gothic dialect does it occur. According to Grimm, this is no simple word, but a compound one, of which some such word as *ei* is the first, and *lic* the second element. (*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 50.)

Aught.—In Mæso-Gothic is found the particle *aiv*, *ever*, but only in negative propositions; *ni* (*not*) preceding it. Its Old High-German form is *éo*, *io*; in Middle High-German, *ie*; in New High-German, *je*; in Old Saxon, *io*; in Anglo-Saxon, *d*; in Norse, *æ*. Combined with this particle the word *whit* (*thing*) gives the following forms: Old High-German, *éowiht*;

Anglo-Saxon, *awiht* ; Old Frisian, *awet* ; English, *ought*. The word *naught* is *ought* preceded by the negative particle. (*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 52.)

Each.—The particle *gi* enters, like the particle, in the composition of pronouns. Old High-German, *éogalther*, every one ; *éocalih*, all ; Middle High-German, *iegelich* ; New High-German, *jeglich* ; Anglo-Saxon, *ælc* ; English, *each* ; the *l* being dropped, as in *which* and *such*. *Ælc*, as the original of the English *each* and the Scotch *ilka*,* must by no means be confounded with the word *ylce*, *the same*. (GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 54.)

Every, in Old English, *everich*, *everech*, *everilk one*, is *alc*, preceded by the particle *ever*. (GRIMM, *D. G.* iii. 54.)

Either.—Old High-German, *éogahuëdar* ; Middle High-German, *iegewëder* ; Anglo-Saxon, *æghwüðer*, *æyðer* ; Old Frisian, *eider*.

Neither.—The same, with the negative article prefixed. *Neither* : *either* : : *naught* : *ought*.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE ARTICLES.

§ 217. In the generality of grammars the definite article *the*, and the indefinite article *an*, are the very first parts of speech that are considered. This is exceptionable. So far are they from being essential to language, that, in many dialects, they are wholly wanting. In Greek there is no indefinite, in Latin there is neither an indefinite nor a definite article. In the former language they say *ἀνὴρ τις* = *a certain man* : in the Latin the words *filius patris* mean equally *the son of the father*, *a son of a father*, *a son of the father*, or *the son of a*

* Different from *ilk*

father. In Mæso-Gothic and in Old Norse, there is an equal absence of the indefinite article; or, at any rate, if there be one at all, it is a different word from what occurs in English. In these the Greek $\tau\iota\varsigma$ is expressed by the Gothic root *sum*.

Now, as it is very evident that, as far as the sense is concerned, the words *some man*, *a certain man*, and *a man*, are, there or thereabouts, the same, an exception may be taken to the statement that in Greek and Mæso-Gothic there is no indefinite article. It may, in the present state of the argument, be fairly said that the words *sum* and $\tau\iota\varsigma$ are pronouns with a certain sense, and that *a* and *an* are no more; consequently, that in Greek the indefinite article is $\tau\iota\varsigma$, in Mæso-Gothic *sum*, and in English *a* or *an*.

A distinction, however, may be made. In the expression $\alpha\nu\eta\rho\ \tau\iota\varsigma$ (*aner tis*) = *a certain man*, or *a man*, and in the expression *sum mann*, the words *sum* and $\tau\iota\varsigma$ preserve their natural and original meaning: whilst in *a man* and *an ox* the words *a* and *an* are used in a secondary sense. These words, as is currently known, are one and the same, the *n*, in the form *a*, being ejected through a euphonic process. They are, moreover, the same words with the numeral *one*; Anglo-Saxon, *a'n*; Scotch, *ane*. Now, between the words *a man* and *one man*, there is a difference in meaning; the first expression being the most indefinite. Hence comes the difference between the English and the Mæso-Gothic expressions. In the one word *sum* has a natural, in the other the word *an* has a secondary power.

The same reasoning applies to the word *the*. Compared with *a man*, the words *the man* are very definite. Compared, however, with the words *that man*, they are the contrary: Now, just as *an* and *a* have arisen out of the numeral *one*, so has *the* arisen out of the demonstrative pronoun $\beta\alpha\epsilon\tau$, or at least from some common root. It will be remembered that in Anglo-Saxon there was a form $\beta\epsilon$, undeclined, and common to all the cases of all the numbers.

In no language in its oldest stage is there ever a word

giving, in its primary sense, the ideas of *a* and *the*. As tongues become modern, some noun with a *similar* sense is used to express them. In the course of time a change of form takes place, corresponding to the change of meaning; e. g. *one* becomes *an*, and afterwards *a*. Then it is that articles become looked upon as separate parts of speech, and are dealt with accordingly. No invalidation of this statement is drawn from the Greek language. Although the first page of the etymology gives us $\delta, \eta, \tau\acute{o}$ (*ho, hæ, to*), as the definite articles, the corresponding page in the syntax informs us, that in the oldest stage of the language, δ (*ho*) = *the*, had the power of $\acute{o}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (*howtos*) = *this*.

The origin of the articles seems uniform. In German *ein*, in Danish *en*, stand to *one* in the same relation that *an* does. The French *un*, Italian and Spanish *uno*, are similarly related to *unus* = *one*.

And as, in English *the*, in German *der*, in Danish *den*, come from the demonstrative pronouns, so in the classical languages are the French *le*, the Italian *il* and *lo*, and the Spanish *el*, derived from the Latin demonstrative, *ille*.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CARDINAL NUMBERS.

§ 218. GENERALLY speaking, the greater part of the cardinal numbers are undeclined. As far as *number* goes, this is necessary.

One is naturally and exclusively *singular*.

Two is naturally *dual*.

The rest are naturally and exclusively *plural*.

As to the inflection of gender and case, there is no reason why all the numerals should not be as fully inflected as the

Latin *unus, una, unum, unius*. It is a mere habit of our language that they are not so in English.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE ORDINAL NUMBERS.

§ 219. It has been seen that *-m* was an early sign of the superlative degree. This bears upon the numerals *seven, nine, and ten*.

These are *cardinal* numbers. Nevertheless, the present chapter is the proper place for noticing them.

There is good reason for believing that the final *-n* is no part of the original root. Thus—

a. Sev-en = the Latin *sept-em*, where the *-m* is equivalent to the *-n*. But in the Greek *ἑπτὰ*, and the Scandinavian *syv*, and *sjv*, neither *-n* nor *-m* occurs.

b. Ni-ne.—This same applies here. The Latin form is *nov-em*; but the Greek and Norse are *ἑννέα* and *niu*.

c. Ten.—The older form is *ti-h-un*, in Latin *de-c-em*. The English *-n* is the Latin *-m*. Nevertheless, in the Greek and Norse the forms are *δέκα* and *tio*.

What explains this? The following hypothesis. Some of the best German authorities believe, that the *-m*, expressive of the superlative degree, was also used to denote the *ordinal character (ordinality) of the numerals*; so that the *-m* in *decim-us*, was the *-m* in *ulti-m-us* and *exti-m-us*. This is the first step in the explanation.

The next is, to suppose that certain *cardinal* numerals have taken and retained the *ordinal* form; these being the—

<i>Latin.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Greek.</i>	<i>Norse.</i>
<i>Sept-em</i>	<i>sev-en</i> , as opposed to the	<i>ἑπτὰ</i>	<i>sjau</i> .
<i>Nov-em</i>	<i>ni-ne</i> . . .	<i>ἑννέα</i>	<i>niu</i> .
<i>Dec-em</i>	<i>te-n</i> . . .	<i>δέκα</i>	<i>tíu</i> .

I give no opinion as to the accuracy or erroneousness of this view.

Thir-teen, &c., is *three* with *ten* added, or $3 + 10$.

Thir-ty, &c., is *three tens* (*three decades*), or 3×10 . In Mæso-Gothic we find the *-ty* in the fuller form *tig* = δέκ-ας in Greek.

CHAPTER XX.

ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE NOUN AND VERB, AND ON THE INFLECTION OF THE INFINITIVE MOOD.

§ 220. IN order to understand clearly the use of the so-called infinitive mood in English, it is necessary to bear in mind two facts, one a matter of logic, the other a matter of history.

In the way of logic, the difference between a noun and a verb is less marked than it is in the way of grammar.

Grammatically, the contrast is considerable. The inflection of nouns expresses the ideas of sex as denoted by gender, and of relation in place as denoted by case. That of verbs rarely expresses sex, and never position in space. On the other hand, however, it expresses what no noun ever does or can express; *e. g.* the relation of the agent to the individual speaking, by means of person; the *time* in which acts take place, by means of tense; and the conditions of their occurrence, by means of mood.

The idea of number is the only one that, on a superficial view, is common to these two important parts of speech.

Logically, the contrast is inconsiderable. A noun denotes an object of which either the senses or the intellect can take cognizance, and a verb does no more. *To move* = *motion*, *to rise* = *rising*, *to err* = *error*, *to forgive* = *forgiveness*. The only

difference between the two parts of speech is this, that, whereas a noun may express any object whatever, verbs can only express those objects which consist in an action. And it is this super-added idea of action that superadds to the verb the phenomena of tense, mood, person, and voice; in other words, the phenomena of conjugation.

A noun is a word capable of declension only. A verb is a word capable of declension and conjugation also. The fact of verbs being declined as well as conjugated must be remembered. The participle has the declension of a noun adjective, the infinitive mood the declension of a noun substantive. Gerunds and supines, in languages where they occur, are only names for certain cases of the verb.

Although in all languages the verb is equally capable of declension, it is not equally declined. The Greeks, for instance, used forms like

τὸ φθονεῖν	=	<i>invidia</i> ,
τοῦ φθονεῖν	=	<i>invidiæ</i> ,
ἐν τῷ φθονεῖν	=	<i>in invidiâ</i> ,

oftener than the Romans. The fact of there being an article in Greek may account for this.

In respect to the substantival character of the so-called infinitive mood, we may easily see—

a. The name of any action may be used without any mention of the agent. Thus, we may speak of the simple fact of *walking* or *moving*, independently of any specification of the *walker* or *mover*.

b. That, when actions are spoken of thus indefinitely, the idea of either person or number has no place in the conception; from which it follows that the so-called infinitive mood must be at once impersonal, and without the distinction of singular, dual, and plural.

c. That, nevertheless, the ideas of time and relation in space *have* place in the conception. We can think of a person being *in the act of striking a blow*, of his *having been in the act of striking a blow*, or of his *being about to be in the act of*

striking a blow. We can also think of a person being *in the act of doing a good action*, or of his being *from the act of doing a good action*.

§ 221. This has been written to show that verbs are as naturally declinable as nouns. What follows will show that the verbs of the Gothic languages in particular were actually declined, and that fragments of this declension remain in the present English.

The inflection of the verb in its impersonal (or infinitive) form consisted, in full, of three cases, a nominative (or accusative), a dative, and a genitive. The genitive is put last, because its occurrence in the Gothic language is the least constant.

In Anglo-Saxon the nominative (or accusative) ended in *-an* :

Lufian = *to love* = *amare*.

Bærnan = *to burn* = *urere*.

Syllan = *to give* = *dare*.

Caution.—The *-en* in words like *strengthen*, &c., is a derivational termination, and by no means a representation of the Anglo-Saxon infinitive inflection.

The Anglo-Saxon infinitive inflection is lost in the present English, except in certain provincial dialects.

In Anglo-Saxon the dative of the infinitive verb ended in *-nne*, and was (as a matter of syntax) generally, perhaps always, preceded by the preposition *to*.

To lufienne = *ad amandum*.

To bærenne = *ad urendum*.

To syllanne = *ad dandum*.

The genitive, ending in *-es*, occurs only in Old High-German and Modern High-German, *pldsannes*, *weinnenes*.

With these preliminaries we can take a clear view of the English infinitives. They exist under two forms, and are referable to a double origin.

1. The independent form.—This is used after the words *can*, *may*, *shall*, *will*, and some others, as, *I can speak*, *I may*

go, I shall come, I will move. Here there is no preposition, and the origin of the infinitive is from the form in *-an*.

2. The prepositional form.—This is used after the majority of English verbs, as *I wish to speak, I mean to go, I intend to come, I determine to move.* Here we have the preposition *to* and the origin of the infinitive is from the form in *-nne*.

Expressions like *to err = error, to forgive = forgiveness*, in lines like

“To err is human, to forgive divine,”

are very remarkable. They exhibit the phenomena of a nominative case having grown not only out of a dative, but out of a dative *plus* its governing preposition.

CHAPTER XXI.

ON DERIVED VERBS.

§ 222. OF number, person, mood, tense, and conjugation, special notice is taken in their respective chapters. Of the divisions of verbs into active and passive, transitive and intransitive, unless there be an accompanying change of form, etymology takes no cognisance. The forces of the auxiliary verbs, and the tenses to which they are equivalent, are also points of syntax rather than of etymology.

Four classes, however, of derived verbs, as opposed to simple, especially deserve notice.

1. Those ending in *-en*; as *soften, whiten, strengthen, &c.* Here it has been already remarked that the *-en* is a derivational affix; and not a representative of the Anglo-Saxon infinitive form *-an* (as *lufian, bænan = to love, to burn*), and the Old English *-en* (as *tellen, loven*).

2. Transitive verbs derived from intransitives by a change of the vowel of the root.

<i>Primitive Intransitive Form.</i>	<i>Derived Transitive Form.</i>
Rise	Raise.
Lie	Lay.
Sit	Set.
Fall	Fell.
Drink	Drench.

In Anglo-Saxon these words were more numerous than they are at present. The following list is taken from the "Cambridge Philological Museum," ii. 386.

<i>Intrans. Infinitive.</i>	<i>Trans. Infinitive.</i>
Yrnan, to run	Ærnan, to make to run.
Byrnan, to burn	Bærnan, to make to burn.
Drincan, to drink	Drencan, to drench.
Sincan, to sink	Sencan, to make to sink.
Liegan, to lie	Leegan, to lay.
Sittan, to sit	Settan, to set.
Drifan, to drift	Dræfan, to drive.
Fëallan, to fall	Fyllan, to fell.
Wëallan, to boil	Wyllan, to make to boil.
Flëogan, to fly	A-fligan, to put to flight.
Bëogan, to bow	Bígan, to bend.
Faran, to go	Feran, to convey.
Wacan, to wake	Weccan, to awaken.

All these intransitives form their præterite by a change of vowel, as *sink*, *sank*; all the transitives by the addition of *d* or *t*, as *fell*, *fell'd*.

3. Verbs derived from nouns by a change of accent; as *to survéy*, from a *súrvéy*. Walker attributes the change of accent to the influence of the participial termination *-ing*. All words thus affected are of foreign origin.

4. Verbs formed from nouns by changing a final sharp consonant into its corresponding flat one; as—

<i>The use</i>	<i>to use,</i>	<i>pronounced</i>	<i>uze.</i>
<i>The breath</i>	<i>to breathe</i>	—	<i>breadhe.</i>
<i>The cloth</i>	<i>to clothe</i>	—	<i>clodhe.</i>

CHAPTER XXII.

ON THE PERSONS.

§ 223. COMPARED with the Latin, the Greek, the Mæso-Gothic, and almost all the ancient languages, there is, in English, in respect to the persons of the verbs, but a very slight amount of inflection. This may be seen by comparing the English word *call* with the Latin *voco*.

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>		<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Voc-o.	Voc-amus.		Call.	Call.
2. Voc-as.	Voc-atis.		Call-est.	Call.
3. Voc-at.	Voc-ant.		*Call-eth.	Call.

Here the Latins have different forms for each different person, whilst the English have forms for two only; and even of these one (*callest*) is becoming obsolete. With the forms of *voco* marked in italics there is, in the current English, nothing correspondent.

In the word *am*, as compared with *are* and *art*, we find a sign of the first person singular.

In the old forms *tellen*, *weren*, &c. we have a sign of the plural number.

In the Modern English, the Old English, and the Anglo-Saxon, the peculiarities of our personal inflections are very great. This may be seen from the following tables of comparison:—

*Present Tense, Indicative Mood.**Mæso-Gothic.*

	<i>1st person.</i>	<i>2nd person.</i>	<i>3rd person.</i>
<i>Singular.</i>	Sôkja.	Sôkeis.	Sôkeiþ—seek.
<i>Plural.</i>	Sôkjam.	Sôkeiþ.	Sôkjangd.

* Or *call-s*.

*Present Tense, Indicative Mood.**Old High-German.*

	<i>1st person.</i>	<i>2nd person.</i>	<i>3rd person.</i>
<i>Singular.</i>	Prennu.	Prennis.	Prennit— <i>burn.</i>
<i>Plural.</i>	Prennames.	Prennat,	Prennant.

Icelandic.

<i>Singular.</i>	Kalla.	Kallar.	Kallar— <i>call.</i>
<i>Plural.</i>	Köllum.	Kallip.	Kalla.

Old Saxon.

<i>Singular.</i>	Sökju.	Sökis.	Sökid— <i>seek.</i>
<i>Plural.</i>	Sökjad.	Sökjad.	Sökjad.

Anglo-Saxon.

<i>Singular.</i>	Lufige.	Lufast.	Lufað.
<i>Plural.</i>	Lufiað.	Lufiað.	Lufiað.

Old English.

<i>Singular.</i>	Love.	Lovest.	Loveth.
<i>Plural.</i>	Loven.	Loven.	Loven.

Modern English.

<i>Singular.</i>	Love.	Lovest.	Loveth (or Loves).
<i>Plural.</i>	Love.	Love.	Love.

Herein remark ; 1. the *Anglo-Saxon* addition of *t* in the second person singular ; 2. the identity in form of the three persons of the plural number ; 3. the change of *-að*, into *-en* in the Old English plural ; 4. the total absence of plural forms in the Modern English ; 5. the change of the *th* into *s*, in *loveth* and *loves*.

§ 224. The present state of the personal inflection in English, so different from that of the older languages, has been brought about by two processes.

1. *Change of form.*—^a) The ejection of *-es* in *-mes*, as in *sökjam* and *köllum*, compared with *prennames* ; ^b) the ejection of *-m*, as in the first person singular, almost throughout ; ^c) the change of *-s* into *-r*, as in the Norse *kallar*, compared with the Germanic *sökeis* ; ^d) the ejection of *-d* from *-nd*, as in *loven* (if this

be the true explanation of that form) compared with *prennant*; °) the ejection of *-nd*, as in *kalla*; †) the addition of *-t*, as in *lufast* and *lovest*. In all these cases we have a change of form.

2. *Confusion or extension*.—In vulgarisms like *I goes, I is*, one person is used instead of another. In vulgarisms like *I are, we goes*, one number is used instead of another. In vulgarisms like *I be tired, or if I am tired*, one mood is used instead of another. In vulgarisms like *I give for I gave*, one tense is used for another. In all this there is confusion. There is also extension: since, in the phrase *I is*, the third person is used instead of the first; in other words, it is used with an extension of its natural meaning. It has the power of the third person + that of the first. In the course of time one person may entirely supplant, supersede, or replace another. The application of this is as follows:—

The only person of the plural number originally ending in *ǫ* is the second; as *sókeiþ, prennat, kallip, lufiaǫ*; the original ending of the first person being *-mes* or *-m*, as *prennames, sókjam, köllum*. Now, in Anglo-Saxon, the other two persons end in *ǫ*, as *lufiaǫ*. Has *-m*, or *-mes*, changed to *ǫ*, or has the second person superseded the first? The latter alternative seems the likelier.

§ 225. The detail of the persons seems to be as follows:—

I call, first person singular.—The word *call* is not one person more than another. It is the simple verb, wholly uninflected. It is very probable that the first person was the one where the characteristic termination was first lost. In the Modern Norse language it is replaced by the second: *Jeg taler* = *I speak*, Danish.

Thou callest, second person singular.—The final *-t* appears throughout the Anglo-Saxon, although wanting in Old Saxon. In Old High-German it begins to appear in Otfred, and is general in Notker. In Middle High-German and New High-German it is universal.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, i. 1041. 857.

He calleth or he calls, third person singular.—The *-s* in *calls* is the *-th* in *calleth*, changed. The Norse form *kallar* either

derives its *-r* from the *-th* by way of change, or else the form is that of the second person replacing the first.

Lufiað, Anglo-Saxon, first person plural.—The second person in place of the first. The same in Old Saxon.

Lufiað, Anglo-Saxon, third person plural.—Possibly changed from *-ND*, as in *sökjand*. Possibly the second person.

Loven, Old English.—For all the persons of the plural. This form may be accounted for in three ways: 1. The *-m* of the Mæso-Gothic and Old High-German became *-n*; as it is in the Middle and Modern German, where all traces of the original *-m* are lost. In this case the first person has replaced the other two. 2. The *-nd* may have become *-n*; in which case it is the third person that replaces the others. 3. The indicative form *loven* may have arisen out of a subjunctive one; since there was in Anglo-Saxon the form *lufion*, or *lufian*, subjunctive.

§ 226. *The person in -T.*—*Art, wast, wert, shalt, wilt.* Here the second person singular ends, not in *-st*, but in *-t*. A reason for this (though not wholly satisfactory) we find in the Mæso-Gothic and the Icelandic.

In those languages the form of the person changes with the tense, and the second singular of the præterite tense of one conjugation is not *-s*, but *-t*; as Mæso-Gothic, *svôr = I swore*, *svôrt = thou swarest*, *gráip = I griped*, *gráipt = thou gripedst*; Icelandic, *brannt = thou burnest*, *gaft = thou gavest*. In the same languages ten verbs are conjugated like præterites. Of these, in each language, *skal* is one.

Mæso-Gothic.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Dual.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. Skal.	Skulu.	Skulum.
2. Skalt.	Skuluts.	Skuluþ.
3. Skall.	Skuluts.	Skulun.

Icelandic.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. Skall.	Skulum.
2. Skalt.	Skuluð.
3. Skal.	Skulu.

§ 227. *Thou spakest, thou brakest, thou sungest.*—In these forms there is a slight though natural anomaly. The second singular præterite in A. S. was formed not in *-st*, but in *-e*; as *pú funde = thou foundest, pú sunge = thou sungest*. Hence, the present English termination is derived from the present. Observe that this applies only to the præterites formed by changing the vowel—the *strong* præterites so-called. *Thou loved'st* is Anglo-Saxon as well as English, viz. *pú lufodest*.

Again, in A. S., the vowel of the plural of certain (so-called) strong præterites was different from that of the singular.

More than this—the vowel of the *second person singular* was different from that of the first and third, but the *same* as that of the plural. Hence—

<i>Singular.</i>		<i>Plural.</i>
1. Ic sang.		1. We sungon.
2. þu sunge.		2. Ge sungon.
3. He sang.		3. Hi sungon.

Is this difference still existing or is it obsolete? It is obsolete. The only persons who use the second person singular at all are the Quakers, and I have specially inquired of many of them whether they draw any distinction in respect to correctness or incorrectness between the form in *u* and the form in *a*. No one, however, has recognised it.

Thou sangest, then, is a form to the evolution of which two irregularities have contributed.

1. The vowel of the first and third persons displaced that of the third.

2. The *-est* of the present displaced the simple *-e* of the original præterite.

Probably, this adoption of the plural vowel in the singular second person, is only another result of the principle by which we say *you* for *thou*.

In the northern dialects of the Anglo-Saxon the *-ø* of plurals

like *lufiað* = *we love* becomes *-s*. In the Scottish this change was still more prevalent :—

The Scottes come that to this day
Havys, and Scotland haldyn ay.

WINTOUN, 11, 9, 73.

James I. of England ends nearly all his plurals in *-s*.

CHAPTER XXIII.

ON THE NUMBERS OF VERBS.

§ 228. THE inflection of the present tense, not only in Anglo-Saxon, but in several other languages as well, has been given in the preceding chapter. As compared with the present plural forms, *we love*, *ye love*, *they love*, both the Anglo-Saxon *we lufiað*, *ge lufiað*, *hi lufiað*, and the Old English *we loven*, *ye loven*, *they loven*, have a peculiar termination for the plural number which the present language wants. In other words, the Anglo-Saxon and the Old English have a plural *personal* characteristic, whilst the Modern English has nothing to correspond with it.

The word *personal* is printed in italics. It does not follow, that, because there is no plural *personal* characteristic, there is also no plural characteristic.

There is no reason against the inflection of the word *love* running thus :— *I love*, *thou lovest*, *he loves* ; *we lave*, *ye lave*, *they lave* ; in other words, there is no reason against the vowel of the root being changed with the number. In such a case there would be no *personal* inflection, though there would be a plural, or a *numeral*, inflection.

Now, in Anglo-Saxon, with a great number of verbs such a plural inflection not only actually takes place, but takes place most regularly. It takes place, however, in the past tense only.

And this is the case in all the Gothic languages as well as in Anglo-Saxon. Amongst the rest, in—

Mæso-Gothic.

Skáin, <i>I shone</i> ; skinum, <i>we shone.</i>	Gab, <i>I gave</i> ; gëbum, <i>we gave.</i>
Smáit, <i>I smote</i> ; smitum, <i>we smote.</i>	At, <i>I ate</i> ; étum, <i>we ate.</i>
Káus, <i>I chose</i> ; kusum, <i>we chose.</i>	Stal, <i>I stole</i> ; stêlum, <i>we stole.</i>
Láug, <i>I lied</i> ; lugum, <i>we lied.</i>	Qvam, <i>I came</i> ; qvêmun, <i>we came.</i>

Anglo-Saxon.

Arn, <i>I ran</i> ; urnon, <i>we run.</i>	Dranc, <i>I drank</i> ; druncon, <i>we drunk.</i>
Ongan, <i>I began</i> ; ongunnon, <i>we begun.</i>	Sanc, <i>I sank</i> ; suncon, <i>we sunk.</i>
Span, <i>I span</i> ; spunnon, <i>we spun.</i>	Sprang, <i>I sprang</i> ; spruncon, <i>we sprung.</i>
Sang, <i>I sang</i> ; sungon, <i>we sung.</i>	Swam, <i>I swam</i> ; swummon, <i>we swum.</i>
Swang, <i>I swang</i> ; swungon, <i>we swung.</i>	Rang, <i>I rang</i> ; runcon, <i>we rung.</i>

For the bearings of this fact, see the chapter on the Strong Præterites.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ON MOODS.

§ 229. THE Anglo-Saxon infinitive has already been considered.

Between the second plural imperative, and the second plural indicative, *speak ye* and *ye speak*, there is no difference of form. Between the second singular imperative *speak*, and the second singular indicative *speakest*, there is a difference in form. Still, as the imperative form *speak* is distinguished from the indicative form *speakest*, by the negation of a character rather than by the possession of one, it cannot be said that there is in English any imperative mood.

If he speak, as opposed to *if he speaks*, is characterised by a negative sign only, and consequently is no true example of a subjunctive. *Be*, as opposed to *am*, in the sentence *if it be so*, is an uninflected word used in a limited sense, and consequently no true example of a subjunctive.

The only true subjunctive inflection in the English language is that of *were* and *wert*, as opposed to the indicative forms *was* and *wast*.

INDICATIVE.		SUBJUNCTIVE.	
<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>	<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
1. I was.	We were.	If I were.	If we were.
2. Thou wast.	Ye were.	If thou wert.	If ye were.
3. He was.	They were.	If he were.	If they were.

CHAPTER XXV.

ON TENSES IN GENERAL.

§ 230. THE nature of tenses in general is best exhibited by reference to the Greek; since in that language they are more numerous, and more strongly marked than elsewhere.

In Greek $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$ (*typtó*) = *I am beating*, $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\nu$ (*etypton*) = *I was beating*; $\tau\acute{\upsilon}\psi\omega$ (*typsó*) = *I shall beat*; $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\psi\alpha$ (*etypsa*) = *I beat*; $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\phi\alpha$ (*tetyfa*) *I have beaten*; $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\tau\upsilon\phi\epsilon\iota\nu$ (*etetyfein*) = *I had beaten*. In these words we have, of the same mood, the same voice, and the same conjugation, six different tenses; whereas, in English, there are but two. The forms $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\phi\alpha$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\psi\alpha$ are so strongly marked, that we recognise them wheresoever they occur. The first is formed by a reduplication of the initial τ , and, consequently, may be called the reduplicate form. As a tense, it is called the perfect.

In the form $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\psi\alpha$ an ϵ is prefixed, and a σ is added. In the allied language of Italy the ϵ disappears, whilst the σ (s)

other words, a perfect tense as well as an aorist. It is by the possession of this form that the verbs of the first six conjugations are characterized.

1st.	Falpa, <i>I fold</i>	.	Fáifalþ, <i>I have folded, or I folded.</i>
	Halda, <i>I feed</i>	.	Háihald, <i>I have fed, or I fed.</i>
	Haha, <i>I hang</i>	.	Háihah, <i>I have hanged, or I hanged.</i>
2nd.	Háita, <i>I call</i>	.	Háiháit, <i>I have called, or I called.</i>
	Láika, <i>I play</i>	.	Láiláik, <i>I have played, or I played.</i>
3rd.	Hláupa, <i>I run</i>	.	Hláiláup, <i>I have run, or I ran.</i>
4th.	Slêpa, <i>I sleep</i>	.	Sáizlêp, <i>I have slept, or I slept.</i>
5th.	Láia, <i>I laugh</i>	.	Láilô, <i>I have laughed, or I laughed.</i>
	Sáija, <i>I sow</i>	.	Sáisô, <i>I have sown, or I sowed.</i>
6th.	Grôta, <i>I weep</i>	.	Gáigrôt, <i>I have wept, or I wept.</i>
	Têka, <i>I touch</i>	.	Táitôk, <i>I have touched, or I touched.</i>

In Mæso-Gothic, as in Latin, the perfect forms have, besides their own, an aorist sense, and *vice versâ*.

In Mæso-Gothic, as in Latin, few (if any) words are found in both forms.

In Mæso-Gothic, as in Latin, the two forms are dealt with as a single tense; *láilô* being called the præterite of *láia*, and *svôr* the præterite of *svara*. The true view, however, is that, in Mæso-Gothic, as in Latin, there are two past tenses, each having a certain latitude of meaning, and each, in certain words, replacing the other.

The reduplicate form, in other words, the perfect tense, is current in none of the Gothic languages except the Mæso-Gothic. A trace of it is said to be found in the Anglo-Saxon, in the word *heht*, which is considered to be *hê-ht*, the Mæso-Gothic *háiháit*, *vocavi*.—(*Cambridge Philological Museum*, ii. 378.) *Did* from *do* is also considered to be a reduplicate form. (*See below*.)

§ 232. In the English language the tense corresponding in power with the Greek aorist and the Latin forms like *vixi*, is formed after two modes; 1, as in *fell*, *sang*, and *took*, from *fall*, *sing*, and *take*, by changing the vowel of the present; 2, as in

moved and *wept*, from *move* and *weep*, by the addition of *d* or *t*; the *d* or *t* not being found in the original word, but being a fresh element added to it. In forms, on the contrary, like *sang* and *fell*, no addition being made, no new element appears. The vowel, indeed, is changed, but nothing is added. Verbs, then, of the first sort, may be said to form their præterites out of themselves; whilst verbs of the second sort require something from without. To speak in a metaphor, words like *sang* and *fell* are comparatively independent. Be this as it may, the German grammarians call the tenses formed by a change of vowel the *Strong* tenses, the *Strong* verbs, the *Strong* conjugation, or the *Strong* order; and those formed by the addition of *d* or *t*, the *Weak* tenses, the *Weak* verbs, the *Weak* conjugation, or the *Weak* order. *Bound, spoke, gave, lay, &c.*, are *Strong*; *moved, favoured, instructed, &c.*, are *Weak*.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SO-CALLED STRONG PRÆTERITES.

§ 233. THE Strong præterites are formed from the present by changing the vowel.

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>
fall	fell	throw	threw
befall	befell	beat	beat
hold	held	weave	wove
draw	drew	freeze	froze
slay	slew	steal	stole
fly	flew	speak	spoke
blow	blew	swear	swore
crow	crew	bear	bore
know	knew	forbear	forbore
grow	grew	tear	tore

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>
wear	wore	climb	clomb
break	broke	bite	bit
shake	shook	*swim	swam
take	took	*begin	began
forsake	forsook	*spin	spun
get	got	win	won
beget	begot	*sing	sang
forget	forgot	*spring	sprung
eat	ate	*sting	stung
tread	trod	*ring	rang
come	came	*wring	wrung
overcome	overcame	*fling	flung
become	became	*cling	clung
bid	bade	*string	strung
forbid	forbade	*sling	slung
give	gave	*sink	sunk
forgive	forgave	*drink	drank
wake	woke	*shrink	shrank
strike	struck	dig	dug
arise	arose	stick	stuck
abide	abode	run	ran
smite	smote	burst	burst
ride	rode	bind	bound
stride	strode	find	found
drive	drove	grind	ground
thrive	throve	wind	wound
strive	strove	choose	chose.
write	wrote		

How far can these varied forms be reduced to rule? What are the divisions and sub-divisions of the so-called *Strong* class?

Before we consider this let us be sure that we have got the full amount of irregularity—real or apparent. Now we do not get this until we have noted a fact connected with those verbs of the above-given list which are marked with an asterisk.

To each and all of these there are (or have been at some

earlier stage of the language) two præterites, one of which is formed in *a* (as *swam*), and the other in *u* (as *swum*), as—

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite in a.</i>	<i>Præterite in u.</i>
swim	swam	swum
begin	began	begun
sing	sang	sung
sink	sank	sunken
drink	drank	drunk.

Such is the fact. Its explanation lies in the facts of chapter xxiii.

There we learn that in A. S. several præterites changed, in the plural, the vowel of their singular.

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
Ic sang = I sang	We sungon = We sung
þu sunga = Thou sungest	Ge sungon = Ye sung
He sang = He sang.	Hi sungon = They sung.

What inference is clearer than that the præterite in *a* comes from the singular, and the præterite in *u* from the plural of the A. S. ?

The verbs wherein the double form of the present præterite is thus explained, fall into two classes.

1. In the first class, the Anglo-Saxon forms were *á* in the singular, and *i* in the plural ; as—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
sceán (<i>I shone</i>)	scinon (<i>we shone</i>)
arás (<i>I arose</i>)	arison (<i>we arose</i>)
smát (<i>I smote</i>).	smiton (<i>we smote</i>)

This accounts for—

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præt. from Sing. form.</i>	<i>Præt. from Plur. form.</i>
rise	rose	*ris
smite	smote	smit
ride	rode	*rid

* The forms marked thus * are either obsolete or provincial.

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præt. from Sing. form.</i>	<i>Præt. from Plur. form.</i>
stride	strode	strid
slide	*slode	slid
chide	*chode	chid
drive	drove	*driv
thrive	throve	*thriv
write	wrote	writ
slit	*slat	slit
bite	*bat	bit.

2. In the second class, the Anglo-Saxon forms were *a* in the singular, and *u* in the plural; as—

<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
band	bundon (<i>we bound</i>)
fand	fundon (<i>we found</i>)
grand	grundon (<i>we ground</i>)
wand.	wundon (<i>we wound</i>).

This accounts for—

<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præt. from Sing. form.</i>	<i>Præt. from Plur. form.</i>
swim	swam	swum
begin	began	begun
spin	*span	spun
sing	sang	sung
swing	*swang	swung
spring	sprang	sprung
sting	*stang	stung
ring	rang	rung
wring	*wring	wrung
fling	flang	flung
string	*strang	strung
sink	sank	sunk
drink	drank	drunk
shrink	shrank	shrunken
stink	*stank	stunk
burst	*braст	burst
bind	*band	bound
find	*fand	found.

* The forms marked thus * are either obsolete or provincial.

This is as much as need, at present, be said respecting the so-called Strong Præterites.

Whatever they are, they are anything but *Irregular*, as may be seen after the consideration of the Weak Præterites and the Participles.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE SO-CALLED WEAK PRÆTERITES.

§ 234. THE præterite tense of the so-called Weak Verbs is formed by the addition of *-d* or *-t*. If necessary, the syllable *-ed* is substituted for *-d*.

The current statement that the syllable *-ed*, rather than the letter *-d*, is the sign of the præterite tense, is true only in regard to the written language. In *stabbed, moved, bragged, whizzed, judged, filled, slurred, slammed, shunned, barred, strewed*, the *e* is a point of spelling only. In *language*, except in declamation, there is no second vowel sound. The *-d* comes in immediate contact with the final letter of the original word, and the number of syllables remains the same as it was before.

When, however, the original word ends in *-d* or *-t*, as *slight* or *brand*, then, and then only (and that not always), is there the addition of the syllable *-ed*; as in *slighted, branded*. This is necessary, since the combinations *slightt* and *brandd* are unpronounceable.

Whether the addition be *-d* or *-t* depends upon the flatness or sharpness of the preceding letter.

After *b, v, th* (as in *clothe*), *g*, or *z*, the addition is *-d*.

This is a matter of necessity. We say *stabd*, *móvd*, *clóthd*, *braggd*, *whizzd*, because *stabt*, *móvt*, *clóht*, *braggt*, *whizzt*, are unpronounceable.

After *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, *w*, *y*, or a vowel, the addition is also *-d*. This is no matter of necessity, but simply the *habit* of the English language. *Filt*, *slurt*, *strayt*, &c. are as pronounceable as *filld*, *shurrd*, *strayd*, &c. It is the habit, however, of the English language to prefer the latter forms. All this, as the reader has probably observed, is merely the reasoning concerning the *s*, in words like *father's*, &c., applied to another letter and to another part of speech.

§ 235. The verbs of the Weak conjugation fall into three classes. In the first there is the simple addition of *-d*, *-t*, or *-ed*.

Serve, served.	Dip, dipped (<i>dípt</i>)
Cry, cried.	Slip, slipped (<i>slípt</i>).
Betray, betrayed.	Step, stepped (<i>stépt</i>).
Expel, expelled.	Look, looked (<i>lookt</i>).
Accuse, accused.	Pluck, plucked (<i>pluckt</i>).
Instruct, instructed.	Toss, tossed (<i>tóst</i>).
Invite, invited.	Push, pushed (<i>pusht</i>).
Waste, wasted.	Confess, confessed (<i>confest</i>).

To this class belong the greater part of the Weak Verbs and all verbs of foreign origin.

In the second class, besides the addition of *-t* or *-d*, the vowel is *shortened*. It also contains those words which end in *-d* or *-t*, and at the same time have a short vowel in the præterite. Such, amongst others, are *cut*, *cost*, &c., where the two tenses are alike, and *bend*, *rend*, &c., where the præterite is formed from the present by changing *-d* into *-t*, as *bent*, *rent*, &c.

In the following list, the words ending in *-p* are remarkable; since, in Anglo-Saxon, each of them had, instead of a Weak, a Strong præterite.

Leave, left.	Creep, crept.
Cleave, cleft.	Sleep, slept.
Bereave, bereft.	Leap, leapt.
Deal, dealt.	Keep, kept.
Feel, felt.	Weep, wept.
Dream, dreamt.	Sweep, swept.
Lean, leant.	Lose, lost.
Learn, learnt.	Flee, fled.

In this class we sometimes find *-t* where the *-d* is expected; the forms being *left* and *dealt*, instead of *leaved* and *dealed*.

Third class.—In the second class the vowel of the present tense was *shortened* in the præterite. In the third class it is *changed*.

Tell, told.		Sell, sold.
Will, would.		Shall, should.

To this class belong the remarkable præterites of the verbs *seek*, *beseech*, *catch*, *teach*, *bring*, *think*, and *buy*, viz. *sought*, *besought*, *caught*, *taught*, *brought*, *thought*, and *bought*. In all these, the final consonant is either *g* or *k*, or else a sound allied to those mutes. When the tendency of these sounds to become *h* and *y*, as well as to undergo further changes, is remembered, the forms in point cease to seem anomalous. In *wrought*, from *work*, there is a transposition. In *laid* and *said* the present forms make a show of regularity which they have not. The true original forms should be *legde* and *sægde*, the infinitives being *lecgan*, *secgan*. In these words the *i* represents the semi-vowel *y*, into which the original *g* was changed. The Anglo-Saxon forms of the other words are as follows:—

Byegan, bóhte.		Bringan, bróhte.
Sêcan, sóhte.		þencan, þóhte.
Wyrcan, wórhte.		

§ 236. Out of the three classes into which the Weak Verbs

in Anglo-Saxon are divided, only one takes a vowel before the *d* or *t*. The other two add the syllables *-te*, or *-de*, to the last letter of the original word. The vowel that, in one out of the three Anglo-Saxon classes, precedes *d* is *o*. Thus we have *lufian*, *lufode*; *clypian*, *clypode*. In the other two classes the forms are respectively *bærnan*, *bærnde*; and *tellan*, *tealde*, no vowel being found. The participle, however, as stated above, ended, not in *-de* or *-te*, but in *-d* or *-t*; and in two out of three classes it was preceded by a vowel, *gelufod*, *bærned*, *geteald*. Now in those conjugations where no vowel preceded the *d* of the præterite, and where the original word ended in *-d* or *-t*, a difficulty, which has already been indicated, arose. To add the sign of the præterite to a word like *eard-ian* (*to dwell*) was an easy matter, inasmuch as *eard-ian* was a word belonging to the first class, and in the first class the præterite was formed in *-ode*. Here the vowel *o* kept the two *d*'s from coming in contact. With words, however, like *métan* and *sendan*, this was not the case. Here no vowel intervened; so that the natural præterite forms were *met-te*, *send-de*, combinations wherein one of the letters ran every chance of being dropped in the pronunciation. Hence, with the exception of the verbs in the first class, words ending in *-d* or *-t* in the root admitted no additional *d* or *t* in the præterite. This difficulty, existing in the present English as it existed in the Anglo-Saxon, modifies the præterites of most words ending in *-t* or *-d*.

In several verbs there is the actual addition of the syllable *-ed*; in other words *d* is separated from the last letter of the original word by the addition of a vowel; as *ended*, *instructed*, &c.

In several verbs the final *-d* is changed into *-t*, as *bend*, *bent*; *rend*, *rent*; *send*, *sent*; *gild*, *gilt*; *build*, *built*; *spend*, *spent*, &c.

In several verbs the vowel of the root is changed; as *feed*, *fed*; *bleed*, *bled*; *breed*, *bred*; *meet*, *met*; *speed*, *sped*; *rēad*, *rēad*, &c. Words of this last-named class cause occa-

sional difficulty to the grammarian. No addition is made to the root, and, in this circumstance, they agree with the Strong Verbs. Moreover, there is a change of the vowel. In this circumstance also they agree with the Strong Verbs. Hence with forms like *fed* and *led* we are in doubt as to the Conjugation. This doubt we have three means of settling.

1. *By the form of the Participle.*—The *-en* in *beaten* shows that the word *beat* is Strong.

2. *By the nature of the Vowel.*—The Weak form of *to beat* would be *bet*, after the analogy of *feed* and *read*.

3. *By a knowledge of the Older forms.*—The A. S. form is *beáte*, *beot*. There is no such a Weak form as *beáte*, *bætte*. The præterite of *sendan* is *sende*, Weak. There is in A. S. no such form as *sand*, Strong.

In all this we see a series of expedients for separating the præterite form from the present, when the root ends with the same sound with which the affix begins.

The change from a long vowel to a short one, as in *feed*, *fed*, &c., can only take place where there is a long vowel to be changed.

Where the vowels are short, and, at the same time, the word ends in *d*, the *d* of the present may become *t* in the præterite. Such is the case with *bend*, *bent*.

Where there is no long vowel to shorten, and no *d* to change into *t*, the two tenses, of necessity, remain alike; such is the case with *cut*, *cost*, &c., &c.

§ 237. Certain *so-called* irregularities may now be noticed.—*Made*, *had*.—In these words there is nothing remarkable but the ejection of a consonant. The Anglo-Saxon forms are *macode* and *hafde*, respectively.

Would, *should*, *could*.—It must not be imagined that *could* is in the same predicament with these words. In *will* and *shall* the *-l* is part of the original word. This is not the case with *can*.

Yode.—Instead of *goed*, a regular præterite from *go*, now

obsolete, and replaced by *went*, the præterite of *wend*,—*he wends his way—he went his way*. Except that the initial *g* has become *y*, and the *e* follows instead of preceding the *d* (a mere point of spelling), there is nothing peculiar in this word.

For *could*, *ought*, *minded*, and *did*, see the following chapters.

This is as much as need, at present, be said about the so-called Weak præterites.

Whatever they are, they are anything but *Irregular*.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE.

§ 238. THE present participle, called also the active participle and the participle in *-ing*, is formed from the original word by adding *-ing*; as, *move*, *moving*. In the older languages the termination was more marked, being *-nd*. Like the Latin participle in *-ns*, it was originally declined. The Mæso-Gothic and Old High-German forms are *habands* and *hapéntér* = *having*, respectively. The *-s* in the one language, and the *-ér* in the other, are the signs of the case and gender. In the Old Saxon and Anglo-Saxon the forms are *-and* and *-ande*; as *bindand*, *bindande* = *binding*. In all the Norse languages, ancient and modern, the *-d* is preserved. So it is in the Old Lowland Scotch, and in many of the modern provincial dialects of England, where *strikind*, *goand*, is said for *striking*, *going*. In Staffordshire, where the *-ing* is pronounced *-ingg*, there is a fuller sound than that of the current English. In Old English the form in *-nd* is predominant, in Middle English the use fluctuates, and in New English the termination *-ing* is uni-

versal. In the Scotch of the modern writers we find the form *-in*.

The rising sun o'er Galston muirs
 Wi' glorious light was glintin' ;
 The hares were hirplin' down the furs,
 'The lav'rocks they were chantin'.

BURNS' *Holy Fair*.

§ 239. It has often been remarked that the participle is used in many languages as a substantive. This is true in Greek—

Ὁ πρᾶσσω = *the actor*, when a male.

Ἡ πρᾶσσοῦσα = *the actor*, when a female.

τὸ πρᾶρτον = *the active principle of a thing*.

But it is also stated, that, in the English language, the participle is used as a substantive in a greater degree than elsewhere, and that it is used in several cases and in both numbers, *e. g.*—

Rising early is healthy.

There is health *in rising* early.

This is the advantage *of rising* early.

The *risings* in the North, &c.

Archbishop Whately has some remarks on this substantival power, in his "Logic."

Some remarks of Mr. R. Taylor, in the Introduction to his edition of Tooke's "Diversions of Purley," modify this view. According to these, the *-ing* in words like *rising* is not the *-ing* of the present participle; neither has it originated in the Anglo-Saxon *-end*. It is rather the *-ing* in words like *morning*, which is anything but a participle of the non-existent verb *morn*, and which has originated in the Anglo-Saxon substantival termination *-ung*. Upon this Rask writes as follows:—
 "Gitsung, gewilnung = *desire*; swutlung = *manifestation*; clænsung = *a cleansing*; sceawung = *view, contemplation*; eorð-beofung = *an earthquake*; gesomnung = *an assembly*. This

termination is chiefly used in forming substantives from verbs of the first class in *-ian*; as, *hālgung* = consecration, from *hālgian* = to consecrate. These verbs are all feminine."—*Anglo-Saxon Grammar*, p. 107.

Now, whatever may be the theory of the origin of the termination *-ing* in old phrases like *rising early is healthy*, it cannot apply to expressions of recent introduction. Here the direct origin in *-ung* is out of the question.

The view, then, that remains to be taken of the forms in question is this:—

1. That the older forms in *-ing* are substantival in origin, and = the Anglo-Saxon *-ung*.

2. That the latter ones are participial, and have been formed on a false analogy.

CHAPTER XXIX.

THE PAST PARTICIPLE.

§ 240. THE participle in *-en*.—In the Anglo-Saxon this participle was declined like the adjectives. Like the adjectives, it is, in the present English, undeclined.

In Anglo-Saxon it always ended in *-en*, as *sungen*, *funden*, *bunden*. In English this *-en* is often wanting, as *found*, *bound*; the word *bounden* being antiquated. Words where the *-en* is wanting may be viewed in two lights; 1, they may be looked upon as participles that have lost their termination; 2, they may be considered as præterites with a participial sense.

Drank, *drunk*, *drunken*.—With all words wherein the vowel of the plural differs from that of the singular, the participle takes the plural form. To say *I have drunk*, is to use an

ambiguous expression ; since *drunk* may be either a participle *minus* its termination, or a præterite with a participial sense. To say *I have drunk*, is to use a præterite for a participle. To say *I have drunken*, is to use an unexceptionable form.

In all words with a double form, as *spake* and *spoke*, *brake* and *broke*, *clave* and *clove*, the participle follows the form in *o*, as *spoken*, *broken*, *cloven*. *Spaken*, *braken*, *claven*, are impossible forms. There are degrees in laxity of language, and to say *the spear is broke* is better than to say *the spear is brake*.

These two statements bear upon the future history of the præterite. That of the two forms *sang* and *sung*, one will, in the course of language, become obsolete, is nearly certain ; and, as the plural form is also that of the participle, it is the plural form which is most likely to be the surviving one.

As a general rule, we find the participle in *-en* wherever the præterite is strong ; indeed, the participle in *-en* may be called the strong participle, or the participle of the strong conjugation. Still the two forms do not always coincide. In *mow*, *mowed*, *mown* ; *sow*, *sowed*, *sown* ; and several other words, we find the participle strong, and the præterite weak. I remember no instances of the converse. This is only another way of saying that the præterite has a greater tendency to pass from strong to weak than the participle.

§ 241. In the Latin language the change from *s* to *r*, and *vice versâ*, is very common. We have the double forms *arbor* and *arbos*, *honor* and *honos*, &c. Of this change we have a few specimens in English. The words *rear* and *raise*, as compared with each other, are examples. In Anglo-Saxon a few words undergo a similar change in the plural number of the strong præterites.

Ceóse, *I choose* ; ceás, *I chose* ; curon, *we chose* ; gecoren, *chosen*.

Forleóse, *I lose* ; forleás, *I lost* ; forluron, *we lost* ; forloren, *lost*.

Hreose, *I rush* ; hreás, *I rushed* ; hrunon, *we rushed* ; gehroren, *rushed*.

This accounts for the participial form *forlorn* or *lost*, in New High-German *verloren*. In Milton's lines,

. the piercing air
Burns *frore*, and cold performs the effect of fire.

Paradise Lost, b. ii.

we have a form from the Anglo-Saxon participle *gefroren* = *frozen*.

§ 242. The participle in *-d*, *-t*, or *-ed*.—In the Anglo-Saxon this participle was declined like the adjective. Like the adjective, it is, in the present English, undeclined.

In Anglo-Saxon it differed in form from the præterite, inasmuch as it ended in *-ed*, or *t*, whereas the præterite ended in *-ode*, *-de*, or *-te*: as *lufode*, *bærnde*, *dypte*, præterites; *gelufod*, *bærned*, *dypt*, participles.

As the ejection of the *e* reduces words like *bærned* and *bærnde* to the same form, it is easy to account for the present identity of form between the weak præterites and the participles in *-d*: e. g. *I moved*, *I have moved*, &c.

§ 243. In the older writers, and in works written, like Thomson's "Castle of Indolence," in imitation of them, we find prefixed to the præterite participle the letter *y*-, as *yclept* = *called*; *yclad* = *clothed*; *ydrad* = *dreaded*.

The following are the chief facts and the current opinion concerning this prefix:—

1. It has grown out of the fuller forms *ge-*: Anglo-Saxon, *ge-*: Old Saxon, *gi-*: Mæso-Gothic, *ga-*: Old High-German, *ka-*, *cha-*, *ga-*, *ki-*, *gi-*.

2. It occurs in each and all of the Proper German languages of the Gothic stock.

3. It occurs, with a few fragmentary exceptions, in none of the Scandinavian languages of the Gothic stock.

4. In Anglo-Saxon it occasionally indicates a difference of sense; as *hâten* = *called*, *ge-hâten* = *promised*; *boren* = *borne*, *ge-boren* = *born*.

5. It occurs in nouns as well as verbs.

6. Its power, in the case of nouns, is generally some idea of *association* or *collection*.—Mæso-Gothic, *sinþs* = a journey, *ga-sinþa* = a companion; Old High-German, *perc* = hill; *ki-perki* (*ge-birge*) = a range of hills.

7. But it has also a *frequentative* power; a frequentative power which is, in all probability, secondary to its collective power: since things which recur frequently recur with a tendency to collection or association; Middle High-German, *ge-rassel* = rustling; *ge-rumpel* = c-rumple.

8. And it has also the power of expressing the possession of a quality.

<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>English.</i>	<i>Anglo-Saxon.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>
feax	hair	ge-feax	comatus
heorte	heart	ge-heort	cordatus
stence	odour	ge-stence	odorus.

This power is also a collective, since every quality is associated with the object that possesses it: *a sea with waves* = a wavy sea.

9. Hence it is probable that the *ga-*, *ki-*, or *gi-*, Gothic, is the *cum* of Latin languages. Such is Grimm's view, as given in *Deutsche Grammatik*, i. 1016.

Concerning this, it may be said that it is deficient in an essential point. It does not show how the participle past is collective. Undoubtedly it may be said that every such participle is in the condition of words like *ge-feax* and *ge-heort*; i. e. that they imply an association between the object and the action or state. But this does not seem to be Grimm's view; he rather suggests that the *ge-* may have been a prefix to verbs in general, originally attached to all their forms, but finally abandoned everywhere except in the case of the participle. The theory of this prefix has yet to assume a satisfactory form.

CHAPTER XXX.

DEFECT AND IRREGULARITY.

§ 244. IN the chapter upon the Strong Præterites, I went out of my way to state that, whatever those forms were, they were not *Irregular*. Nevertheless, in nine grammars out of ten they are called so.

The same caution against the habit of multiplying irregularities may be found amongst the remarks on the comparisons of adjectives.

The present chapter is devoted to the illustration of the same subject. The better the grammarian the fewer the irregularities of his grammar. If it were not so, the phenomena of language would scarcely be worth studying.

Now the pre-eminently *irregular* part of the ordinary grammars is the part that deals with the so-called Strong Verbs—not that there are no irregularities elsewhere, but that this is the great field for them; the field wherein language most especially runs riot, and least shows itself reducible to law.

The words that have hitherto served as illustrations are the personal pronouns *I* and *me*, and the adjectives *good*, *better*, and *best*.

The view of these words was as follows: viz. that none of them were irregular, but that they were all defective. *Me* wanted the nominative, *I* the oblique cases. *Good* was without a comparative, *better* and *best* had no positive degree.

Now *me* and *better* may be said to make good the defectiveness of *I* and *good*; and *I* and *good* may be said to replace the forms wanting in *me* and *better*. This gives us the principle of compensation. To introduce a new term, *I* and *me*, *good* and *better*, may be said to be complementary to each other.

What applies to nouns applies to verbs also. *Go* and *went* are not irregularities. *Go* is (at least in the present stage of our language) defective in the past tense. *Went* (at least in its current sense) is without a present. The two words, however, compensate for their mutual deficiencies, and are to each other complementary.

The distinction between defectiveness and irregularity, is the first instrument of criticism for coming to true views concerning the proportion of the regular and irregular verbs.

§ 245. The second instrument of criticism in determining the irregular verbs, is the meaning that we attach to terms.

It is very evident that it is in the power of the grammarian to raise the number of etymological irregularities to any amount, by narrowing the definition of the word irregular; in other words, by framing an exclusive rule. The current rule of the common grammarians is, that the præterite is formed *by the addition of -t, or -d, or -ed*. Now this position is sufficiently exclusive; since it proscribes not only the whole class of strong verbs, but also words like *bent* and *sent*, where *-t* exists, but where it does not exist as *an addition*. The regular forms, it may be said, should be *bended* and *sended*.

Exclusive, however, as the rule in question is, it is plain that it might be made more so. The regular forms might, by the *fiat* of a rule, be restricted to those in *-d*. In this case, words like *wept* and *burnt* would be added to the already numerous list of irregulars.

Finally, a further limitation might be made, by laying down as a rule that no word was regular, unless it ended in *-ed*.

Thus much concerning the modes of making rules exclusive, and, consequently, of raising the amount of irregularities. This is the last art that the philosophic grammarian is ambitious of acquiring. True etymology reduces irregularity by making the rules of grammar not exclusive, but general. The

quantum of irregularity is in the inverse proportion to the generality of our rules. In language itself there is no irregularity. The word itself is only another name for our ignorance of the processes that change words; and, as irregularity is in the direct proportion to the exclusiveness of our rules, the exclusiveness of our rules is in the direct proportion to our ignorance of etymological processes.

§ 246. The explanation of some fresh terms will lead us towards (but not to) the definition of the word irregular.

1. *Vital and obsolete processes*.—The word *moved* is formed from *move*, by the addition of *-d*. The addition of *-d* is the process by which the present form is rendered præterite. The word *fell* is formed from *fall*, by changing *a* into *e*. The change of vowel is the process by which the present form is rendered præterite. Of the two processes the result is the same. In what respect do they differ?

For the sake of illustration, let a new word be introduced into the language. Let a præterite tense of it be formed. This præterite would be formed, not by changing the vowel, but by adding *-d*. No new verb ever takes a strong præterite. The like takes place with nouns. No new substantive would form its plural, like *oxen* or *geese*, by adding *-en*, or by changing the vowel. It would rather, like *fathers* and *horses*, add the lene sibilant.

Now, the processes that change *fall*, *ox*, and *goose* into *fell*, *oxen*, and *geese*, inasmuch as they cease to operate on the language in its present stage, are obsolete processes; whilst those that change *move* into *moved*, and *horse* into *horses*, operating on the language in its present stage, are vital processes.

A definition of the word irregular might be so framed as to include all words whose forms could not be accounted for by the vital processes. Such a definition would, in the present English, make words like *bent*, *sought*, &c. (the euphonic processes being allowed for), regular, and all the strong verbs irregular.

The very fact of so natural a class as that of the strong verbs being reduced to the condition of irregulars, invalidates such a definition as this.

2. *Processes of necessity as opposed to processes of habit.*—The combinations *-pd-*, *-fd-*, *-kd-*, *-sd-*, and some others, are unpronounceable. Hence words like *step*, *quaff*, *back*, *kiss*, &c., take after them the sound of *-t*; *stept*, *quafft*, &c. (the sound being represented), being their præterites, instead of *stepd*, *quaffd*. Here the change from *-d* (the natural termination) to *-t* is a matter (or process) of necessity. It is not so with words like *weep* and *wept*, &c. Here the change of vowel is not necessary. *Weept* might have been said if the habit of the language had permitted.

A definition of the word irregular might be so framed as to include all words whose natural form was modified by any euphonic process whatever. In this case *stept* (modified by a process of necessity), and *wept* (modified by a process of habit), would be equally irregular.

A less limited definition might account words regular as long as the process by which they are deflected from their natural form was a process of necessity. Those, however, which were modified by a process of habit it would class with the irregulars.

Definitions thus limited arise from ignorance of euphonic processes, or rather from an ignorance of the generality of their operation.

3. *Ordinary processes as opposed to extraordinary processes.*—The whole scheme of language is analogical. A new word introduced into a language takes the forms of its cases or tenses, &c., from the forms of the cases or tenses, &c., of the old words. The analogy is extended. Now, few forms (if any) are so unique as not to have some others corresponding with them; and few processes of change are so unique as not to affect more words than one. The forms *wept* and *slept* correspond with each other. They are brought about by the same process; viz. by the shortening of the vowel in *weep*

and *sleep*. The analogy of *weep* is extended to *sleep*, and *vice versa*. Changing our expression, a common influence affects both words. The alteration itself is an ultimate fact. The extent of its influence is an instrument of classification. When processes affect a considerable number of words, they may be called ordinary processes; as opposed to extraordinary processes, which affect one or few words.

When a word stands by itself, with no other corresponding to it, we confess our ignorance, and say that it is affected by an extraordinary process, by a process peculiar to itself, or by a process to which we know nothing similar.

A definition of the word irregular might be so framed as to include all words affected by extraordinary processes; the rest being considered regular.

4. *Positive processes as opposed to ambiguous processes.*—The words *wept* and *slept* are similarly affected. Each is changed from *weep* and *sleep* respectively; and we know that the process which affects the one is the process that affects the other also. Here there is a positive process.

Reference is now made to words of a different sort. The nature of the word *worse* has already been explained. There the form is accounted for in two ways, of which only one can be the true one. Of the two processes, each might equally have brought about the present form. Which of the two it was, we are unable to say. Here the process is ambiguous.

A definition of the word irregular might be so framed as to include all words affected by ambiguous processes.

5. *Normal processes as opposed to processes of confusion.*—Let a certain word come under Class A. Let all words under Class A be similarly affected. Let a given word come under Class A. This word will be affected even as the rest of Class A is affected. The process affecting, and the change resulting, will be normal, regular, or analogical.

Let, however, a word, instead of really coming under Class A, *appear* to do so. Let it be dealt with accordingly. The

analogy then is a false one. The principle of imitation is a wrong one. The process affecting is a process of confusion.

Examples of this (a few amongst many) are words like *songstress*, *theirs*, *minded*, where the words *songstr—*, *their—*, and *mind—*, are dealt with as roots, which they are not.

Ambiguous processes, extraordinary processes, processes of confusion—each, or all of these, are legitimate reasons for calling words irregular. The practice of etymologists will determine what definition is most convenient.

With extraordinary processes we know nothing about the word. With ambiguous processes we are unable to make a choice. With processes of confusion we see the analogy, but, at the same time, see that it is a false one.

§ 247. *Approximate example of irregularity.*—The nearest approach to a real irregularity is the case of the word *could*.

With all persons who pronounce the *l* it is truly irregular. The A. S. form is *cuðe*. The *-l* is inserted by a process of confusion.

Can, *cunne*, *canst*, *cunnon*, *cunnan*, *cuðe*, *cuðon*, *cuð*—such are the remaining forms in A. S. None of them account for the *l*. The presence of the *l* makes the word *could* irregular. No reference to the allied languages accounts for it.

Notwithstanding this, the presence of the *l* is accounted for. In *would* and *should* the *l* has a proper place. It is part of the original words, *will* and *shall*. A false analogy looked upon *could* in the same light. Hence a true irregularity; *provided that the L be pronounced*.

The *L*, however, is pronounced by few, and that only in pursuance to the spelling. This reduces the word *could* to an irregularity, not of language, but only of orthography.

That the mere ejection of the *n* in *can*, and that the mere lengthening of the vowel, are not irregularities, we learn from a knowledge of the processes that convert the Greek ὀδοντος (*odontos*) into ὀδῶς (*odows*).

§ 248. *Example of defect.*—The verb *quoth* is truly defec-

tive. It is found in only one tense, one number, and one person. It is the third person singular of the præterite tense. It has the further peculiarity of preceding its pronoun. Instead of saying *he quoth*, we say *quoth he*. In A. S., however, it was not defective. It was found in the other tenses, in the other number, and in other moods. *Ic cwæðe, þú cwyst, he cwyrð. Ic cwæð, þú cwæðe, he cwæð, we cwædon, ge cwædon, hi cwædon.* Imperative, *cwæð*. Participle, *geweden*. In the Scandinavian it is current in all its forms. There, however, it means, not *to speak*, but, *to sing*. As far as its conjugation goes, it is strong. As far as its class goes, it follows the form of *speak, spoke*. Like *speak*, its A. S. form is in *æ*, as *cwæð*. Like one of the forms of *speak*, its English form is in *o*, as *quoth, spoke*.

The principle that I recognise for myself is, to consider no words irregular unless affected by ambiguous processes, or by processes of confusion. The words affected by extraordinary processes form a provisional class, which a future increase of our etymological knowledge may show to be regular. *Worse* and *could* (its spelling alone being considered) are the fairest specimens of our irregulars. The class, instead of filling pages, is exceedingly limited.

CHAPTER XXXI.

THE VERB SUBSTANTIVE.

§ 249. THE verb substantive is generally dealt with as an irregular verb. This is inaccurate. The true notion is, that the idea of *being* or *existing* is expressed, in the present language, by three different verbs, each of which is defective in some of its parts. The parts, however, that are wanting in

one verb, are made up by the inflections of one of the others. There is, for example, no præterite of the verbs *be* and *am*, and no present of the verb *was*. The forms, however, that one word wants another supplies.

Was.—Defective, except in the præterite tense, where it is found both in the indicative and conjunctive.

INDICATIVE.		CONJUNCTIVE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Was.	Were.	1. Were.	Were.
2. Wast.	Were.	2. Wert.	Were.
3. Was.	Were.	3. Were.	Were.

Be.—In the present English its inflection is as follows:—

<i>Present.</i>			
CONJUNCTIVE.		IMPERATIVE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
Be.	Be.	—	—
—	Be.	Be.	Be.
Be.	Be.	—	—
<i>Infm.</i> To be.	<i>Pres. P.</i> Being.	<i>Past Part.</i> Been.	

Note.—In the “*Deutsche Grammatik*,” i. 1051, it is stated that the Anglo-Saxon forms *beð*, *bist*, *bið*, *beoð*, or *beó*, have not a present, but a future sense; that whilst *am* means *I am*, *beó* means *I shall be*; and that in the older languages it is only where the form *am* is not found that *be* has the power of a present form. The same root occurs in the Slavonic and Lithuanic tongues with the same power; as, *esmi* = *I am*; *búsu* = *I shall be*, Lithuanic.—*Esmu* = *I am*; *buhshu* = *I shall be*, Livonian.—*Jesm* = *I am*; *budu* = *I shall be*, Slavonic.—*Gsem* = *I am*; *budu* = *I shall be*, Bohemian. This, however, proves, not that there is in Anglo-Saxon a future tense (or form), but that the word *beó* has a future sense. There is no fresh tense where there is no fresh form.

The following is a specimen of the future power of *beón* in Anglo-Saxon:—“*Hi ne beoð na cilde, soðlice, on domesdæge,*

ac beoð swa miccle menn swa swa hi, migton beon gif hi full wæron on gewunlicre ylde.—ÆLFRIC'S *Homilies*. "They will not be children, forsooth, on Domesday, but will be as much (so muckle) men as they might be if they were full grown (waxen) in customary age."

This is explained if we consider the word *beon* to mean not so much *to be* as to *become*, a view which gives us an element of the idea of futurity. Things which are *becoming anything* have yet something further to do. Again, from the idea of futurity we get the idea of contingency, and this explains the subjunctive power of *be*.

Am.—Of this form it should be stated, that the letter *-m* is no part of the original word. It is the sign of the first person, just as it is in all the Indo-European languages.

It should also be stated, that, although the fact be obscured, and although the changes be insufficiently accounted for, the forms *am*, *art*, *are*, and *is*, are not, like *am* and *was*, parts of different words, but forms of one and the same word; in other terms, that, although between *am* and *be* there is no etymological connection, there is one between *am* and *is*. This we collect from the comparison of the Indo-European languages.

	1.	2.	
Sanskrit	<i>Asmi.</i>	<i>Asi.</i>	<i>Asti.</i>
Zend	<i>Ahmi.</i>	<i>Asi.</i>	<i>Aшти.</i>
Greek	<i>Εἰμι.</i>	<i>Εἶ.</i>	<i>Εἶ.</i>
Latin	<i>Sum.</i>	<i>Es.</i>	<i>Est.</i>
Lithuanic	<i>Esmi.</i>	<i>Essi.</i>	<i>Esti.</i>
Old Slavonic	<i>Yesmy.</i>	<i>Yesi.</i>	<i>Yesty.</i>
Mæso-Gothic	<i>Im.</i>	<i>Is.</i>	<i>Ist.</i>
Old Saxon	—	* <i>Is.</i>	<i>Ist.</i>
Anglo-Saxon	<i>Eom.</i>	<i>Eart.</i>	<i>Is.</i>
Icelandic	<i>Em.</i>	<i>Ert.</i>	<i>Er.</i>
English	<i>Am.</i>	<i>Art.</i>	<i>Is.</i>

* Found rarely; *bist* being the current form.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, i. 894.

In English and Anglo-Saxon the word is found in the present indicative only. In English it is inflected through both numbers: in A. S. in the singular number only. The A. S. plurals are forms of what appears, in German, as *seyn*, a word of which we have, in the present English, no vestiges.

Worth.—This is a fragment of the A. S. *weord-an* = *werden*, German, = *be, become*.

Woe *worth* the chase, woe worth the day
That cost thy life, my gallant grey.

Lady of the Lake.

CHAPTER XXXII.

ON THE WORDS *DID* (PROPERLY USED) AND *HIGHT*.

§ 250. *Did*.—*Did* from *do* = *facio*, is a *strong* verb. This we infer from the form of its participle *done*.

If so, the final *-d* is not the same as the *-d* in *moved*. What is it? There are good grounds for believing that in the word *did* we have a single instance of the old *reduplicate præterite*. If so, it is the latter *d* which is radical, and the former which is inflectional.

§ 251. *Hight*.—The following couplet from Dryden's *Mac Flecnoc* exhibits both a form and a construction which require explanation:—

An ancient fabric, raised t' inform the sight,
There stood of yore, and Barbican *it hight*.

Here the word *hight* = *was called*, and seems to present an instance of the participle being used in a passive sense without the so-called verb substantive. Yet it does no such thing. The word is no participle at all; but a simple præterite.

Certain verbs are *naturally* either passive or active, as one of two allied meanings may predominate. *To be called* is passive; so is, *to be beaten*. But, *to bear as a name* is active; so is, *to take a beating*. The word *hight* is of the same class of verbs with the Latin *vapulo*; and it is the same as the Latin word, *chuo*.—*Barbican chuit* = *Barbican audivit* = *Barbican it hight*.

So much for the question as to the construction, which is properly a point of Syntax rather than Etymology.

In respect to the form, it must be observed that the *t* is no sign of the præterite tense, but, on the contrary, a part of the original word, which is, in German, *heiss-en*, in Norse, *het-a*, and *hed-e*. In A. S. this præterite was *héht*, and as the M. G. was *hái-háit*, the form has been looked upon as reduplicate.—(See Mr. Kemble's paper already quoted.)

Whatever may be its origin, the present spelling is inaccurate. The *g* has no business where it is; it being only the false analogy of the words *high* and *height* that has introduced it.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

ON THE WORDS *DID* AND *BECAME*, CATACHRESTIC.

§ 252. *Did, catachrestic*.—In the phrase *this will do* = *this will answer the purpose*, the word *do* is wholly different from the word *do*, meaning *to act*. In the first case it is equivalent to the Latin *valere*, in the second to the Latin *facere*. Of the first the Anglo-Saxon inflection is *deáh, dugon, dohte, dohtest, &c.* Of the second it is *dó, doð, dyde, &c.*

In the present Danish they write *duger*, but say *duer*: as *duger det noget?* = *Is it worth anything?* pronounced *doer deh*

note? This accounts for the ejection of the *g*. The Anglo-Saxon form *deáh* does the same.

We cannot, however, although we ought, say *that doed well enough*, though a Dane says *det dugede nok*.

§ 253. *Became, catachrestic.* — The *catachresis, abuse, or confusion* between *do = valeo* and *do = facio*, repeats itself with the verb *become*.

When *become = fio*, its original inflection is strong, and its præterite is *became*.

When *become = convenio = suit* (as in *that dress becomes you*), its original inflection is weak. Hence, though we cannot do so, we ought to say *that dress becomed him*.

Become = convenio, is from the same root as the German *bequem = convenient*.

Note.—There is another verb which has not yet gone wrong, but is going. I have seen such sentences as *a field overflowed with water*. No one, however, has (I hope) brought himself to say *the water overflowed the field*.

Nevertheless, the tendency to catachresis has set in.

CHAPTER XXXIV.

ON CERTAIN APPARENTLY IRREGULAR PRESENTS.

§ 254. LET US draw our illustration of the principle which determines the forms of the present chapter from the classical languages—the Greek and Latin. In translating from those tongues, we find more words than one, which, although *perfect* in appearance, are generally and properly rendered as if there were *presents*. Of this kind are *oïda* in Greek, and *memini* in Latin. Few render these words *I knew*, or *I have known*, *I remember*, or *I have remembered*. On the contrary, they say *I know*, *I remember*. The reason hereof lies in the

nature of the connection between the cause and effect in certain actions. A man who has collected his ideas *remembers*. A man who has seen (or got) his facts *knows*. Neither does it matter much after which of the two fashions he expresses himself. His *knowledge* and his *memory* belong to his present state: the preliminary processes of *getting his facts* and *calling up his reminiscences*, belong to a past one. The link, however, which connects the two is so short, that, for practical purposes, the action is one and indivisible. When language adapts itself to this phenomenon we have a present tense taking the power of a past one; or, *vice versâ*, a past tense used as a present. The words just quoted illustrate the latter alternative. When ἦκω is translated *I have come* (= *here I am*), we have the former. The latter, however, is the one which is at present before us.

In the English and the allied languages there are several præterites whose power is present; or (changing the expression) several presents which were originally præterites. Had they not been so, their form and inflection would be different to what it is.

But the present out of which they were evolved is lost: so that it is only by inference that we can venture to say what it was.

More than this—they have secondary præterites of their own, formed from them, just as if they had been presents from the beginning.

Now, it is very evident that the præterites most likely to become present are those of the strong class. In the first place, the fact of their being præterite is less marked. The word *fell* carries with it fewer marks of its tense than the word *moved*. In the second place they can more conveniently give rise to secondary præterites. A weak præterite already ends in *-d* or *-t*. If this be used as a present, a second *-d* or *-t* must be appended.

Hence it is that all the transposed præterites in the Gothic tongues were, before they took the present sense, not weak,

but strong. The word in question, *mind* (from whence *minded*), is only an apparent exception to this statement.

Respecting these præterite-presents, we have to consider—

Firstly—the words themselves ;

Secondly—the forms they take as præterite-presents (or present-præterites) ; and—

Thirdly—the forms of the secondary præterites derived from them.

If we can do more than this, it is well and good.

Thus—it is well and good if we can succeed in arguing back from the existing forms to the ones that are lost, so reconstructing the original true presents ; also—

If we can ascertain the original meaning as well, so much the better.

We begin, however, with the chief details of the words themselves ; which are *dare, own, can, shall, may, mind, wot, aught, must*.

§ 255. *Dare, durst*.—The verb *dare* is both transitive and intransitive. We can say either *I dare do such a thing*, or *I dare (challenge) such a man to do it*. This, in the present tense, is unequivocally correct. In the præterite the double power of the word *dare* is ambiguous ; still it is, to my mind at least, allowable. We can certainly say *I dared him to accept my challenge* ; and we can, perhaps, say *I dared not venture on the expedition*. In this last sentence, however, *durst* is the preferable expression.

Now, although a case can be made out in favour of *dare* being both transitive and intransitive, *durst* is only intransitive. It never agrees with the Latin word *provoco*, only with the Latin word *audeo* ; inasmuch as, whatever may be the propriety or impropriety of such a sentence as *I dared not venture, &c.*, it is quite certain that we cannot say *I durst him to accept my challenge*.

Again—*dare* can be used in the present tense only : *dared* in the præterite only.

Durst can be used in either. Thus—we can say *I durst not*

in the sense *I am afraid to*—and in the sense *I was afraid to*. We can also say, *I durst not do it, although you ask me*; and *I durst not do it when you asked me*. In sense, then, *durst* is both a præterite and a present.

In form *dur-st* is peculiar. What is the import of the *-st*? In such an expression as *thou durst not*, it looks like the *-st* in *call-est*; viz. the sign of the second person singular. But we say *I durst* and *he durst*. Hence, if the *-st* in *dur-st* be the *-st* in *call-est*, it is *that and something more*.

But it is something wholly different. In all probability the *-s* is part of the original root, of which the fuller and older form was *dars*. If so, the inflection would run—

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Dars . . .	Durs-on.	1. Durs-te . .	Durs-ton.
2. Durs-e . .	Durs-on.	2. Durs-t-est .	Durs-ton.
3. Dars . . .	Durs-on.	3. Durs-te . .	Durs-t-on.

Let *-s-* be lost in the present, and let *a* become *ea*, and we have the actual A. S. forms—

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. Dear	Durr-on.	1. Durste	Durs-t-on.
2. { Durre? }	Durr-on.	2. { Durst (for)	Durs-t-on.
{ Dear-st }		{ Durst-est }	
3. Dear	Durr-on.	3. Durst	Durs-t-on.

The Mæso-Gothic forms are *dar*, *dart*? *dar*, *daúrūm*, *daúrūþ*, *daúrūn*, for the persons of the present tense; and *daúrsta*, *daúrstés*, *daúrsta*, &c., for those of the præterite. The same is the case throughout the German languages. No *-s*, however, appears in the Scandinavian; the præterites being *þorði* and *törde*, Icelandic and Danish. The Anglo-Saxon is *dear* = *I dare*, *dearest* = *thou darest*, *durron* = *we dare*.

Observe the form which this root takes in the Greek—*ἤραρ-εῖν* and *ἤραρ-εῖν* (*tharr-ein* and *thars-ein*).

§ 256. *Own*—*owned from own* = *admit*. — The sentences

“he *owned* to having done it = he *admitted* having done it;”
 “I have *owned* to it = I have *admitted*, *conceded*, or *granted* it.” This last word indicates the original and fundamental idea. It is that of *giving*; an idea allied to that of *concession* and *admission*. Notion for notion, this has but little to do with the word *own*, as applied to property. Indeed, it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that the two words are distinct. To express this difference, the word before us may be called the *own concedentis*; the other, the *own possidentis*; or the *concessive own*, and the *possessive own*.

The *own concedentis* is a word of the same class with *dare*, &c. It is a præterite in the garb of a present. Hence, *owned* is a secondary præterite, or a præterite derived from a præterite.

The A. S. forms are—

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
1.	an		unnon.
2.	unne		unnon.
3.	an		unnon.

Participle, ge-unnen.

Of these A. S. forms, *unne* deserves notice. It gives the form in *-e*, not the form in *-st*; in other words, it is the true second person of the præterite tense, as opposed to that of the present. It also gives us the change of the vowel; so that the word comes out the true præterite *unne*, instead of the present *an-est* (*own, own-est*). The plural forms are also præterite—*unn-on*, rather than *an-að*.

The præterite form is more important still.

	<i>Sing.</i>		<i>Plur.</i>
1.	uðe		uð-on.
2.	uðest		uð-on.
3.	uðe		uð-on.

Truly præterite as was *an*, it still gave rise to the secondary form *uðe*.

Now *uðe* is to *an*, as *cuðe* is to *can*.

But compare it with the present word *own-ed*; and it will be seen that the peculiarities of the word increase. *Owneð* is no modern form of *uðe*. It is a separate and independent formation.

Hence, its history is as follows:—

a. A certain present form, long ago obsolete, gave as its præterite *an*.

b. This præterite *an* passed as a present.

c. This præterite-present gave origin to the secondary præterite *uðe*.

d. The original præterite-present changed its form, and from *an* or *un* (*unne*) became *own*.

e. Meanwhile the form *uðe* became obsolete; and—

f. *Own-ed* became evolved as an ordinary præterite of *own*.

If *can* (*cuðe*) had followed the same line of change, its præterite would have been *cann-ed*, as it is in the present German—*künnte* from *können*.

§ 257. *Can*.—The form *could* has already been noticed; the remarks upon it being to the effect that as the *l* was a blunder (and that a blunder of spelling only), we may simplify the investigation by dealing with the word as if it were simply *coud*—i. e. *could* minus the *l*.

The history of the word then comes to be that of the word *an* and *uðe*. This is what it is in the main. There are, however, a few points of difference.

PRESENT.

	<i>Sing.</i>			<i>Plur.</i>
1.	can	.	.	cunn-on.
2.	{ can-st }	.	.	cunn-on.
	{ cunn-e }	.	.	
3.	can	.	.	cunn-on.

The form *can-st* constitutes the peculiarity. It is a truly present form co-existent with the truly præterite form *cunne*.

		PRÆTERITE.		
Sing.				Plur.
1. cuð-e	.	.	.	cuð-on.
2. cuð-est	.	.	.	cuð-on.
3. cuð-e	.	.	.	cuð-on.

This is the form that has come down to it ; spoilt by the cacography of the letter *l*.

Had the history of *can* been *exactly* that of *an*, the præterite would have been *canned*.

§ 258. *Shall and should*.—The latter word stands nearly in the same relation to *shall* as *coud* does to *can*, and *uðe* to *an*.

In A. S., however, the *u* of the plural of the present was long.

PRESENT.			PRÆTERITE.	
Sing.	Plur.		Sing.	Plur.
1. sceal .	. scul-on.		1. scul-de .	. scul-d-on.
2. { scealt }	. scul-on.		2. scul-d-est .	. scul-d-on.
{ scule }			3. scul-de .	. scul-d-on.
3. sceal .	. scul-on.			

The most remarkable point connected with the inflection of *hall*, is its second person singular *shal-t*. This being a question of *person* rather than *tense*, is noticed in chapter xxii., 226.

§ 259. *Might, from may*.—The *-y* in *may* was originally *-g* ; so that our inquiries may proceed as if the word before us were *mag*.

		PRESENT.		
Sing.				Plur.
1. mag	.	.	.	mug-on.
2. { α. mag-est }	.	.	.	mug-on.
{ β. mug-e }				
3. mag	.	.	.	mug-on.

This is what the inflection would be if the vowel changes were those of *skal* exactly. But this is not the case. The vowel conducts itself differently in the two words. In *skal* it

becomes *-u* (*scul*), regularly and generally. In *mag* it generally remains unchanged.

In M. G. the singular is *mag*; the plural *magum*.

In O. H. G. the singular is *mac*, the plural *mak-um*, and *mug-um* as well.

A similar variation occurs in the O. H. G. præterite; which is found both as *mah-t-a* and as *moh-t-a*, the *h = g*.

§ 260. *Minded*.—This word is the præterite of *mind*; as A. *mind your business*; B. *I do mind it, and have minded it all along*.

As the præterite of *mind*, there is nothing particular in the word *minded*. But there is a great deal which is particular in the word.

Mind—The *-d* is no part of the root. On the contrary, it is the sign of the præterite tense; so that *minded* is a præterite formed from a præterite, just like *should*, *owned*, &c., &c.

But *minded* has the further peculiarity of being not only a præterite in *-d*, but a præterite in *-d* formed upon a præterite in *-d*. This is the case with none of the previous words. Secondary præterites as they are, their basis was always formed by a change of vowel; in other terms, it was a præterite like *swam* rather than one like *call-ed*. If it were not so, there would be two *d*'s in all the preceding words; just as there are two *d*'s in *min-d-ed*.

The A. S. forms are *ge-man*, *ge-manst*, *ge-munon*. Also *ge-munde*, *ge-mundon*.

Hence, the form *minded* (*he minded his business*) is a tertiary formation.

1st. There was the strong form *man* (*mun*) from *min* (?); for all practical purposes a present.

2nd. There was the A. S. præterite *ge-munde*, whence the English present *mind*,

3rd. There is *min-d-ed* from *mind*.

Let us again go over the A. S. forms, paying special attention to those in *u*.

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. ge-man . .	ge-mun-on.	1. ge-mun-d-e	ge-mund-on.
2. { ge-man-st }	ge-mun-on.	2. ge-mun-d-est	ge-mun-d-on.
{ ge-mune }		3. ge-mun-d-e	ge-mun-d-on.
3. ge-man . .	ge-mun-on.		

It is from (*ge*)-*munde* that *mind* has arisen. From *min-d* has arisen *min-d-ed*.

Another form still stands over. In more than one of our provincial dialects we find the word—

Mun—as in *I mun go*; at present, this = *I must go*. Originally, however, it must have been *I am minded to go* = *I have made up my mind to go*. It is a truly præterite form. In the Scandinavian tongue it reappears, with a somewhat different, though allied, power, as *mon* and *monne*.

§ 261. *Wot*.—This = *knew*. It is the perfect form of *wit*, as in *Middlesex to wit* = *Middlesex to know* (or *to be known**).

§ 262. *Ought*.—In this word the *gh* represents an A. S. *h*; an *h* which grew out of an older sound *g*.

PRESENT.		PRÆTERITE.	
<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>	<i>Sing.</i>	<i>Plur.</i>
1. áh . .	ág-on.	1. áh-te . .	ah-t-on.
2. agest, ahst . .	ág-on.	2. áh-t-est . .	ah-t-on.
3. ah . .	ág-on.	3. áh-te . .	ah-t-on.

Infinitive, ág-an.

Participle, ág-en.

In the present English the word *owe* = the A. S. *áh*; and *ought* = the A. S. *áhte*. The Latin *debeo* = both words; viz. the A. S. *áh*, and the English *owe*. But it has two senses—*I am under a moral obligation*, and *I am a debtor*.

Now the present form *owe* is limited to the latter of these senses; in the language of the nineteenth century, at least. We

* Just as we say *I am to blame*, or *I am to be blamed*.

can say *I owe money*; but we cannot say *I owe to pay some*. On the other hand, we cannot say *I ought money*; though we can say *I ought to pay some*.

The effect of this twofold sense has been to separate the words *owe* and *ough-t*; by giving to the former the modern præterite *ow-ed*, which never came from *áhte*, any more than *owned* came from *uðe*.

It has also deprived *ought* of its present form, the equivalent to the A. S. *áh*. As a consequence of this, *ought* has two powers. It is a present and a præterite as well. We can say—

He says that I ought to go; and
He said that I ought to go—

just as we say—

He says that I wish to go; and
He said that I wished to go.

Ought comes from *owe*—from *ow-* without any sound of *n*.

Own concedentis comes from *o-n*, where there is not only a sound of *n*, but where that sound of *n* is part and parcel of the root.

What does *own possidentis* come from?

Not from the *own concedentis*, though it agrees with that word in having the sound of *n*.

Let us take the points of contrast.

1. The *-n* of the *own concedentis* is radical. The *-n* of the *own possidentis* is not so.

2. The *ow* of the *own concedentis* has grown out of *u*. The *w* of the *own possidentis* has grown out of an *h*, which has grown out of a *g*, *gh*, *k*, or *kh*.

Such are the points of contrast between the *own possidentis* and the *own concedentis*.

Let us now look to the relation between *own* and *owe* (whence *ought*).

1. *Owe* (whence *ought*) has no *n*. Neither had *own* (*possidentis*) until after the time of Elizabeth. Shakspeare, for

instance, always (or nearly always) writes *owe* rather than *own*.

See where he comes ; nor poppy nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy syrups of the world,
Can ever med'cine thee to that sweet sleep
Which thou *owe'dst* yesterday.

Othello.

2. The *w* in the *owe* (whence *ought*) represents an *h* (A. S. *ah*), representing a *g*, or *gh*, *k*, or *kh*.

Hence, the connections of *own possidentis* are with *owe* (whence *ought*).

Let us call the latter *owe debentis*, the former *owe possidentis*.

Doing this we give the latter word two forms, and look at it under a double aspect—one for comparison (or rather contrast) with *own concedentis*, and one for comparison with *owe debentis*.

Essentially, however, the word is *owe* without the *-n*. Briefly, as roots—

Own concedentis = *u* + *n*.

Owe possidentis = *a vowel* + *h*.

§ 263. *Must*.—I can only say of this form that it is common to all persons, numbers, and tenses ; the powers of the *-s-* and *-t-* being, at present, unsusceptible of any satisfactory explanation.

The same (as I might have stated in § 261) is the case in the archaic forms *wiss* and *wist* (= *know* and *knew*).

§ 264. The class of words under notice is a natural one, one of their characteristics being their long standing in language. This is shown by the large portion of the so-called Indo-European language over which they are spread ; inasmuch as the greater part of their roots is classical as well as English—in some cases Sarmatian as well. Hence, their origin goes back to the time of that ancient mother language, which was, at one time, common to the ancestors of the Italians, Greeks, Slavonians, Lithuanians, Germans, and Scandinavians. Thus—

372 ON CERTAIN APPARENTLY IRREGULAR PRESENTS.

1. *C-n* (the root of *can*) = the $\gamma\nu$, the root of $\gamma\nu\text{-}\delta\omega$, $\gamma\nu\text{-}\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omega$, *gn-ovi* = *know*.

2. *D-rs* (the root of *durs-t*) = the $\delta\text{-}\rho\sigma$, the root of $\delta\alpha\rho\sigma\text{-}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ = *dare*.

3. *M-g* (the root of *may*) = (?) the *mac* in *macte*. *Macte* (*proceed, go on*) *tua virtute puer, &c.*

4. *-N-* (the root of *own concedentis*) = (?) the *-n-* in *nuo*, *annuo* (= *nod assent*).

5. *Ow-* (the root of *own possidentis* = the older form *eig-an*) = the $\epsilon\chi$ - in $\epsilon\chi\text{-}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ = *to have*.

6. *W-t* (the root of *wit* and *wot*) = the δ - in $\alpha\acute{\iota}\delta\text{-}\alpha$ (*I know* = *I have seen*) and *vid-i*.

7. *M-n* (the root of *mun* and *mind*) = the *m-n* in *me-min-i* = *remember*.

The forms that have been dealt with are perfects, or præterites—perfects or præterites rather than presents. They presuppose, however, a previous present, out of which they originated. The reconstruction of this involves two considerations; viz. that of the original *form*, and that of the original meaning.

The reconstruction of the original *form* may safely be attempted with three words of the list, *own*, *can*, and *dare*, of which the primitive presents were probably *en*, *ken*, and *ders*, or (perhaps) *in*, *kin*, and *dirs*; this being the inference from the inflection of a large class of words like the A. S. *helpe*, and the M. G. *hilpa*.

	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præt. Sing.</i>	<i>Præt. Plur.</i>
M. G.—	Hilp-a	Halp	Hulp-um.
A. S.—	Help-e	Healp	Hulp-on.
	Swimm-e	Swam	Swumm-on.

Hence, perhaps—

<i>En</i> (<i>in</i>)	<i>An</i>	<i>Unn-on.</i>
<i>Ken</i> (<i>cin</i>)	<i>Can</i>	<i>Cunn-on.</i>
<i>Der</i> (<i>dir</i>)	<i>Dar</i>	<i>Durr-on.</i>

The others are less reducible.

As contributions towards the reconstruction of the original meaning, the following powers are suggested.

1. *Can.*—Meaning *I have learned, I have got information*; the present sense is *I am able*.

2. *Dare.*—If this means *I have taken courage*, the present sense, *I am in a state to undertake*, = *dare*.

3. *May.*—If this mean *I have gotten the power*, it also means *I am free to act*.

4. *Owe* = *I have come under an obligation* = *I am bound to*.

5. *Own* = *I have gotten possession* = *I possess*.

6. *Wit, wot* = *I have perceived* = *I understand*.

CHAPTER XXXV.

ON CONJUGATION.

§ 265. It is hoped that it is now equally superfluous to urge further arguments against the indiscriminate use of the word *irregular*, and to add to the evidence in favour of the strong class of verbs being a *natural*, rather than an *artificial* one. Let us, however, put the chief general statements that may be made concerning them together; remarking upon each, to say how far it is universal, or how far it is liable to exceptions.

I. No *new* word is ever strong. One of our earliest Norman-French words, a word introduced as early as A.D. 1085, is the word *adouber* = *dubb*. Its præterite is *dubbade*. — (*Phil. Mus.* ii. p. 387.)

Hence the strong processes are obsolete—obsolete and not vital.

II. All the *English* strong verbs are of *Angle*, none of *foreign* origin. This is a deduction from the preceding statement.

III. Strong words become weak. Weak words do *not* become strong.

IV. The verbs which are strong in any one of the German languages are generally so in all the rest.

Take this along with No. III., and you come to the conclusion that the later the stage of a given language, the fewer are the strong forms. Then, as the provincial dialects retain many archaisms, it is only natural to expect that they will partially agree with the A. S. of the list of pp. 316, 317, rather than the modern English. Hence, if we find (as we actually do), instead of (say) *leapt, slept, mowed, snowed, &c.*, such forms as *lep, slep, mew, snew*, it is no more than what we expect.

V. Derived words are weak rather than strong. The intransitive forms *drink* and *lie*, are strong; the transitive forms *drench* and *lay*, are weak.

It is safe, then, to say that the Strong Conjugation (so-called) is a *natural* one.

§ 266. Nevertheless, I have taken every opportunity to suggest the possibility of its being something other than natural, or (if not this) exceptionable in some respect or other. I have taken no ordinary pains to attach to the words *Strong* and *Conjugation* the qualifying participle *so-called*—writing of the *so-called Strong Conjugation*, or the *Strong Conjugation so-called*. Whether the reader has observed this or not, there is something implied by the qualification; an exception of some sort.

What does it lie against? Not against the *natural* character of the group.

Nor yet against the words *strong* and *weak*—though it may be doubtful whether they are the best words that could have been chosen.

It lies against the word *Conjugation*.

Two (or more) tenses, absolutely identical in power, and absolutely different in form, in one and the same conjugation, as original elements of a language, are a philological tautology,

which a more advanced criticism will eliminate from the phenomena of speech, and relegate to the limbo of irregularities and similar concealments of our want of knowledge.

But two conjugations for one and the same tense, are a philological tautology also.

What, then, are such forms as *swoll* and *swelled*, *hung* and *hanged*, if, being regular, they are neither instances of two tenses to one conjugation, nor of one tense to two conjugations?

Can we make it matter of *transitive* and *intransitive*, and allow ourselves to suppose either an actually existent, or an once-existing difference of meaning between such forms as those of the pairs in question? Can *hung* = *pependit*, whilst *hanged* = *suspendit*? Can *swoll* = *tumuit*, whilst *swelled* = *tumefecit*? Should we cultivate such distinctions as the following?—

1. I *hanged* him up, and there he *hung*.

2. I *swelled* the number of his followers, which *swoll*, at last, to a thousand.

This view is suggested in a paper *on certain tenses attributed to the Greek verb* in the "Philological Museum;" and, it may be added, that there is something in favour of it. The two instances just given look likely. The forms like

<i>Drink</i>	and	<i>Drank</i> ,	as	opposed	to	<i>Drench</i>	and	<i>Drenched</i> ,
<i>Lie</i>	.	<i>Lay</i>	.	.	.	<i>Lay</i>	.	<i>Laid</i> ,
<i>Rise</i>	.	<i>Rose</i>	.	.	.	<i>Raise</i>	.	<i>Raised</i> ,

are, more or less, confirmatory. Yet they are anything but conclusive. All that they tell us is, that *when we have two forms*, one primitive and intransitive, and the other derivative and transitive, it is the former which is strong rather than weak, and the latter which is weak rather than strong.

The real explanation is to be found in the chapters on *Tenses in general*, and upon the *Strong and Weak Præterites*.

a. Cut off from such a word as *te-tig-i*, the reduplicational *te*.

b. Replace the English forms in *d* (*mov-ed*) by the Latin forms in *-si* (*vic-si = vixi*).

When this is done, the history of such a pair of words as *drank* and *moved*, is the history of such a pair of words as *te-tigi* and *vixi*.

Now the place of these is that of *τέτυφα* and *ἔτιψα*, i. e. they both belong to one and the same conjugation—of which, however, they are different tenses, one a perfect, the other aorist.

If so, what are our Strong Præterites? Perfects modified in form by the loss of the reduplication, and changed in power by having adopted that of the aorist.

And what are our Weak Præterites? Aorists.

The *Conjugation* is really one.

The *Tense* is one in appearance only.

The following verbs, *weak* in the present English, were strong in the *Anglo-Saxon*. They serve to illustrate the remarks of § 265.

Præterites.

ENGLISH.		ANGLO-SAXON.	
<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>
Wreak	Wreaked.	Wrece	Wræc.
Fret	Fretted.	Frete	Fræt.
Mete	Meted.	Metē	Mæt.
Shear	Sheared.	Scere	Scear.
Braid	Braided.	Brede	Bræd.
Knead	Kneaded.	Cnede	Cnæd.
Dread	Dreaded.	Dræde	Dred.
Sleep	Slept.	Slæpe	Slep.
Fold	Folded.	Fealde	Feold.
Wield	Wielded.	Wealde	Weold.
Wax	Waxed.	Weaxe	Weox.
Leap	Leapt.	Hleápe	Hleop.
Sweep	Swept.	Swápe	Sweop.
Weep	Wept.	Wepe	Weop.
Sow	Sowed.	Sáwe	Seow.
Bake	Baked.	Bace	Bék.

ENGLISH.		ANGLO-SAXON.	
<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>	<i>Present.</i>	<i>Præterite.</i>
Gnaw	Gnawed.	Gnage	Gnóh.
Laugh	Laughed.	Hlihhe	Hlóh.
Wade	Waded.	Wade	Wód.
Lade	Laded.	Hlade	Hlód.
Grave	Graved.	Grafe	Gróf.
Shave	Shaved.	Scafe	Scóf.
Step	Stepped.	Steppe	Stóp.
Wash	Washed.	Wacse	Wócs.
Bellow	Bellowed.	Belge	Bealh.
Swallow	Swallowed.	Swelge	Sweahl.
Mourn	Mourned.	Murne	Mearn.
Spurn	Spurned.	Spurne	Spearn.
Carve	Carved.	Ceorfe	Cearf.
Starve	Starved.	Steorfe	Stærfe.
Thresh	Threshed.	þersce	þærsc.
Hew	Hewed.	Heawe	Heow.
Flow	Flowed.	Flówe	Fleow.
Row	Rowed.	Rówe	Reow.
Creep	Crept.	Creópe	Creáp.
Dive	Dived.	Deófe	Deáf.
Shove	Shoved.	Scéofe	Sceáf.
Chew	Chewed.	Ceówe	Ceáw.
Brew	Brewed.	Breówe	Breáw.
Lock	Locked.	Lúce	Leác.
Suck	Sucked.	Súce	Seác.
Reek	Reeked.	Reóce	Reác.
Smoke	Smoked.	Smeóce	Smeác.
Bow	Bowed.	Beóge	Beáh.
Lie	Lied.	Leóge	Leáh.
Gripe	Griped.	Grípe	Gráp.
Span	Spanned.	Spanne	Spén.
Eke	Eked.	Eáca	Eóc.
Fare	Fared.	Fare	Fôr.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

ADVERBS.

§ 267. *Adverbs*.—The adverbs are capable of being classified on a variety of principles.

1. Firstly, they may be divided according to their meaning. In this case we speak of the adverbs of time, place, number, manner. This division is logical rather than etymological.

A division, however, which although logical bears upon etymology, is the following :—

Well, better, ill, worse.—Here we have a class of adverbs expressive of degree, or intensity. Adverbs of this kind are capable of taking an inflection, viz. that of the comparative and superlative degrees.

Now, then, here, there.—In the idea expressed by these words there are no degrees of intensity. Adverbs of this kind are incapable of taking any inflection.

Words like *better* and *worse* are adjectives or adverbs as they are joined to nouns or verbs.

Adverbs differ from nouns and verbs in being susceptible of one sort of inflection only, viz. that of degree.

2. Secondly, adverbs may be divided according to their form and origin. This is truly an etymological classification.

a. Better, worse.—Here the combination of sounds gives equally an adjective and an adverb. *This book is better than that*—here *better* agrees with *book*, and is therefore adjectival. *This looks better than that*—here *better* qualifies *looks*, and is therefore adverbial. Again; *to do a thing with violence* is equivalent to *do a thing violently*. This shows how adverbs may arise out of cases. In words like the English *better*, the Latin *vi* (= *violenter*), the Greek *καλον* (= *καλως*), we have

adjectives in their degrees, and substantives in their cases, with adverbial powers. In other words, nouns are deflected from their natural sense to an adverbial one. Adverbs of this kind are adverbs of deflection.

b. Brightly, bravely.—Here an adjective is rendered adverbial by the addition of the derivative syllable *-ly*. Adverbs like *brightly*, &c., may (laxly speaking) be called adverbs of derivation.

c. Now.—This word has not satisfactorily been shown to have originated as any other part of speech than as an adverb. Words of this sort are adverbs absolute.

When, now, well, worse, better—here the adverbial expression consists in a single word, and is *simple*. *To-day, yesterday, not at all, somewhat*—here the adverbial expression consists of a compound word, or a phrase. This indicates the division of adverbs into simple and complex.

§ 268. The adverbs of deflection (of the chief importance in etymology) may be arranged after a variety of principles. I. According to the part of speech from whence they originate. This is often an adjective, often a substantive, at times a pronoun, occasionally a preposition, rarely a verb. II. According to the part of the inflection from whence they originate. This is often an ablative case, often a neuter accusative, often a dative, occasionally a genitive.

The following notices are miscellaneous rather than systematic.

Else, unawares, eftsoons.—These are the genitive forms of adjectives. *By rights* is a word of the same sort.

Once, twice, thrice.—These are the genitive forms of numerals.

Needs (as in *needs must go*) is the genitive case of a substantive.

Seldom.—The old dative (singular or plural) of the adjective *seld*.

Whilom.—The dative (singular or plural) of the substantive *while*.

Little, less, well.—Neuter accusatives of adjectives. *Bright, in the sun shines bright,* is a word of the same class. The neuter accusative is a common source of adverbs in all tongues.

Athwart.—A neuter accusative, and a word exhibiting the Norse neuter in *-t*.

§ 269. *Darkling.*—This is no participle of a verb *darkle*, but an adverb of derivation, like *unwaringún = unawares*, Old High-German; *stillenge = secretly*, Middle High-German; *blindlings = blindly*, New High-German; *darnungo = secretly*, Old Saxon; *nichtinge = by night*, Middle Dutch; *blindeling = blindly*, New Dutch; *bæclinga = backwards*, *handlunga = hand to hand*, Anglo-Saxon; and, finally, *blindlins, backlins, darklins, middlins, scantlins, stridelins, stowlins*, in Lowland Scotch.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 236.

§ 270. “Adverbs like *brightly* may (*laxly speaking*) be called adverbs of derivation.” Such is the assertion made a few paragraphs above. The first circumstance that strikes the reader is, that the termination *-ly* is common both to adjectives and to adverbs. This termination was once an independent word, viz. *leik*. Now, as *-ly* sprung out of the Anglo-Saxon *-lice*, and as words like *early, dearly*, &c., were originally *arlice, deorlice*, &c., and as *arlice, deorlice*, &c., were adjectives, the adverbs in *-ly* are (*strictly speaking*) adverbs, not of derivation, but of deflection.

It is highly probable that not only the adverbs of derivation, but that also the absolute adverbs, may eventually be reduced to adverbs of deflection. For now, see *Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 249.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

ON CERTAIN ADVERBS OF PLACE.

§ 271. It is a common practice for languages to express by different modifications of the same root the three following ideas :—

1. The idea of rest *in* a place.
2. The idea of motion *towards* a place.
3. The idea of motion *from* a place.

This habit gives us three correlative adverbs—one of position, and two of direction.

It is also a common practice of language to depart from the original expression of each particular idea, and to interchange the signs by which they are expressed.

This may be seen in the following table, illustrative of the forms *here, hither, hence*, and taken from the *Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 199 :—

<i>Mæso-Gothic</i>	. .	þar, þaþ, þapro, hêr, hiþ, hidrô,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Old High-German</i>	. .	huâr, huara, huanana, dâr, dara, danana, hêr, hêra, hinana,	<i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Old Saxon</i>	. .	huar, huar, huanan, thar, thar, thanan, hêr, hêr, hênan,	<i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Anglo-Saxon</i>	. .	þar, þider, þonan, hvar, hvider, hvonan, hêr, hider, hênan,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Old Norse</i>	. .	þar, þaðra, þaðan, hvar, hvert, hvaðan, hêr, hêðra, hêðan,	<i>there, thither, thence.</i> <i>where, whither, whence.</i> <i>here, hither, hence.</i>

<i>Middle High-German</i>	dâ, dan, dannen, wâ, war, wannen, hie, hër, hennen,	<i>there, thither, thence. where, whither, whence. here, hither, hence.</i>
<i>Modern High-German</i>	da, dar, dannen, wo, wohin, wannen, hier, her, hinnen,	<i>there, thither, thence. where, whither, whence. here, hither, hence.</i>

These local terminations were commoner in the earlier stages of language than at present. The following are from the Mæso-Gothic :—

Īnnaprô	= <i>from within.</i>
Ûtaprô	= <i>from without.</i>
Īupaprô	= <i>from above.</i>
Fáirraprô	= <i>from afar.</i>
Allaprô	= <i>from all quarters.</i>

Now a reason for the comparative frequency of these forms in Mæso-Gothic lies in the fact of the Gospel of Ulphilas being a translation from the Greek. The Greek forms in -θεν, ἔσωθεν, ἔξωθεν, ἄνωθεν, πόρρωθεν, πάντοθεν, were just the forms to encourage such a formation as that in -*pro*.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 199, &c.

The -*ce* (= *es*) in *hen-ce*, *when-ce*, *then-ce*, has yet to be satisfactorily explained. The Old English is *whenn-es*, *thenn-es*. As far, therefore, as the spelling is concerned, they are in the same predicament with the word *once*, which is properly *on-es*, the genitive of *one*. This statement, however, explains only the peculiarity of their orthography; since it by no means follows, that, because the -*s* in *ones* and the -*s* in *whennes*, *thennes*, are equally replaced by -*ce* in orthography, they must equally have the same origin in etymology.

§ 272. *Yonder*.—In the Mæso-Gothic we have the following forms: *jáinar*, *jáind*, *jáinprô* = *illic*, *illuc*, *illinc*. They do not, however, explain the form *yon-d-er*. It is not clear whether the *d* = the -*d* in *jáind*, or the *p* in *jáinprô*.

Anon, as used by Shakspeare, in the sense of *presently*.—The probable history of this word is as follows:—the first

syllable contains a root akin to the root *yon*, signifying *distance in place*. The second is a shortened form of the Old High-German and Middle High-German, *-nt*, a termination expressive, 1, of removal in space ; 2, of removal in time : Old High-German, *ënont*, *ënnont* ; Middle High-German, *ënentlig*, *jenunt* = *beyond*. The transition from the idea of *place* to that of *time* is shown in the Old High-German, *nâhunt*, and the Middle High-German, *vërnent* = *lately* ; the first from the root *nigh*, the latter from the root *far*.—See *Deutsche Grammatik*, iii. 215.

CHAPTER XXXVIII.

ON WHEN, THEN, AND THAN.

§ 273. THE Anglo-Saxon adverbs are *whenne* and *penne* = *when*, *then*.

The masculine accusative cases of the relative and demonstrative pronoun are *hwæne* (*hwone*) and *þæne* (*þone*).

Notwithstanding the difference, the first form is a variety of the second ; so that the adverbs *when* and *then* are pronominal in origin.

As to the word *than*, the conjunction of comparison, it is a variety of *then* ; the notions of *order*, *sequence*, and *comparison* being allied.

This is good : then (or *next in order*) *that is good*, is an expression sufficiently similar to *this is better than that* to have given rise to it.

CHAPTER XXXIX.

PREPOSITIONS AND CONJUNCTIONS.

§ 274. *Prepositions*.—Prepositions, as such, are wholly unsusceptible of inflection. Other parts of speech, in a state of inflection, may be used with a prepositional sense. This, however, is not an inflection of prepositions.

No word is ever made a preposition by the addition of a derivational* element. If it were not for this, the practical classification of the prepositions, in respect to their form, would coincide with that of the adverbs. As it is, there are only the prepositions of deflection, and the absolute prepositions. On another principle of division there are the simple prepositions (*in, on, &c.*), and the complex prepositions (*upon, roundabout, across*).

The prepositions of deflection, when simple, originate chiefly in adverbs, as *up, down, within, without*, unless, indeed, we change the assertion, and say that the words in point (and the others like them) are adverbs originating in prepositions. The absence of characteristic terminations renders these decisions difficult.

The prepositions of deflection, when complex, originate chiefly in nouns, accompanied by an absolute preposition; as *instead of* of substantival, *between* of adjectival origin.

The absolute prepositions, in the English language, are *in, on, of, at, up, by, to, for, from, till, with, through*.

§ 275. *Conjunctions*.—Conjunctions, like prepositions, are

* *Over, under, after*.—These, although derived forms, are not prepositions of derivation; since it is not by the affix *-er* that they are made prepositions. *He went over, he went under, he went after*—these sentences prove the forms to be as much adverbial as prepositional.

wholly unsusceptible of inflection. Like prepositions, they are never made by means of a derivational element. Like prepositions they are either simple (as *and*, *if*), or complex (as *also*, *nevertheless*).

The conjunctions of deflection originate chiefly in imperative moods (as *all save one*, *all except one*); participles used like the ablative absolute in Latin (as *all saving one*, *all excepting one*); adverbs (as *so*); prepositions (as *for*); and relative neuters (as *that*).

The absolute conjunctions in the English language are *and*, *or*, *but*, *if*.

§ 276. *Yes*, *no*.—Although *not* may be reduced to an adverb, *nor* to a conjunction, and *none* to a noun, these two words (the direct affirmative and the direct negative) are referable to none of the current parts of speech. Accurate grammar places them in a class by themselves.

§ 277. *Particles*.—The word particle is a collective term for all those parts of speech that are *naturally* unsusceptible of inflection; comprising, 1, interjections; 2, direct affirmatives; 3, direct negatives; 4, absolute conjunctions; 5, absolute prepositions; 6, adverbs unsusceptible of degrees of comparison; 7, inseparable prefixes.

QUESTIONS.

1. WHAT is Johnson's explanation of the word *Etymology*? Into what varieties does the study fall? What is the difference between *Etymology* and *Syntax*?

2. How far are the following words instances of gender—*boy*, *he-goat*, *actress*, *which*? Analyse the forms *what*, *her*, *its*, *vixen*, *spinster*, *gander*, *drake*.

3. How far is there a dual number in the Gothic tongues? What

is the rule for forming such a plural as *stags* from *stag*? What are the peculiarities in *monarchs*, *cargoes*, *keys*, *pence*, *geese*, *children*, *women*, *houses*, *paths*, *leaves*? Of what number are the words *alms*, *physics*, *news*, *riches*?

4. To what extent have we in English a dative, an accusative, and instrumental case? Disprove the doctrine that the genitive in *-s* (*the father's son*) is formed out of the combination *father his*.

5. Decline *me*, *thee*, and *ye*.

6. How far is there a true reflective pronoun in English?

7. What were the original powers and forms of *she*, *her*, *it*? What case is *him*? What is the power and origin of *the* in such expressions as *all the more*? Decline *he* in Anglo-Saxon. Investigate the forms *these* and *those*, *whose*, *what*, *whom*, *which*, *myself*, *himself*, *herself*, *such*, *every*.

8. What is the power (real or supposed) of the *-er* in *over*, and in *either*?

9. What words in the present English are explained by the following forms—*sutiza*, in Mæso-Gothic, and *scearpor*, *neak*, *yldre*, in Anglo-Saxon? Explain the forms *better*, *worse*, *more*, *less*.

10. Analyse the words *former*, *next*, *upmost*, *thirty*, *streamlet*, *sweet-heart*, *duckling*.

11. Translate *Ida wæs Eopping*. Analyse the word *Wales*.

12. Exhibit the extent to which the noun partakes of the character of the verb, and *vice versâ*. What were the Anglo-Saxon forms of *I can call*, *I begin to call*?

13. Investigate the forms *drench*, *raise*, *use* (the verb), *clothe*.

14. *Thou speakest*. What is the peculiarity of the form? *We loven*, *we love*, account for this.

15. *Thou rannest* = (*tu cucurristi*). Is this an unexceptionable form? if not, why?

16. What are the *moods* in English? What the *tenses*? How far is the division of verbs into weak and strong tenses natural? Account for the double forms *swam* and *swum*. Enumerate the other verbs in the same class. Explain the forms *taught*, *wrought*, *ought*, *did* (from *do* = *facio*), *did* (from *do* = *valeo*), *minded*.

17. Define the term *irregular*, so as to raise the number of irregular verbs, in English, to more than a hundred. Define the same term, so as to reduce them to none. Explain the form *could*.

18. What is the construction of *meseems* and *methinks*? Illustrate the *future* power of *be*. *Werden* in German means *become*—in what form does the word appear in English?

19. *To err is human,—the rising* in the North. Explain these constructions. Account for the second *-r* in *forlorn*; and for the *y* in *y-cleped*.

20. Explain the difference between *composite* and *de-composite* words, *true* and *improper compounds*. Analyse the word *nightingale*.

21. How far are adverbs inflected? Distinguish between a *preposition* and a *conjunction*.

22. Explain the forms *there*, *thence*, *yonder*, and *anon*.

23. What part of speech is *mine*?

24. What is the probable origin of the *-d* in such præterites as *call-ed*?

PART V.
SYNTAX.

CHAPTER I.

ON SYNTAX IN GENERAL.

§ 278. THE word *syntax* is derived from the Greek *syn* (*with* or *together*), and *taxis* (*arrangement*). It relates to the arrangement, or putting together of words. Two or more words must be used before there can be any application of the study of syntax.

§ 279. In the English, as in all other languages, it is convenient to notice certain so-called figures of speech. They always furnish convenient modes of expression, and sometimes, as in the case of the ones immediately about to be noticed, *account* for facts.

Personification.—The ideas of apposition and collectiveness account for the apparent violations of the concord of number. The idea of personification applies to the concord of gender. A masculine or feminine gender, characteristic of persons, may be substituted for the neuter gender, characteristic of things. In this case the term is said to be personified.

The cities who aspired to liberty.—A personification of the idea expressed by *cities* is here necessary to justify the expression.

It, the sign of the neuter gender, as applied to a male or female child, is the reverse of the process.

Ellipsis (from the Greek *elleipein* = *to fall short*), or a

falling short, occurs in sentences like *I sent to the bookseller's*. Here the word *shop* or *house* is understood. Expressions like *to go on all fours*, and *to eat of the fruit of the tree*, are reducible to ellipses.

Pleonasm (from the Greek *pleonazein* = *to be in excess*) occurs in sentences like *the king, he reigns*. Here the word *he* is superabundant. In many *pleonastic* expressions we may suppose an interruption of the sentence, and afterwards an abrupt renewal of it; as *the king—he reigns*.

The fact of the word *he* neither qualifying nor explaining the word *king*, distinguishes pleonasm from apposition.

Pleonasm, as far as the view above is applicable, is reduced to what is, apparently, its opposite, viz. ellipsis.

My banks, they are furnished,—the most straitest sect,—these are pleonastic expressions. In *the king, he reigns*, the word *king* is in the same predicament as in *the king, God bless him*.

The double negative, allowed in Greek and Anglo-Saxon, but not admissible in English, is pleonastic.

The verb *do*, in *I do speak*, is *not* pleonastic. In respect to the sense it adds intensity. In respect to the construction it is not in apposition, but in the same predicament with verbs like *must* and *should*, as in *I must go, &c.*; i. e. it is a verb followed by an infinitive. This we know from its power in those languages where the infinitive has a characteristic sign; as in German—

Die Augen *thaten* ihm winken.—GOETHE.

Besides this, *make* is similarly used in Old English.—*But men make draw the branch thereof, and beren him to be graffed at Babyloyn*.—Sir J. MANDEVILLE.

The figure zeugma.—*They wear a garment like that of the Scythians, but a language peculiar to themselves*.—The verb, naturally applying to garment only, is here used to govern *language*. This is called, in Greek, *zeugma* (junction).

My paternal home was made desolate, and he himself was

sacrificed.—The sense of this is plain; *he* means *my father*. Yet no such substantive as *father* has gone before. It is supplied, however, from the word *paternal*. The sense indicated by *paternal* gives us a subject to which *he* can refer. In other words, the word *he* is understood, according to what is indicated, rather than according to what is expressed. This figure, in Greek, is called *pros to semainomenon* (*according to the thing indicated*).

§ 280. *Apposition*.—*Cæsar, the Roman emperor, invades Britain*.—Here the words *Roman emperor* explain, or define, the word *Cæsar*; and the sentence, filled up, might stand, *Cæsar, that is, the Roman emperor, &c.* Again, the word *Roman emperor* might be wholly ejected; or, if not ejected, they might be thrown into a parenthesis. The practical bearing of this fact is exhibited by changing the form of the sentence, and inserting the conjunction *and*. In this case, instead of one person, two are spoken of, and the verb *invades* must be changed from the singular to the plural.

Now the words *Roman emperor* are said to be in apposition to *Cæsar*. They constitute, not an additional idea, but an explanation of the original one. They are, as it were, *laid alongside* (*appositi*) of the word *Cæsar*. Cases of doubtful number, wherein two substantives precede a verb, and wherein it is uncertain whether the verb should be singular or plural, are decided by determining whether the substantives be in apposition or the contrary. No matter how many nouns there may be, as long as it can be shown that they are in apposition, the verb is in the singular number.

§ 281. *Collectiveness as opposed to plurality*.—In sentences like *the meeting was large, the multitude pursue pleasure, meeting and multitude* are each collective nouns; that is, although they present the idea of a single object, that object consists of a plurality of individuals. Hence, *pursue* is put in the plural number. To say, however, *the meeting were large* would sound improper. The number of the verb that shall accompany a collective noun depends upon whether the idea of the multipli-

city of individuals, or that of the unity of the aggregate, shall predominate.

Sand and salt and a mass of iron is easier to bear than a man without understanding.—Let *sand and salt and a mass of iron* be dealt with as a series of things the aggregate of which forms a mixture, and the expression is allowable.

The king and the lords and commons forms an excellent frame of government. Here the expression is doubtful. Substitute *with* for the first *and*, and there is no doubt as to the propriety of the singular form *is*.

§ 282. *The reduction of complex forms to simple ones.*—Take, for instance, a current illustration, viz. *the-king-of-Saxony's army*.—Here the assertion is, not that the army belongs to *Saxony*, but that it belongs to the *king of Saxony*; which words must, for the sake of taking a true view of the construction, be dealt with as a single word in the possessive case. Here two cases are dealt with as one; and a complex term is treated as a single word.

The same reasoning applies to phrases like *the two king Williams*. If we say *the two kings William*, we must account for the phrase by apposition.

§ 283. *True notion of the part of speech in use.*—In *he is gone*, the word *gone* must be considered as equivalent to *absent*; that is, as an adjective. Otherwise the expression is as incorrect as the expression *she is eloped*. Strong participles are adjectival oftener than weak ones; their form being common to many adjectives.

True notion of the original form.—In the phrase *I must speak*, the word *speak* is an infinitive. In the phrase *I am forced to speak*, the word *speak* is (in the present English) an infinitive also. In one case, however, it is preceded by *to*; whilst in the other, the participle *to* is absent. The reason for this lies in the original difference of form. *Speak—to* = the Anglo-Saxon *sprécan*, a simple infinitive; *to speak*, or *speak + to* = the Anglo-Saxon *to sprécanne*, an infinitive in the dative case.

§ 284. *Convertibility*.—In the English language, the greater part of the words may, as far as their form is concerned, be one part of speech as well as another. Thus the combinations *s-a-n-t-h*, or *f-r-e-n-k*, if they existed at all, might exist as either nouns or verbs, as either substantives or adjectives, as conjunctions, adverbs, or prepositions. This is not the case in the Greek language. There, if a word be a substantive, it will probably end in *-s*, if an infinitive verb, in *-ein*, &c. The bearings of this difference between languages like the English and languages like the Greek will soon appear.

At present, it is sufficient to say that a word, originally one part of speech (*e. g.* a noun), may become another (*e. g.* a verb). This may be called the convertibility of words.

There is an etymological convertibility, and a syntactic convertibility; and although, in some cases, the line of demarcation is not easily drawn between them, the distinction is intelligible and convenient.

Etymological convertibility.—The words *then* and *than*, now adverbs or conjunctions, were once cases: in other words, they have been converted from one part of speech to another. Or, they may even be said to be cases, at the present moment; although only in an historical point of view. For the practice of language, they are not only adverbs or conjunctions, but they are adverbs or conjunctions exclusively.

Syntactic convertibility.—The combination *to err*, is at this moment an infinitive verb. Nevertheless it can be used as the equivalent to the substantive *error*.

To err is human = error is human. Now this is an instance of syntactic conversion. Of the two meanings, there is no doubt as to which is the primary one; which primary meaning is part and parcel of the language at this moment.

The infinitive, when used as a substantive, can be used in a singular form only.

To err = error; but we have no such form as *to errs = errors*. Nor is it wanted. The infinitive, in a substantival sense, always conveys a general statement, so that even when

singular, it has a plural power; just as *man is mortal = men are mortal*.

The adjective used as a substantive.—Of these, we have examples in expressions like *the blacks of Africa—the bitters and sweets of life—all fours were put to the ground*. These are true instances of conversion, and are proved to be so by the fact of their taking a plural form.

Let the blind lead the blind is not an instance of conversion. The word *blind* in both instances remains an adjective, and is shown to remain so by its being uninflected.

Uninflected parts of speech, used as substantives.—When King Richard III. says, *none of your ifs*, he uses the word *if* as a substantive = *expressions of doubt*.

So in the expression *one long now*, the word *now* = *present time*.

The convertibility of words in English is very great; and it is so because the structure of the language favours it. As few words have any peculiar signs expressive of their being particular parts of speech, interchange is easy, and conversion follows the logical association of ideas unimpeded.

The convertibility of words is in the inverse ratio to the amount of their inflection.

CHAPTER II.

SYNTAX OF SUBSTANTIVES.

§ 285. THE phenomena of convertibility have been already explained.

The remaining points connected with the syntax of substantives, are chiefly points of either ellipsis, or apposition.

Ellipsis of substantives.—The historical view of phrases, like *Rundell and Bridge's, St. Paul's, &c.*, shows that this ellipsis is

common to the English and the other Gothic languages. Furthermore, it shows that it is met with in languages not of the Gothic stock ; and, finally, that the class of words to which it applies, is, there or thereabouts, the same generally.

A. 1. The words most commonly understood, are *house* and *family*, or words reducible to them. In Latin, *Diana* = *ædem Dianæ*.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iv. 262.

2. *Country, retinue*.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iv. 262.

3. *Son, daughter, wife, widow*.—*Deutsche Grammatik*, iv. 262.—*Νηλεὺς Κόδρου*, Greek.

B. The following phrases are referable to a different class of relations—

1. *Right and left*—supply *hand*. This is, probably, a real ellipsis. The words *right* and *left*, have not yet become true substantives ; inasmuch as they have no plural forms. In this respect, they stand in contrast with *bitter* and *sweet* ; inasmuch as we can say *he has tasted both the bitters and sweets of life*. Nevertheless, the expression can be refined on.

2. *All fours*.—*To go on all fours*. No ellipsis. The word *fours* is a true substantive, as proved by its existence as a plural.

From expressions like *ποτήριον ψυχροῦ* (Matt. x. 42), from the Greek, and *perfundit gelido* (understand *latice*), from the Latin, we find that the present ellipsis was used with greater latitude in the classical languages than our own.

§ 286. *Proper names can only be used in the singular number*.—This is a rule of logic, rather than of grammar. When we say *the four Georges, the Pitts and Camdens, &c.*, the words that thus take a plural form, have ceased to be proper names. They either mean—

1. The persons called *George, &c.*

2. Or, persons so like *George*, that they may be considered as identical.

§ 287. *Collocation*.—In the present English, the genitive case always precedes the noun by which it is governed—*the man's hat* = *hominis pileus* ; never *the hat man's* = *pileus hominis*.

CHAPTER III.

SYNTAX OF ADJECTIVES.

§ 288. *Pleonasm*.—Pleonasm can take place with adjectives only in the expression of the degrees of comparison. Over and above the etymological signs of the comparative and superlative degrees, there may be used the superlative words *more* and *most*.

And this pleonasm really occurs—

The more serene spirit.

The most straitest sect.

These are instances of pleonasm in the strictest sense of the term.

§ 289. *Collocation*.—As a general rule, the adjective precedes the substantive—*a good man*, not *a man good*.

When, however, the adjective is qualified by either the expression of its degree, or accompanied by another adjective, it may follow the substantive—

A man just and good.

A woman wise and fair.

A hero devoted to his country.

A patriot disinterested to a great degree.

Single simple adjectives thus placed after their substantive, belong to the poetry of England, and especially to the ballad poetry—*sighs profound*—*the leaves green*.

§ 290. *Government*.—The only adjective that governs a case, is the word *like*. In the expression, *this is like him*, &c., the original power of the dative remains. This we infer—

1. From the fact that in most languages which have inflec-

tions to a sufficient extent, the word meaning *like* governs a dative case.

2. From the fact that if ever we use in English any preposition at all to express similitude, it is the preposition *to*—*like to me, like to death, &c.*

Expressions like *full of meat, good for John*, are by no means instances of the government of adjectives; the really governing words being the prepositions *to* and *for* respectively.

The most that can be said, in cases like these, is that particular adjectives determine the use of particular prepositions—thus the preposition *of* generally follows the adjective *full*, &c.

§ 291. The positive degree preceded by the adjective *more*, is equivalent to the comparative form—*e. g. more wise = wiser.*

The reasons for employing one expression in preference to the other, depend upon the nature of the particular word used.

When the word is, at one and the same time, of Anglo-Saxon origin and monosyllabic, there is no doubt about the preference to be given to the form in *-er*. Thus, *wis-er* is preferable to *more wise*.

When, however, the word is compound, or trisyllabic, the combination with the word *more* is preferable—

more fruitful being better than *fruitfuller*.
more villanous *villanouser*.

Between these two extremes, there are several intermediate forms wherein the use of one rather than another, will depend upon the taste of the writer. The question, however, is a question of euphony, rather than of aught else. It is also illustrated by the principle of not multiplying secondary elements. In such a word as *fruit-full-er*, there are two additions to the root. The same is the case with the superlative, *fruit-full-est*.

The chapter on certain forms in *-er* should be read carefully for a refinement upon the current notions as to the power of the comparative degree.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TRUE PERSONAL PRONOUNS.

§ 292. *Personal pronouns*.—The use of the second person plural instead of the second singular has already been noticed. This use of one number for another is current throughout the Gothic languages. A pronoun so used is conveniently called the *pronomem reverentiæ*.

§ 293. *Dativus ethicus*.—In the phrase

Rob me the exchequer.—*Henry IV.*

the *me* is expletive, and is equivalent to *for me*. This expletive use of the dative is conveniently called the *dativus ethicus*. It occurs more frequently in the Latin than in the English, and more frequently in the Greek than in the Latin.

§ 294. *The reflected personal pronoun*.—In the English language there is no equivalent to the Latin *se*, the German *sich*, and the Scandinavian *sik*, and *sig*.

It follows from this that the word *self* is used to a greater extent than would otherwise be the case.

I strike me is awkward, but not ambiguous.

Thou strikest thee is awkward, but not ambiguous.

He strikes him is ambiguous; inasmuch as *him* may mean either the *person who strikes* or some one else. In order to be clear, we add the word *self* when the idea is reflective. *He strikes himself* is, at once, idiomatic, and unequivocal.

So it is with the plural persons.

We strike us is awkward, but not ambiguous.

Ye strike you is the same.

They strike them is ambiguous.

This shows the value of a reflective pronoun for the third person.

As a general rule, therefore, whenever we use a verb reflectively we use the word *self* in combination with the personal pronoun.

Yet this was not always the case. The use of the simple personal pronoun was current in Anglo-Saxon, and that, not only for the first two persons, but for the third as well.

The exceptions to this rule are either poetical expressions, or imperative moods.

He sat *him* down at a pillar's base.—BYRON.

Sit *thee* down.

Reflective neuters.—In the phrase *I strike me* the verb *strike* is transitive; in other words, the word *me* expresses the object of an action, and the meaning is different from the meaning of the simple expression *I strike*.

In the phrase *I fear me* (used by Lord Campbell in his "Lives of the Chancellors"), the verb *fear* is intransitive or neuter; in other words, the word *me* (unless, indeed, *fear* mean *terrify*) expresses no object of any action at all; whilst the meaning is the same as in the simple expression *I fear*.

Here the reflective pronoun appears out of place, *i. e.* after a neuter or intransitive verb.

Such a use, however, is but the fragment of an extensive system of reflective verbs thus formed, developed in different degrees in the different Gothic languages; but in all more than in the English.

§ 295. *Equivocal reflectives.*—The proper place of the reflective is *after* the verb.

The proper place of the governing pronoun is, in the indicative and subjunctive moods, *before* the verb.

Hence in expressions like the preceding there is no doubt as to the power of the pronoun.

The imperative mood, however, sometimes presents a complication. Here the governing person may follow the verb.

Mount ye = either *be mounted* or *mount yourselves*. In phrases like this, and in phrases

*Busk ye, busk ye, my bonny, bonny bride,
Busk ye, busk ye, my winsome marrow,*

the construction is ambiguous. *Ye* may either be a nominative case governing the verb *busk*, or an accusative case governed by it.

This is an instance of what may be called the *equivocal reflective*.

CHAPTER V.

ON THE SYNTAX OF THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS, AND THE PRONOUNS OF THE THIRD PERSON.

§ 296. As *his*, and *her*, are genitive cases (and not adjectives), there is no need of explaining such combinations as *his mother*, *her father*, inasmuch as no concord of gender is expected. The expressions are respectively equivalent to

*mater ejus, not mater sua;
pater ejus, . pater suus.*

It has already been shewn that *its* is a secondary genitive, and it may be added, that it is of late origin in the language. The Anglo-Saxon form was *his*, the genitive of *he* for the neuter and masculine equally. Hence, when, in the old writers, we meet *his*, where we expect *its*, we must not suppose that any personification takes place, but simply that the old genitive common to the two genders is used in preference

to the modern one limited to the neuter, and irregularly formed. This has been illustrated by Mr. Guest.

The following instances are the latest specimens of its use:—

“The apoplexy is, as I take it, a kind of lethargy. I have read the cause of *his* effects in Galen; *it* is a kind of deafness.”—2 *Henry IV.* i. 2.

“If the salt have lost *his* savour, wherewith shall it be seasoned? *It* is neither fit for the land nor yet for the dunghill; but men cast *it* out.”—*Luke* xiv. 34, 35.

“Some affirm that every plant has *his* particular fly or caterpillar, which it breeds and feeds.”—WALTON’S *Angler*.

“This rule is not so general, but that *it* admitteth of *his* exceptions.”—CAREW.

CHAPTER VI.

ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORD *SELF*.

§ 297. THE undoubted constructions of the word *self*, in the present state of the cultivated English, are threefold.

1. *Government*.—In *my-self*, *thy-self*, *our-selves*, and *your-selves*, the construction is that of a common substantive with an adjective or genitive case. *My-self* = *my individuality*, and is similarly construed—*mea individualitas* (or *persona*), or *mei individualitas* (or *persona*).

2. *Apposition*.—In *him-self* and *them-selves*, when accusative, the construction is that of a substantive in apposition with a pronoun. *Him-self* = *him, the individual*.

3. *Composition*.—It is only, however, when *himself* and *them-selves* are in the accusative case, that the construction is appositional. When they are used as nominatives, it must be explained on another principle. In phrases like

He himself was present,

They themselves were present,

there is neither apposition nor government; *him* and *them*, being neither related to *my* and *thy*, so as to be governed, nor yet to *he* and *they*, so as to form an apposition. In order to come under one of these conditions, the phrases should be either *he his self* (*they their selves*), or else *he he self* (*they they selves*). In this difficulty, the only logical view that can be taken of the matter, is to consider the words *himself* and *themselves*, not as two words, but as a single word compounded; and even then, the compound will be of an irregular kind; inasmuch as the inflectional element *-m*, is dealt with as part and parcel of the root.

Her-self.—The construction here is ambiguous. It is one of the preceding constructions. Which, however, it is, is uncertain; since *her* may be either a so-called genitive, like *my*, or an accusative, like *him*.

Itself—is also ambiguous. The *s* may represent the *-s* in *its*, as well as the *s-* in *self*.

This inconsistency is as old as the Anglo-Saxon stage of the English language.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

§ 298. THE possessive pronouns fall into two classes. The first class contains the forms connected, partially in their etymology and wholly in their syntax, with *my* and *thy*, &c. The second class contains the forms connected, partially in their etymology and wholly in their syntax, with *mine* and *thine*, &c.

The first class is the class of what may be called the *oblique* possessives; the name being founded upon the etymological fact of their being connected with the oblique cases of the pronominal inflection.—*My, thy, his* (as in *his book*), *her, its* (as in *its book*), *our, your, their*. These are conveniently considered as the equivalents to the Latin forms, *mei, tui, ejus, nostrum, vestrum, eorum*.

The second class is the class of what may be called the *absolute* possessives; the name being founded upon the syntactic fact of their being able to form the term of a proposition by themselves; as *whose is this? Mine* (not *my*).—*Mine, thine, his* (as in *the book is his*), *hers, ours, yours, theirs*, are conveniently considered as the equivalents to the Latin forms *meus, mea, meum; tuus, tua, tuum; suus, sua, suum; noster, nostra, nostrum; vester, vestra, vestrum*.

How far either or both of these two classes of pronouns are cases, or adjectives, is a point of etymology that has already been noticed.

How far both or either are cases or adjectives is, in syntax, a matter of indifference.

There is, however, a palpable difference between the construction of *my* and *mine*. We cannot say *this is mine hat*, and we cannot say *this hat is my*. Nevertheless, this difference is not explained by any change of construction from that of adjectives to that of cases. As far as the syntax is concerned, the construction of *my* and *mine* is equally that of an adjective agreeing with a substantive, and of a genitive (or possessive) case governed by a substantive.

Now a common genitive case can be used in two ways; either as part of a term, or as a whole term (*i. e.* absolutely).—
1. As part of a term—*this is John's hat*. 2. As a whole term—*this hat is John's*.

And a common adjective can be used in two ways; either as part of a term, or as a whole term (*i. e.* absolutely).—
1. As part of a term—*these are good hats*. 2. As a whole term—*these hats are good*.

Now whether we consider *my*, and the words like it, as adjectives or cases, they possess only *one* of the properties just illustrated, *i. e.* they can only be used as part of a term—*this is my hat* ; not *this hat is my*.

And whether we consider *mine*, and the words like it, as adjectives or cases, they possess only *one* of the properties just illustrated, *i. e.* they can only be used as whole terms, or absolutely—*this hat is mine* ; not *this is mine hat*.

For a full and perfect construction, whether of an adjective or a genitive case, the possessive pronouns present the phenomenon of being, singly, incomplete, but, nevertheless, complementary to each other when taken in their two forms.

In the absolute construction of a genitive case, the term is formed by the single word only so far as the *expression* is concerned. A substantive is always *understood* from what has preceded.—*This discovery is Newton's* = *this discovery is Newton's discovery*.

The same with adjectives.—*This weather is fine* = *this weather is fine weather*.

And the same with absolute pronouns.—*This hat is mine* = *this hat is my hat* ; and *this is a hat of mine* = *this is a hat of my hats*.

In respect to all matters of syntax considered exclusively, it is so thoroughly a matter of indifference whether a word be an adjective or a genitive case, that Wallis considers the forms in *-s*, like *father's*, not as genitive cases, but as adjectives. Looking to the logic of the question alone, he is right, and, looking to the practical syntax of the question, he is right also. He is only wrong on the etymological side of the question.

“Nomina substantiva apud nos nullum vel generum vel casuum discrimen sortiuntur.”—P. 76.

“Duo sunt adjectivorum genera, a substantivis immediate descendia, quæ semper substantivis suis præponuntur. Primum quidem adjectivum possessivum libet appellare. Fit autem a quovis substantivo, sive singulari sive plurali, addito *-s*.—Ut *man's nature, the nature*

of man, natura humana vel hominis; men's nature, natura humana vel hominum; Virgil's poems, the poems of Virgil, poemata Virgilii vel Virgiliana."—P. 89.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE RELATIVE PRONOUNS.

§ 299. It is necessary that the relative be in the same *gender* as the antecedent—*the man who—the woman who—the thing which.*

It is necessary that the relative be in the same *number* with the antecedent.

It is *not* necessary for the relative to be in the same *case* with its antecedent.

1. John, *who* trusts me, comes here.
2. John, *whom* I trust, comes here.
3. John, *whose* confidence I possess, comes here.
4. I trust John, *who* trusts me.

The reason why the relative must agree with its antecedent in both number and gender, whilst it need not agree with it in case, is found in the following observations.

1. All sentences containing a relative contain two verbs—*John who* (1) *trusts me* (2) *comes here.*

2. Two verbs express two actions—(1) *trust*, (2) *come.*

3. Whilst, however, the actions are two in number, the person or thing which does, or suffers them is single—*John.*

4. *He* (*she* or *it*) is singular, *ex vi termini.* The relative expresses the *identity* between the subjects (or objects) of

the two actions. Thus *who* = *John*, or is another name for *John*.

5. Things and persons that are one and the same, are of one and the same gender. The *John* who *trusts* is necessarily of the same gender with the *John* who *comes*.

6. Things and persons that are one and the same, are of one and the same number. The number of *Johns* who *trust*, is the same as the number of *Johns* who *come*. Both these elements of concord are immutable.

7. But a third element of concord is not immutable. The person or thing that is an agent in the one part of the sentence, may be the object of an action in the other. The *John* whom I *trust* may *trust* me also. Hence—

a. I trust John—*John* the object.

b. John trusts me—*John* the agent.

As the relative is only the antecedent in another form, it may change its case according to the construction.

1. I trust John—(2) *John* trusts me.

2. I trust John—(2) *He* trusts me.

3. I trust John—(2) *Who* trusts me.

4. John trusts me—(2) I trust *John*.

5. John trusts me—(2) I trust *him*.

6. John trusts me—(2) I trust *whom*.

7. John trusts me—(2) *Whom* I trust.

8. John—(2) *Whom* I trust trusts me.

§ 300. *The books I want are here.*—This is a specimen of a true ellipsis. In all such phrases in *full*, there are *three* essential elements.

1. The first proposition ; as *the books are here*.

2. The second proposition ; as *I want*.

3. The word which connects the two propositions, and without which they naturally make separate, independent, unconnected statements.

Now, although true and unequivocal ellipses are scarce,

the preceding is one of the most unequivocal kind—the word which connects the two propositions being wanting.

§ 301. *When there are two words in a clause, each capable of being an antecedent, the relative refers to the latter.*

1. *Solomon the son of David who slew Goliath.* This is unexceptionable.

2. *Solomon the son of David who built the temple.* This is exceptionable.

Nevertheless, it is defensible, on the supposition that *Solomon-the-son-of-David* is a single many-worded name.

The inference, that *David* built the temple, wrong as it would be in history, would be but a legitimate deduction from this text, otherwise interpreted.

This rule is much neglected.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN.

§ 302. QUESTIONS are of two sorts, direct and oblique.

Direct.—Who is he ?

Oblique.—Who do you say that he is ?

All difficulties about the cases of the interrogative pronoun may be determined by framing an answer, and observing the case of the word with which the interrogative coincides. Whatever be the case of this word will also be the case of the interrogative.

DIRECT.

Qu. *Who* is this ?—*Ans.* *I.*

Qu. *Whose* is this ?—*Ans.* *His.*

Qu. *Whom* do you seek ?—*Ans.* *Him.*

OBLIQUE.

Qu. Who do you say that it is?—Ans. He.

Qu. Whose do you say that it is?—Ans. His.

Qu. Whom do you say that they seek?—Ans. Him.

Note.—The answer should always be made by means of a pronoun, as, by so doing, we distinguish the accusative case from the nominative.

Note.—And, if necessary, it should be made in full. Thus the full answer to *whom do you say that they seek?* is, *I say that they seek him.*

Nevertheless, such expressions as *whom do they say that it is?* are common, especially in oblique questions. The following examples are Mr. Guest's,—*Philological Transactions* :—

“And he axed hem and seide, *whom* seien the people that I am? Thei answeredn and seiden, Jon Baptist—and he seide to hem, But *whom* seien ye that I am?”—WYCLIFFE, Luke ix.

“Tell me in sadness *whom* she is you love.”

Romeo and Juliet, i. 1.

“And as John fulfilled his course, he said, *whom* think ye that I am?”—Acts xiii. 25.

This confusion, however, is exceptionable.

CHAPTER X.

THE RECIPROCAL CONSTRUCTION.

§ 303. IN all sentences containing the statement of a reciprocal or mutual action there are in reality two assertions, viz. the assertion that A. *strikes* (or *loves*) B., and the assertion that B. *strikes* (or *loves*) A.; the action forming one, the reaction

another. Hence, if the expressions exactly coincided with the fact signified, there would always be two propositions. This, however, is not the habit of language. Hence arises a more compendious form of expression, giving origin to an ellipsis of a peculiar kind. Phrases like *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other* are elliptical, for *Eteocles and Polynices killed—each the other*. Here the second proposition expands and explains the first, whilst the first supplies the verb to the second. Each, however, is elliptic. The first is without the object, the second without the verb. That the verb must be in the plural (or dual) number, that one of the nouns must be in the nominative case, and that the other must be objective, is self-evident from the structure of the sentence; such being the conditions of the expression of the idea. An aposiopesis takes place after a plural verb, and then there follows a clause wherein the verb is supplied from what went before.

§ 304. This is the syntax. As to the power of the words *each* and *one* in the expression (*each other* and *one another*), I am not prepared to say that in the common practice of the English language there is any distinction between them. A distinction, however, if it existed, would give strength to our language. Where *two* persons performed a reciprocal action, the expression might be *one another*; as *Eteocles and Polynices killed one another*. Where *more than two* persons were engaged on each side of a reciprocal action the expression might be *each other*; as, *the ten champions praised each other*.

This amount of perspicuity is attained, by different processes, in the French, Spanish, and Scandinavian languages.

1. French.—*Ils* (*i. e.* A. and B.) *se battaient—l'un l'autre*. *Ils* (A. B. C.) *se battaient—les uns les autres*. In Spanish, *uno otro = l'un l'autre*, and *unos otros = les uns les autres*.

2. Danish.—*Hinander* = the French *l'un l'autre*; whilst *hverandre* = *les uns les autres*.

CHAPTER XI.

THE INDETERMINATE PRONOUNS.

§ 305. DIFFERENT nations have different methods of expressing indeterminate propositions.

Sometimes it is by the use of the passive voice. This is the common method in Latin and Greek, and is also current in English—*dicitur*, λέγεται, *it is said*.

Sometimes the verb is reflective—*si dice* = *it says itself*, Italian.

Sometimes the plural pronoun of the third person is used. This also is an English locution—*they say* = *the world at large says*.

Finally, the use of some word = *man* is a common indeterminate expression.

The word *man* has an indeterminate sense in the Modern German; as, *man sagt* = *they say*.

The word *man* was also used indeterminately in the Old English, although it is not so used in the modern.—*Deutsche Grammatik*.

In the Old English, the form *man* often lost the *-n*, and became *me*. This form is also extinct.

The present indeterminate pronoun is *one*; as, *one says* = *they say* = *it is said* = *man sagt*, German = *on dit*, French = *si dice*, Italian.

It has been stated that the indeterminate pronoun *one* has no etymological connection with the numeral *one*; but that it is derived from the French *on* = *homme* = *homo* = *man*; and that it has replaced the Old English *man* or *me*.

§ 306. Two other pronouns, or, to speak more in accord-

ance with the present habit of the English language, one pronoun, and one adverb of pronominal origin, are also used indifferently, viz. *it* and *there*.

It can be either the subject or the predicate of a sentence,—*it is this, this is it, I am it, it is I*. When *it* is the subject of a proposition, the verb necessarily agrees with it, and can be of the singular number only; no matter what be the number of the predicate—*it is this, it is these*.

When *it* is the predicate of a proposition, the number of the verb depends upon the number of the subject. These points of universal syntax are mentioned here for the sake of illustrating some anomalous forms.

There can only be the predicate of a subject. It differs from *it* in this respect. It follows also that it must differ from *it* in never affecting the number of the verb. This is determined by the nature of the subject—*there is this, there are these*.

When we say *there is these*, the analogy between the words *these* and *it* misleads us; the expression being illogical.

Furthermore, although a predicate, *there* always stands in the beginning of propositions, *i. e.* in the place of the subject. This also misleads.

Although *it*, when the subject, being itself singular, absolutely requires that its verb should be singular also, there is a tendency to use it incorrectly, and to treat it as a plural. Thus, in German, when the predicate is plural, the verb joined to the singular form *es* (= *it*) is plural—*es sind menschen*, literally translated = *it are men*; which, though bad English, is good German.

CHAPTER XII.

THE ARTICLES.

§ 307. THE rule of most practical importance about the articles, is the rule that determines when the article shall be repeated as often as there is a fresh substantive, and when it shall not.

When two or more substantives following each other denote the same object, the article precedes the first only. We say *the secretary and treasurer* (or, *a secretary and treasurer*), when the two offices are held by one person.

When two or more substantives following each other denote different objects, the article is repeated, and precedes each. We say *the* (or *a*) *secretary and the* (or *a*) *treasurer*, when the two offices are held by different persons.

This rule is much neglected.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE NUMERALS.

§ 308. THE numeral *one* is naturally singular. All the rest are naturally plural.

Nevertheless such expressions—*one two* (= *one collection of two*), *two threes* (= *two collections of three*), are legitimate.

These are so because the sense of the word is changed. We may talk of several *ones* just as we may talk of several *aces*; and of *one two* just as of *one pair*.

Expressions like *the thousandth-and-first* are incorrect. They mean neither one thing nor another; 1001st being expressed by *the thousand-and-first*, and 1000th + 1st being expressed by *the thousandth and the first*.

Here it may be noticed that, although I never found it to do so, the word *odd* is capable of taking an ordinal form. The *thousand-and-odd-th* is as good an expression as the *thousand-and-eight-th*.

The construction of phrases like the *thousand-and-first* is the same construction as we find in the *king-of-Saxony's army*.

It is by no means a matter of indifference whether we say the *two first* or the *first two*.

The captains of two different classes at school should be called the *two first boys*. The first and second boys of the same class should be called the *first two boys*.

CHAPTER XIV.

ON VERBS IN GENERAL.

§ 309. FOR the purposes of syntax, it is necessary to divide verbs into the five following divisions: transitive, intransitive, auxiliary, substantive, and impersonal.

Transitive verbs.—In transitive verbs the action is never a simple action. It always affects some object or other,—*I move my limbs*; *I strike my enemy*. The presence of a transitive verb implies also the presence of a noun; which noun is the name of the object affected. A transitive verb, unaccompanied by a noun, either expressed or understood, is a contradiction in

terms. The absence of the noun, in and of itself, makes it intransitive. *I move* means, simply, *I am in a state of moving*. *I strike* means, simply, *I am in the act of striking*. Verbs like *move* and *strike* are naturally transitive.

Intransitive verbs.—An act may take place, and yet no object be affected by it. *To hunger, to thirst, to sleep, to wake*, are verbs that indicate states of being, rather than actions affecting objects. Verbs like *hunger*, and *sleep*, are naturally intransitive.

Many verbs, naturally transitive, may be used as intransitive,—e. g. *I move, I strike, &c.*

Many verbs, naturally intransitive, may be used as transitive,—e. g. *I walked the horse = I made the horse walk.*

This variation in the use of one and the same verb is of much importance in the question of the government of verbs.

1. Transitive verbs are naturally followed by some noun or other; and that noun is *always* the name of something affected by them *as an object*.

2. Intransitive verbs are not naturally followed by any noun at all; and when they are so followed, the noun is *never* the name of anything affected by them *as an object*.

Nevertheless, intransitive verbs may be followed by nouns denoting the manner, degree, or instrumentality of their action,—*I walk with my feet = incedo pedibus.*

The verb *substantive* has this peculiarity, viz. that for all purposes of syntax it is no verb at all. *I speak* may, logically, be reduced to *I am speaking*; in which case it is only the *part* of a verb. Etymologically, indeed, the verb substantive is a verb; inasmuch as it is inflected as such: but for the purposes of construction, it is a copula only, *i. e.* it merely denotes the agreement or disagreement between the subject and the predicate.

CHAPTER XV.

THE CONCORD OF VERBS.

§ 310. THE verb must agree with its subject in person,—*I walk*, not *I walks*; *he walks*, not *he walk*.

It must also agree with it in number,—*we walk*, not *we walks*; *he walks*, not *he walk*.

Clear as these rules are, they require some expansion before they become sufficient to solve all the doubtful points of English syntax connected with the concord of the verb.

1. *It is I, your master, who command you.* Query? would *it is I, your master, who commands you*, be correct? This is an example of a disputed point of concord in respect to the person of the verb.

2. *The wages of sin is death.* Query? would *the wages of sin are death*, be correct? This is an example of a disputed point of concord in respect to the number of the verb.

§ 311. In respect to the concord of person the following rules will carry us through a portion of the difficulties.

Rule.—In sentences, where there is but one proposition, when a noun and a pronoun of different persons are in apposition, the verb agrees with the first of them,—*I, your master, command you* (not *commands*): *your master, I, commands you* (not *command*).

To understand the nature of the difficulty, it is necessary to remember that subjects may be extremely complex as well as perfectly simple; and that a complex subject may contain, at one and the same time, a noun-substantive and a pronoun,—*I, the keeper*; *he, the merchant*, &c.

Now all noun-substantives are naturally of the third person

—*John speaks, the men run, the commander gives orders.* Consequently the verb is of the third person also.

But the pronoun with which such a noun-substantive may be placed in apposition, may be a pronoun of either person, the first or second: *I* or *thou*—*I the commander*—*thou the commander*.—In this case the construction requires consideration. With which does the verb agree? with the substantive which requires a third person? or with the pronoun which requires a first or second?

Undoubtedly, the idea which comes first is the leading idea; and undoubtedly, the idea which explains, qualifies, or defines it, is the subordinate idea: and, undoubtedly, it is the leading idea which determines the construction of the verb. We may illustrate this from the analogy of a similar construction in respect to number—*a man with a horse and a gig meets me on the road*. Here the ideas are three; nevertheless the verb is singular. No addition of subordinate elements interferes with the construction that is determined by the leading idea. In the expression *I, your master*, the ideas are two; viz. the idea expressed by *I*, and the idea expressed by *master*. Nevertheless, as the one only explains or defines the other, the construction is the same as if the idea were single. *Your master, I*, is in the same condition. The general statement is made concerning the *master*, and it is intended to say what *he* does. The word *I* merely defines the expression by stating who the master is. Of the two expressions the latter is the awkwardest. The construction, however, is the same for both.

From the analysis of the structure of complex subjects of the kind in question, combined with a rule concerning the position of the subject, which will soon be laid down, I believe that, for all single propositions, the foregoing rule is absolute.

Rule.—In all single propositions the verb agrees in person with the noun (whether substantive or pronoun) which comes first.

But the expression *it is I, your master, who command* (or

commands) *you*, is not a single proposition. It is a sentence containing two propositions.

1. *It is I.*
2. *Who commands you.*

Here, the word *master* is, so to say, undistributed. It may belong to either clause of the sentence, *i. e.* the whole sentence may be divided into—

Either—*it is I your master*—
Or—*your master who commands you.*

This is the first point to observe. The next is, that the verb in the second clause (*command* or *commands*) is governed, not by either the personal pronoun or the substantive, but by the relative, *i. e.* in the particular case before us, not by either *I* or *master*, but by *who*.

And this brings us to the following question:—with which of the two antecedents does the *relative* agree? with *I* or with *master*?

This may be answered by the two following rules:—

Rule 1.—When the two antecedents are in the same proposition, the relative agrees with the first. Thus—

1. *It is I your master*—
2. *Who command you.*

Rule 2.—When the two antecedents are in different propositions, the relative agrees with the second. Thus—

1. *It is I*—
2. *Your master who commands you.*

This, however, is not all. What determines whether the two antecedents shall be in the same or in different propositions? I believe that the following rules for what may be called *the distribution of the substantive antecedent* will bear criticism.

Rule 1. That when there is any natural connection between the substantive antecedent and the verb governed by the rela-

tive, the antecedent belongs to the second clause. Thus, in the expression just quoted, the word *master* is logically connected with the word *command*; and this fact makes the expression, *It is I your master who commands you*, the better of the two.

Rule 2. That when there is no natural connection between the substantive antecedent and the verb governed by the relative, the antecedent belongs to the first clause. *It is I, John, who command* (not *commands*) *you*.

To recapitulate, the train of reasoning has been as follows:—

1. The person of the second verb is the person of the relative.

2. The person of the relative is that of one of two antecedents.

3. Of such two antecedents the relative agrees with the one which stands in the same proposition with itself.

4. Which position is determined by the connection or want of connection between the substantive antecedent and the verb governed by the relative.

Respecting the person of the verb in the *first* proposition of a complex sentence there is no doubt. *I, your master, who commands you to make haste, am* (not *is*) *in a hurry*. Here, *I am in a hurry* is the first proposition; *who commands you to make haste*, the second.

It is not difficult to see why the construction of sentences consisting of two propositions is open to an amount of latitude which is not admissible in the construction of single propositions. As long as the different parts of a complex idea are contained within the limits of a single proposition, their subordinate character is easily discerned. When, however, they amount to whole propositions, they take the appearance of being independent members of the sentence.

§ 312. *The concord of number.*—It is believed that the following three rules will carry us through all difficulties of the kind just exhibited.

Rule 1. That the verb agrees with the subject, and with

nothing but the subject. The only way to justify such an expression as *the wages of sin is death*, is to consider *death* not as the subject, but as the predicate; in other words, to consider the construction to be, *death is the wages of sin*.

Rule 2. That, except in the case of the word *there*, the word which comes first is always the subject, until the contrary be proved.

Rule 3. That no number of connected singular nouns can govern a plural verb, unless they be connected by a copulative conjunction. *The sun and moon shine*,—*the sun* in conjunction with *the moon shines*.

§ 313. *Plural subjects with singular predicates.*—The wages of sin *are* death.—Honest men *are* the salt of the earth.

Singular subjects with plural predicates.—These constructions are rarer than the preceding: inasmuch as two or more persons (or things) are oftener spoken of as being equivalent to one, than one person (or thing) is spoken of as being equivalent to two or more.

Sixpence *is* twelve halfpennies.

He *is* all head and shoulders.

Vulnere totus *erat*.

Tu *es* deliciæ meæ.

Ἐκτωρ, ἀτὰρ σὺ μοι ἴσσι πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ,

Ἦδι κασίγνητος, σὺ δέ μοι θαλιρὸς παρακοίτης.

CHAPTER XVI.

ON THE GOVERNMENT OF VERBS.

§ 314. THE government of verbs is of two sorts, (1.) *objective*, and (2.) *modal*.

It is objective where the noun which follows the verb is the name of some object affected by the action of the verb,—as *he strikes me; he wounds the enemy*.

It is modal when the noun which follows the verb is not the

name of any object affected by the verb, but the name of some object explaining the manner in which the action of the verb takes place, the instrument with which it is done, the end for which it is done, &c.

The government of all transitive verbs is necessarily objective. It may also be modal,—*I strike the enemy with the sword = ferio hostem gladio.*

The government of all intransitive verbs can only be modal,—*I walk with the stick.* When we say, *I walk the horse*, the word *walk* has changed its meaning, and signifies *make to walk*, and is, by the very fact of its being followed by the name of an object, converted from an intransitive into a transitive verb.

The modal construction may also be called the *adverbial construction*; because the effect of the noun is akin to that of an adverb,—*I fight with bravery = I fight bravely; he walks a king = he walks regally.* The modal (or adverbial) construction (or government) sometimes takes the appearance of the objective: inasmuch as intransitive verbs are frequently followed by a substantive; which substantive is in the objective case. Nevertheless, this is no proof of government. For a verb to be capable of governing an objective case, it must be a verb signifying an action affecting an object: and if there be no such object, there is no room for any objective government. *To break the sleep of the righteous* is *to affect, by breaking, the sleep of the righteous*: but, *to sleep the sleep of the righteous*, is *not to affect, by sleeping, the sleep of the righteous*; since the act of sleeping is an act that affects no object whatever. It is a *state*. We may, indeed, give it the appearance of a transitive verb, as we do when we say, *the opiate slept the patient*, meaning thereby, *lulled to sleep*; but the transitive character is only apparent.

To sleep the sleep of the righteous is *to sleep in agreement with—or according to—or after the manner of—the sleep of the righteous*, and the construction is adverbial.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE IMPERSONAL VERBS.

§ 315. *Meseems*.—Equivalent to *it seems to me*; *mihi videtur*, φαίνεταί μοι. The verb *seems* is intransitive; consequently the pronoun *me* has the power of a dative case. The pronoun *it* is not required to accompany the verb.

Methinks.—In Anglo-Saxon there are two forms; *pencan* = *to think*, and *þincan* = *to seem*. It is from the latter form that the verb in *methinks* comes. Such being the case, it is intransitive, and consequently the pronoun *me* has the power of a dative case. The pronoun *it* is not required to accompany the verb.

Of this word we have also the past form *methought*.

Methought I saw my late espoused wife
Brought to me, like Alcestis, from the grave.

MILTON.

Me listeth, or *me lists*.—Equivalent to *it pleases me* = *me juvat*. Anglo-Saxon *lystan* = *to wish*, *to choose*, also *to please*, *to delight*; Norse, *lysta*. Unlike the other two, the verb is transitive, so that the pronoun *me* has the power of an accusative case. The pronoun *it* is not required to accompany the verb.

These three are the only true impersonal verbs in the English language. They form a class by themselves, because no pronoun accompanies them, as is the case with the equivalent expressions *it appears*, *it pleases*, and with all the other verbs in the language.

CHAPTER XVIII.

ON THE PARTICIPLES.

§ 316. THE present participle, or the participle in *-ing*, must be considered in respect to its relations with the substantive in *-ing*. *Dying-day* is, probably, no more a participle than *morning-walk*. In respect to the syntax of such expressions as the forthcoming, I consider that they are *either* participles or substantives.

1. When substantives, they are in regimen, and govern a genitive case—*What is the meaning of the lady's holding up her train?* Here the word *holding* = *the act of holding*.—*Quid est significatio elevationis pallæ de parte fæminæ?*

2. When participles, they are in apposition or concord, and would, if inflected, appear in the same case with the substantive, or pronoun, preceding them—*What is the meaning of the lady holding up her train?* Here the word *holding* = *in the act of holding*, and answers to the Latin *fæminæ elevantis*.—*Quid est significatio fæminæ elevantis pallam?*

§ 317. The past participle corresponds not with the Greek form *τυπτόμενος*, but with the form *τετυμμένος*. *I am beaten* is essentially a combination, expressive not of present but of past time, just like the Latin *sum verberatus*. Its Greek equivalent is not *εἰμι τυπτόμενος* = *I am a man in the act of being beaten*, but *εἰμι τετυμμένος* = *I am a man who has been beaten*. It is past in respect to the action, though present in respect to the state brought about by the action.

CHAPTER XIX.

ON THE MOODS.

§ 318. THE infinitive mood is a noun. The current rule—that *when two verbs come together the latter is placed in the infinitive mood*—means that one verb can govern another only by converting it into a noun,—*I begin to move = I begin the act of moving*. Verbs, as verbs, can only come together in the way of apposition,—*I irritate, I beat, I talk at him, I call him names, &c.*

The construction, however, of English infinitives is twofold. (1.) Objective. (2.) Gerundial.

When one verb is followed by another without the preposition *to*, the construction must be considered to have grown out of the objective case, or from the form in *-an*.

This is the case with the following words, and, probably, with others:—

I may go,	<i>not</i> I may <i>to</i> go.
I might go,	. I might <i>to</i> go.
I can move,	. I can <i>to</i> move.
I could move,	. I could <i>to</i> move.
I will speak,	. I will <i>to</i> speak.
I would speak,	. I would <i>to</i> speak.
I shall wait,	. I shall <i>to</i> wait.
I should wait,	. I should <i>to</i> wait.
Let me go,	. Let me <i>to</i> go.
He let me go,	. He let me <i>to</i> go.
I do speak,	. I do <i>to</i> speak.
I did speak,	. I did <i>to</i> speak.
I dare go,	. I dare <i>to</i> go.
I durst go,	. I durst <i>to</i> go.

This, in the present English, is the rarer of the two constructions.

When a verb is followed by another, preceded by the preposition *to*, the construction must be considered to have grown out of the so-called gerund, *i. e.* the form in *-nne*, *i. e.* the dative case—*I begin to move*. This is the case with the great majority of English verbs.

§ 319. Imperatives have three peculiarities. (1.) They can only, in English, be used in the second person: (2.) They take pronouns after, instead of before, them: (3.) They often omit the pronoun altogether.

For the syntax of subjunctives, see the chapter on Conjunctions.

CHAPTER XX.

ON THE TENSES.

§ 320. NOTWITHSTANDING its name, the present tense, in English, does not express a strictly *present* action. It rather expresses an habitual one. *He speaks well = he is a good speaker*. If a man means to say that he is in the act of speaking, he says *I am speaking*.

It has also, especially when combined with a subjunctive mood, a future power—*I beat you (= I will beat you) if you don't leave off*.

§ 321. The English præterite is the equivalent, not to the Greek perfect, but the Greek aorist. *I beat = ἔτυψα*, not *τέτυφα*. The true perfect is expressed, in English, by the auxiliary *have* + the past participle.

CHAPTER XXI.

SYNTAX OF THE PERSONS OF VERBS.

§ 322. *The concord of persons.*—A difficulty that occurs frequently in the Latin language is rare in English. In expressions like *ego et ille* followed by a verb, there arises a question as to the person in which that verb should be used. Is it to be in the first person in order to agree with *ego*, or in the *third* in order to agree with *ille*? For the sake of laying down a rule upon these and similar points, the classical grammarians arrange the persons (as they do the genders) according to their *dignity*, making the verb (or adjective if it be a question of gender) agree with the most *worthy*. In respect to persons, the first is more worthy than the second, and the second more worthy than the third. Hence, the Latins said—

Ego et Balbus sustulimus manus.

Tu et Balbus sustulistis manus.

Now, in English, the plural form is the same for all three persons. Hence we say *I and you are friends, you and I are friends, I and he are friends, &c.*, so that, for the practice of language, the question as to the relative dignity of the three persons is a matter of indifference.

Nevertheless, it *may* occur even in English. Whenever two or more pronouns of different persons, and of the *singular* number, follow each other *disjunctively*, the question of concord arises. *I or you,—you or he,—he or I.* I believe that, in these cases, the rule is as follows:—

1. Whenever the words *either* or *neither* precede the pronouns, the verb is in the third person. *Either you or I is in the wrong; neither you nor I is in the wrong.*

2. Whenever the disjunctive is simple (*i. e.* unaccompanied with the word *either* or *neither*), the verb agrees with the *first* of the two pronouns.

I or *he* *am* in the wrong.

He or *I* *is* in the wrong.

Thou or *he* *art* in the wrong.

He or *thou* *is* in the wrong.

Now, provided that they are correct, it is clear that the English language knows nothing about the relative degrees of dignity between these three pronouns; since its habit is to make the verb agree with the one which is placed first—whatever may be the person. I am strongly inclined to believe that the same is the case in Latin; in which case (in the sentence *ego et Balbus sustulimus manus*) *sustulimus* agrees, in person, with *ego*, not because the first person is the worthiest, but because it comes first in the proposition. That the greater supposed worth of the first person may be a reason for putting it first in the proposition is likely enough.

CHAPTER XXII.

ON THE AUXILIARY VERBS.

§ 323. THE auxiliary verbs, in English, play a most important part in the syntax of the language. They may be classified upon a variety of principles. The following, however, are all that need here be applied.

A. *Classification of auxiliaries according to their inflectional or non-inflectional powers.*—Inflectional auxiliaries are those that may either replace or be replaced by an inflection. Thus —*I am struck* = the Latin *ferior*, and the Greek *τύπτομαι*. These auxiliaries are in the same relation to verbs that prepositions are to nouns. The inflectional auxiliaries are:—

two ideas, a past idea in the participle, and a present idea in the word denoting possession.

For an object of any sort, affected in a particular manner, to be in the possession of a person, it must previously have been affected in the manner required. If I possess a horse that has been ridden, the riding must have taken place before I mention the fact of the ridden horse being in my possession; inasmuch as I speak of it as a thing already done,—the participle, *ridden*, being in the past tense.

I have ridden a horse—I have a horse ridden. I have a horse as a ridden horse, or (changing the gender and dealing with the word *horse* as a thing), *I have a horse as a ridden thing*.

In this case the syntax is of the usual sort. (1.) *Have* = *own* = *habeo* = *teneo*; (2.) *horse* is the accusative case = *equum*; (3.) *ridden* is a past participle agreeing either with *horse*, or with a word in apposition with it understood.

Mark the words in italics. The word *ridden* does not agree with *horse*, since it is of the neuter gender. Neither if we said *I have ridden the horses*, would it agree with *horses*; since it is of the singular number.

The true construction is arrived at by supplying the word *thing*. *I have a horse as a ridden thing* = *habeo equum equitatum* (neuter). Here the construction is the same as *triste lupus stabulis*.

I have horses as a ridden thing = *habeo equos equitatum* (singular neuter).

The combination of *have* with an intransitive verb is irreducible to the idea of possession: indeed, it is illogical. In *I have waited*, we cannot make the idea expressed by the word *waited* the object of the verb *have* or *possess*. The expression has become a part of language by means of the extension of a false analogy. It is an instance of an illegitimate imitation.

The combination of *have* with *been* is more illogical still, and is a stronger instance of the influence of an illegitimate imitation. In German and Italian, where even *intransitive* verbs are combined with the equivalents to the English *have* (*haben*,

and *avere*), the verb-substantive is not so combined; on the contrary, the combinations are—

Italian; <i>io sono stato</i>	=	<i>I am been.</i>
German; <i>ich bin gewesen</i>	=	<i>. Ditto.</i>

which is logical.

§ 325. *I am to speak*.—Three facts explain this idiom.

1. The idea of *direction towards an object* conveyed by the dative case, and by combinations equivalent to it.

2. The extent to which the ideas of necessity, obligation, or intention are connected with the idea of *something that has to be done*, or *something towards which some action has a tendency*.

3. The fact that expressions like the one in question historically represent an original dative case, or its equivalent; since *to speak* grows out of the Anglo-Saxon form *to spreccanne*, which, although called a gerund, is really a dative case of the infinitive mood.

When Johnson thought that, in the phrase *he is to blame*, the word *blame* was a noun, if he meant a noun in the way that *culpa* is a noun, his view was wrong. But if he meant a noun in the way that *culpare*, and *ad culpandum*, are nouns, it was right.

§ 326. *I am to blame*.—This idiom is one degree more complex than the previous one; since *I am to blame* = *I am to be blamed*. As early, however, as the Anglo-Saxon period, the gerunds were liable to be used in a passive sense: *he is to lufigenne* = not *he is to love*, but *he is to be loved*.

The principle of this confusion may be discovered by considering that *an object to be blamed* is *an object for some one to blame*, *an object to be loved* is *an object for some one to love*.

§ 327. *I am beaten*.—This is a present combination, and it is present on the strength of the verb *am*, not on the strength of the participle *beaten*, which is præterite.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE SYNTAX OF ADVERBS.

§ 328. THE syntax of the adverb is simpler than that of any other part of speech, excepting, perhaps, that of the adjective.

Adverbs have no concord.

Neither have they any government. They *seem*, indeed, to have it, when they are in the comparative or superlative degree; but it is merely apparent. In *this is better than that*, the word *that* is governed neither by *better* nor by *than*. It is not governed at all. It is a nominative case; the subject of a separate proposition,—*This is better (i. e. more good) than that is good*. Even if we admit such an expression as *he is stronger than me* to be good English, there is no adverbial government. *Than*, if it govern *me* at all, governs it as a preposition.

The position of an adverb is, in respect to matters of syntax, pre-eminently parenthetic; *i. e.* it may be omitted without injuring the construction. *He is fighting—now; he was fighting—then; he fights—bravely; I am—almost—tired, &c.*

By referring to the chapter on the Adverbs, we shall find that the neuter adjective is frequently converted into an adverb by deflection. As any neuter adjective may be so deflected, we may justify such expressions as *full* (for *fully*) as *conspicuous* (for *conspicuously*), and *peculiar* (for *peculiarly*). We are not, however, bound to imitate everything that we can justify.

§ 329. The termination *-ly* was originally adjectival. At present it is a derivational syllable by which we can convert an adjective into an adverb: *brave, brave-ly*. When, however, the adjective ends in *-ly* already, the formation is awkward. *I eat*

my daily bread is unexceptionable English; *I eat my bread daily* is exceptionable. One of two things must here take place: the two syllables *ly* are packed into one (the full expression being *dai-li-ly*), or else the construction is that of a neuter adjective deflected.

§ 330. It has been remarked, that in expressions like *he sleeps the sleep of the righteous*, the construction is adverbial. So it is in expressions like *he walked a mile, it weighs a pound*. The ideas expressed by *mile* and *pound* are not the names of anything that serves as either object or instrument to the verb. They only denote the *manner* of the action, and define the meaning of the verb.

§ 331. *From whence, from thence*.—This is an expression which, if it have not taken root in our language, is likely to do so. It is an instance of excess of expression in the way of syntax; the *-ce* denoting direction *from* a place, and the preposition doing the same. It is not so important to determine what this construction is, as to suggest what it is *not*. It is *not* an instance of an adverb governed by a preposition. If the two words be dealt with as logically separate, *whence* (or *thence*) must be a noun = *which place* (or *that place*); just as *from then till now* = *from that time till this*. But if (which is the better view) the two words be dealt with as one (*i. e.* as an improper compound) the preposition *from* has lost its natural power, and become the element of an adverb.

CHAPTER XXIV.

PREPOSITIONS.

§ 332. ALL prepositions govern an oblique case. If a word ceases to do this, it ceases to be a preposition. In the first of

the two following sentences the word *up* is a preposition, in the second an adverb.

1. *I climbed up the tree.*

2. *I climbed up.*

All prepositions, in English, precede the noun which they govern. *I climbed up the tree*, never *I climbed the tree up*.

§ 333. No preposition, in the present English, governs a genitive case. This remark is made, because expressions like the *part of the body—pars corporis,—a piece of the bread—portio panis*, make it appear as if the preposition *of* did so. The true expression is, that the preposition *of*, followed by an objective case is equivalent, in many instances, to the genitive case of the classical languages.

CHAPTER XXV.

CONJUNCTIONS.

§ 334. A CONJUNCTION is a part of speech which connects propositions,—*the day is bright*, is one proposition. *The sun shines*, is another. *The day is bright because the sun shines*, is a pair of propositions connected by the conjunction *because*.

From this it follows, that when there is a conjunction, there are two subjects, two copulas, and two predicates: *i. e.* two propositions in all their parts.*

But this may be expressed compendiously. *The sun shines, and the moon shines*, may be expressed by the *sun and moon shine*.

Nevertheless, however compendious may be the expression, there are two propositions where there is one conjunction. A part of speech that merely combines two words is a preposition,—*the sun along with the moon shines*.

* There are a few exceptions to this, *e. g.* *all men are black or white*.

It is highly important to remember that conjunctions connect *propositions* rather than *words*.

It is also highly important to remember that many double propositions may be expressed so compendiously as to look like one. When this takes place, and any question arises as to the construction, they must be exhibited in their fully-expanded form; *i. e.* the second subject, the second predicate, and the second copula, must be supplied. This can always be done from the first proposition,—*he likes you better than me = he likes you better than he likes me.* The compendious expression of the second proposition is the first point of note in the syntax of conjunctions.

§ 335. The second point in the syntax of conjunctions is, the fact of their great convertibility. Most conjunctions have been developed out of some other part of speech.

The conjunction of comparison, *than*, is derived from the adverb of time, *then*; which is derived from the accusative singular of the demonstrative pronoun.

The conjunction, *that*, is derived also from a demonstrative pronoun.

The conjunction, *therefore*, is a demonstrative pronoun + a preposition.

The conjunction, *because*, is a substantive governed by a preposition.

One and the same word, in one and the same sentence, may be a conjunction or preposition, as the case may be.

All fled but John.—If this mean *all fled* except *John*, the word *but* is a preposition, the word *John* is an accusative case, and the proposition is single. If instead of *John*, we had a personal pronoun, we should say, *all fled but him*.

All fled but John.—If this mean *all fled but John did not fly*, the word *but* is a conjunction, the word *John* is a nominative case, and the propositions are two in number. If, instead of *John*, we had a personal pronoun, we should say, *all fled but he*.

From the fact of the great convertibility of conjunctions,

it is often necessary to determine whether a word be a conjunction or not. *If it be a conjunction, it cannot govern a case. If it govern a case, it is no conjunction, but a preposition.* A conjunction cannot govern a case, for the following reason,—the word that follows it *must* be the subject of the second proposition, and as such, a nominative case.

§ 336. The third point to determine in the syntax of conjunctions is, the certainty or uncertainty in the mind of the speaker as to the facts expressed by the propositions which they serve to connect.

1. Each proposition may contain a certain, definite, absolute fact,—*the day is clear* because *the sun shines*. Here there is neither doubt nor contingency of either the *day being clear*, or of the *sun shining*.

2. Of two propositions one may be the condition of the other,—*the day will be clear* if *the sun shine*. Here, although it is certain that *if the sun shine the day will be clear*, there is no certainty of *the sun shining*. Of the two propositions one only embodies a certain fact, and that is certain only conditionally.

Now an action, wherein there enters any notion of uncertainty, or indefinitude, and which is, at the same time, connected with another action, is expressed, not by the indicative mood, but by the subjunctive. *If the sun shine* (not *shines*) *the day will be clear*.

Simple uncertainty will not constitute a subjunctive construction,—*I am*, perhaps, *in the wrong*.

Neither will simple connection,—*I am wrong*, because *you are right*.

But, the two combined constitute the construction in question,—*if I be wrong, you are right*.

Now, a conjunction that connects two certain propositions may be said to govern an indicative mood.

And a conjunction that connects an uncertain proposition with a certain one, may be said to govern a subjunctive mood.

The government of mood is the only form of government of which conjunctions are capable.

§ 337. Previous to the question of the government of conjunctions in the way of mood, it is necessary to notice certain points of agreement between them and the relative pronouns inasmuch as, in many cases, the relative pronoun exerts the same government, in the way of determining the mood of the verb, as the conjunction.

Between the relative pronouns and conjunctions in general there is this point of connection,—both join propositions. Wherever there is a relative, there is a second proposition. So there is wherever there is a conjunction.

Between certain relative pronouns and those particular conjunctions that govern a subjunctive mood there is also a point of connection. Both suggest an element of uncertainty or indefinitude. This the relative pronouns do, through the logical elements common to them and to the interrogatives: these latter essentially suggesting the idea of doubt. Wherever the person, or thing, connected with an action, and expressed by a relative is indefinite, there is room for the use of a subjunctive mood. Thus—“he that troubled you shall bear his judgment, *whosoever* he be.”

By considering the nature of such words as *when*, their origin as relatives on the one hand, and their conjunctive character on the other hand, we are prepared for finding a relative element in words like *till, until, before, as long as, &c.* These can all be expanded into expressions like *until the time when, during the time when, &c.* Hence, in an expression like *seek out his wickedness till thou find (not findest) none*, the principle of the construction is nearly the same as in *he that troubled you, &c., or vice versâ.**

In most conditional expressions the subjunctive mood should follow the conjunction. All the following expressions are conditional.

* Notwithstanding the extent to which a relative may take the appearance of a conjunction, there is always one unequivocal method of deciding its true nature. The relative is always a *part* of the second proposition. A conjunction is *no part* of either.

1. *Except I be* by Silvia in the night,
There is no music in the nightingale.

SHAKSPERE.

2. Let us go and sacrifice to the Lord our God, *lest* he *fall* upon us with pestilence.—*Old Testament*.

3. —Revenge back on itself recoils.

Let it. I reck not, so it *light* well aimed.

J. MILTON.

4. *If* this *be* the case.

5. *Although* my house *be* not so with God.—*Old Testament*.

6. He shall not eat of the holy thing *unless* he *wash* his flesh with water.—*Old Testament*.

Expressions like *except* and *unless* are equally conditional with words like *if* and *provided that*, since they are equivalent to *if—not*.

Expressions like *though* and *although* are peculiar. They join propositions, of which the one is a *prima facie* reason against the existence of the other: and this is the conditional element. In the sentence, *if the children be so badly brought-up, they are not to be trusted*, the *bad bringing-up* is the reason for their *being unfit to be trusted*; and, as far as the expression is concerned, *is admitted to be so*. The only uncertainty lies in the question as to the degree of the badness of the education. The inference from it is unequivocal.

But, if, instead of saying *if*, we say *although*, and omit the word *not*, so the sentence run *although the children be so badly brought-up they are to be trusted*, we do two things: we indicate the general relation of cause and effect that exists between *bad bringing-up* and *unfitness for being trusted*, but we also, at the same time, take an exception to it in the particular instance before us. These remarks have been made for the sake of showing the extent to which words like *though*, &c., are conditional.

It must be remembered, however, that conjunctions, like

the ones lately quoted, do not govern subjunctive moods because they are conditional, but because, in the particular condition which they accompany, there is an element of uncertainty.

§ 338. This introduces a fresh question. Conditional conjunctions are of two sorts :—

1. Those which express a condition as an actual fact, and one admitted as such by the speaker.

2. Those which express a condition as a possible fact, and one which the speaker either does not admit, or admits only in a qualified manner.

Since *the children* are *so badly brought-up*, &c.—This is an instance of the first construction. The speaker admits as an actual fact the *bad bringing-up of the children*.

If *the children* be *so badly brought-up*, &c.—This is an instance of the second construction. The speaker admits as a possible (perhaps, as a probable) fact the *bad bringing-up of the children*; but he does not adopt it as an indubitable one.

Now, if every conjunction had a fixed unvariable meaning, there would be no difficulty in determining whether a condition was absolute, and beyond doubt, or possible, and liable to doubt. But such is not the case.

Although may precede a proposition which is admitted as well as one which is doubted.

a. Although *the children* are, &c.

b. Although *the children* be, &c.

If, too, may precede propositions wherein there is no doubt whatever implied: in other words, it may be used instead of *since*.

In some languages this interchange goes further than in others: in the Greek, for instance, such is the case with $\epsilon\iota$, to a very great extent indeed.

Hence we must look to the meaning of the sentence in general, rather than to the particular conjunction used.

It is a philological fact that *if* may stand instead of *since*.

It is also a philological fact, that when it does so, it should be followed by the indicative mood.

This is written in the way of illustration. What applies to *if* applies to other conjunctions as well.

As a point of practice, the following method of determining the amount of doubt expressed in a conditional proposition is useful:—

Insert, immediately after the conjunction, one of the two following phrases,—(1.) *as is the case*; (2.) *as may or may not be the case*. By ascertaining which of these two supplements expresses the meaning of the speaker, we ascertain the mood of the verb which follows.

When the first formula is the one required, there is no element of doubt, and the verb should be in the indicative mood. *If (as is the case) he is gone, I must follow him.*

When the second formula is the one required, there is an element of doubt, and the verb should be in the subjunctive mood. *If (as may or may not be the case) he be gone, I must follow him.*

§ 339. The use of the word *that* in expressions like *I eat that I may live, &c.*; is a modification of the subjunctive construction, that is conveniently called *potential*. It denotes that one act is done for the sake of supplying the *power* or opportunity for the performance of another.

The most important point connected with the powers of *that* is the so-called *succession of tenses*.

The succession of tenses.—Whenever the conjunction *that* expresses intention, and consequently connects two verbs, the second of which takes place *after* the first, the verbs in question must be in the same tense.

I do this that I may gain by it.

I did this that I might gain by it.

In the Greek language this is expressed by a difference of mood; the subjunctive being the construction equivalent to

may, the optative to *might*. The Latin idiom coincides with the English.

A little consideration will show that this rule is absolute. For a man *to be doing* one action (in present time) in order that some other action may *follow* it (in past time) is to reverse the order of cause and effect. To do anything in A.D. 1851, that something may result from it in 1850 is a contradiction; and so it is to say *I do this* that *I might gain by it*.

The reasons against the converse construction are nearly, if not equally, cogent. To have done anything at any *previous* time in order that a *present* effect may follow, is, *ipso facto*, to convert a past act into a present one, or, to speak in the language of the grammarian, to convert an aorist into a perfect. To say *I did this* that *I may gain by it*, is to make, by the very effect of the expression, either *may* equivalent to *might*, or *did* equivalent to *have done*.

I did this that *I might gain*.

I have done this that *I may gain*.

§ 340. *Disjunctives*.—Disjunctives (*or*, *nor*) are of two sorts, real and nominal.

A king or queen always rules in England. Here the disjunction is real; *king* or *queen* being different names for different objects. In all *real* disjunctions the inference is, that if one out of two (or more) individuals (or classes) do not perform a certain action, the other does.

A sovereign or supreme ruler always rules in England. Here the disjunction is nominal; *sovereign* and *supreme governor* being different names for the same object. In all nominal disjunctives the inference is, that if an agent (or agents) do not perform a certain action under one name, he does (or they do) it under another.

Nominal disjunctives are called by Harris *subdisjunctives*.

As a periphrasis, the combination *in other words* is *subdisjunctive*.

Both nominal and real disjunctives agree in this,—whatever may be the number of nouns which they connect, the construction of the verb is the same as if there were but one—Henry, or John, or Thomas, *walks* (not *walk*); the sun, or solar luminary, *shines* (not *shine*). The disjunctive *isolates* the subject, however much it may be placed in juxtaposition with other nouns.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE SYNTAX OF THE NEGATIVE.

§ 341. WHEN the verb is in the infinitive mood, the negative precedes it.—*Not to advance is to retreat.*

When the verb is not in the infinitive mood, the negative follows it.—*He advanced not. I cannot.*

This rule is absolute. It only *seems* to precede the verb in such expressions as *I do not advance, I cannot advance, I have not advanced, &c.* However, the words *do, can, and have,* are no infinitives; and it consequently follows them. The word *advance* is an infinitive, and it consequently precedes it.

That the negative is rarely used, except with an auxiliary—in other words, that the presence of a negative converts a simple form like *it burneth not* into the circumlocution *it does not burn*—is a fact in the practice of the English language. The syntax is the same in either expression.

§ 342. In the present English, two negatives make an affirmative. *I have not not seen him = I have seen him.* In Greek this was not the case. *Duæ aut plures negativæ apud Græcos vehementius negant* is a well-known rule. The Anglo-Saxon idiom differed from the English, and coincided with the

Greek. The French negative is only apparently double; words like *point, pas*, mean not *not*, but *at all*. *Je ne parle pas* = *I not speak at all*, not *I not speak no*.

§ 843. *Questions of appeal*.—All questions imply want of information; want of information may then imply doubt; doubt, perplexity; and perplexity the absence of an alternative. In this way, we have what are called *questions of appeal*; which are, practically speaking, negatives. *What should I do?* when asked in extreme perplexity, means that nothing can well be done.

CHAPTER XXVII.

THE CASE ABSOLUTE.

§ 344. WHEN two actions are connected with each other, either by the fact of their simultaneous occurrence, or as cause and effect, they may be expressed within the limits of a single proposition, by expressing the one by means of a verb, and the other by means of a noun and participle agreeing with each other. *The door being open, the horse was stolen*.

Considering the nature of the connection between the two actions, we find good grounds for expecting *à priori* that the participle will be in the instrumental case, when such exists in the language; and when not, in some case allied to it, *i. e.* the ablative or dative.

In Latin the ablative is the case that is used absolutely. *Sole orto, claruit dies*.

In Anglo-Saxon the absolute case was the dative. This is logical.

In the present English, however, the nominative is the absolute case. *He made the best proverbs, him alone excepted, is*

an expression of Tillotson's. We should now write *he alone excepted*. The present mode of expression is only to be justified by considering the nominative form to be a dative one, just as in the expression *you are here*, the word *you*, although an accusative, is considered as a nominative. A real nominative absolute is as illogical as a real accusative case governing a verb.

QUESTIONS.

1. Explain the terms *Syntax*, *Ellipsis*, *Pleonasm*, *Zeugma*, *Pros-to-semainomenon*, *Apposition*, and *Convertibility*, giving examples of each.
2. What is the Government of Adjectives?
3. What is the construction in—
 - a. Rob *me* the Exchequer.—SHAKSPEARE.
 - b. Mount *ye* on horseback.
 - c. *His* mother.
 - d. If the salt have lost *his* savour.
 - e. Myself *is* weak.
 - f. This is *mine*.
4. What are the concords between the relative and antecedent? How far is, *whom* do they say that I am, an exceptionable expression?
5. *Eteocles and Polynices killed each other*. What is the construction here? *Ils se battaient, l'un l'autre*—*Ils se battaient, les uns les autres*. Translate these two sentences into English. *My wife and little ones are well*. What is the origin of the word *ones* here? *It was those who spoke*. *There was those who spoke*. Why is one of those expressions correct, the other incorrect?
6. What is the difference between—
 - a. *The* secretary and treasurer,
and
The secretary and *the* treasurer?

What is that between—

The first two,
and

The two first ?

7. What is the construction of—

He sleeps the sleep of the righteous ?

8. Whether do you say—It is I your master who *command* you ;
or, It is I your master who *commands* you ?

9. Explain in full the following constructions—

a. I have ridden a horse.

b. I am to blame.

c. I am beaten.

d. A part of the body.

e. All fled but John.

10. What is meant by the *Succession of Tenses* ? Show the logical necessity of it.

11. Or *hear'st* thou rather pure ethereal stream,

Whose fountain *who can* tell ?—MILTON.

Give the meaning of this passage, and explain the figure of speech exhibited in the words in Italics.

12. The *door* being open the steed was stolen.—In what case is *door* ?

WORKS BY DR. R. G. LATHAM.

A HANDBOOK OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE; for the Use of Students of the Universities and Higher Classes of Schools. Second Edition. 1 vol. crown 8vo.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. Fourth Edition. 2 vols. 8vo.

AN ELEMENTARY ENGLISH GRAMMAR FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS. Thirteenth Thousand. 12mo. 4s. 6d. cloth.

AN ENGLISH GRAMMAR FOR THE USE OF LADIES' SCHOOLS. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

THE HISTORY AND ETYMOLOGY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, FOR THE USE OF CLASSICAL SCHOOLS. Second Edition. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

A GRAMMAR OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE, FOR THE USE OF COMMERCIAL SCHOOLS. Foolscap 8vo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

FIRST OUTLINES OF LOGIC, Applied to Grammar and Etymology. 12mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

THE GERMANIA OF TACITUS; with Ethnological Dissertations and Notes. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

WALTON AND MABERLY,

Upper Gower Street, and Ivy Lane, Paternoster Row.

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF THE VARIETIES OF MAN. In 1 vol. 8vo. Illustrated, price 21s.—Van Voorst.

“The truly masculine minds of England, of continental Europe, and of Anglo-Saxon America, will prize it as the best book of its time, on the best subject of its time.”—*Weekly News*.

MAN AND HIS MIGRATIONS. In foolscap 8vo. Price 5s.—Ditto.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF THE BRITISH COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES. Foolscap 8vo. 5s.—Ditto.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF GREAT BRITAIN. Foolscap 8vo. 5s.—Ditto.

THE ETHNOLOGY OF EUROPE. Foolscap 8vo. 5s.—Ditto.

THE NATIVE RACES OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE. 8s.—Baillière.

LONDON, February, 1855.

WORKS

PUBLISHED BY

WALTON AND MABERLY,

UPPER GOWER STREET, AND IVY LANE, PATERNOSTER ROW.

THE Chinese Rebel Chief Hung-siu-tsun; His History, and the Origin of the Present Insurrection. By the Rev. THEODORE HAMBERG, Hong-Kong. Edited by GEORGE PEARSE, Foreign Secretary of the Chinese Evangelisation Society. Foolscap 8vo., 1s. 6d. cloth.

The *Friend of China* contains a Review of this narrative, attributed to the Bishop of Victoria, Hong Kong, in which it is said—"The author's well-known caution, truthfulness, and candour, give to the little volume under review an interest and a reality which we miss while perusing the flighty, groundless theories and statements hazarded in such works as those by M.M. YVAN and CALLERY. . . . The author had with him in his own house a prominent agent in the events narrated, and kinsman of the Insurgent Chief."

London Quarterly Review, No. VI., Price 6s., for January. 1. Luther.—2. Spain and her Governments.—3. The Queen's College in Ireland.—4. Professor Maurice and his Writings.—5. The British Government and Buddhism.—6. Life in Lunatic Asylums.—7. Valley of the Amazon.—8. British Association for the Advancement of Science.—Brief Literary Notices.

Far above Rubies. A MEMOIR OF HELEN S. HERSCHELL. By her Daughter. Edited by the Rev. RIDLEY H. HERSCHELL. Foolscap 8vo, 6s. 6d. cloth.

. The Volume also contains the "Bystander," a Series of Papers by Mrs. Herschell, on the following subjects:—1. Introductory.—2. Education.—3. The Law of Consideration.—4. The Deserted Village.—5. Sectarianism.—6. High Church Principles.—7. Love.—8. Elmwood.—9. Spiritual Declension.—10. The Fête.—11. Party Spirit.—12. Training Children.—13. Home Education.—14. An Amusing Companion.—15. Christian Benevolence.—16. Special Providence.—17. Moral Influence.—18. Christian Society.—19. Human Responsibility.

A Memoir of the Rev. James Crabb, LATE OF SOUTHAMPTON. THE "GIPSY ADVOCATE." By JOHN RUDALL, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. One Vol., Crown 8vo. With a Portrait on Steel. 6s. cloth.

"The Author has presented us with a faithful portraiture of Mr. Crabb's life, character, persevering labours, and never-tiring zeal in the service of his divine Master."—*Hampshire Independent.*

The Jews. A Brief Sketch of their Present State and Future Expectations. By RIDLEY H. HERSCHELL. Ninth Thousand. Foolscap 8vo, 1s. 6d.

The Crystal Palace. An Essay Descriptive and Critical. From the London Quarterly Review. 8vo, 1s.

EMBOSSSED BOOKS FOR THE BLIND.

By MR. FRERE.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Genesis, 8s.—Exodus, 7s.
Joshua, 4s. 6d.—Judges, 4s. 6d.
Samuel I., 6s.—Samuel II., 5s. 6d.
Job, 5s.—Proverbs, 5s. 6d.
Psalms, Part I., 6s. 6d.
Psalms, Part II., 5s. 6d.
Isaiah, 7s. 6d.
Daniel, Esther, and Ruth, 5s. 6d.
Morning Prayers, 2s.
Shepherd of Salisbury Plain, 2s.
Olney Hymns, 2s.

NEW TESTAMENT (In 8 Vols.).

Matthew, 6s.
Mark, 5s. 6d.
Luke, 7s.
John, 5s. 6d.
Acts, 7s.
Romans to Corinthians, 6s.
Galatians to Philemon, 5s. 6d.
Hebrews to Revelations, 7s.
A Grammar, 1s.
Five Addresses to those who wish to go to Heaven, 1s. 6d.

Art of Teaching to Read by Elementary Sounds, 1s. 6d.

JURISPRUDENCE.

ELEMENTS of Jurisprudence. By CHARLES JAMES FOSTER, M.A., LL.D., Professor of Jurisprudence in University College, London. Crown 8vo, 5s. cloth. "Mr. Foster treats his subject in a masterly manner, and his volume may be read with profit both by students and men of the world."—*Athenæum*.

RHETORIC.

ELEMENTS of Rhetoric; A Manual of the Laws of Taste, including the Theory and Practice of Composition. By SAMUEL NEIL, Author of "The Art of Reasoning." Large 12mo, 4s. 6d. cloth.

LOGIC.

THE Art of Reasoning; A Popular Exposition of the Principles of Logic, Inductive and Deductive, with an Introductory Outline of the History of Logic, and an Appendix on Recent Logical Developments. By SAMUEL NEIL. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

"This work is of undoubted merit. It displays a great thoughtfulness and research, and contains a vast amount of useful information on the subject of which it treats. The author seems to have thoroughly mastered his subject, and to the illustration of it has skilfully applied his extensive and varied knowledge."—*Glasgow Constitutional*.

An Investigation of the Laws of Thought, on which are founded the Mathematical Theories of Logic and Probabilities. By GEORGE BOOLE, Professor of Mathematics in Queen's College, Cork. One Vol. 8vo, 14s. cloth.

Formal Logic; or, the Calculus of Inference necessary and PROBABLE. By AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN, Professor of Mathematics in University College, London. Cheap Issue, 8vo, 6s. 6d.

HISTORY, ANTIQUITIES, &c.

DICTIONARY of Greek and Roman Geography. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D., Editor of the Dictionaries of "Greek and Roman Antiquities," and of "Biography and Mythology." With very numerous Illustrations on Wood. Volume I. (1100 pages), 1l. 16s. cloth lettered. The Work will be continued in Quarterly Parts, each 4s., and will be completed in Two Volumes.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D., Classical Examiner in the University of London. Medium 8vo. Illustrated by numerous Engravings on Wood. Complete in Three Vols., 5l. 15s. 6d.

Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. By various Writers. Edited by Dr. WILLIAM SMITH. Second Edition. Revised throughout, with very numerous Additions and Alterations. One thick Volume, medium 8vo, with several hundred Engravings on Wood, 2l. 2s.

A New Classical Dictionary of Ancient Biography, Mythology, AND GEOGRAPHY. Edited by Dr. WILLIAM SMITH. New Edition. One Volume, 8vo, 15s. cloth.

This work comprises the same subjects as are contained in the well-known Dictionary of Lemprière, avoiding its errors, supplying its deficiencies, and exhibiting in a concise form the results of the labours of modern scholars. It will thus supply a want that has been long felt by most persons engaged in tuition.

- A Smaller Dictionary of Antiquities;** Selected and Abridged from the "Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities." By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. New and Cheaper Edition. One small Volume, Two Hundred Woodcuts, 7s. 6d. cloth.
- A Smaller Classical Dictionary.** Abridged from the larger work. By Dr. WILLIAM SMITH. Cheaper Edition. Two Hundred Woodcuts, Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d. cloth.
- The Odes of Horace,** translated into Unrhymed Metres. With Introductions and Notes. By F. W. NEWMAN, Professor of Latin, University College, London. Crown 8vo. 5s. cloth.
- Niebuhr's History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the FALL OF THE WESTERN EMPIRE.** Translated by BISHOP THIRLWALL, ARCHDEACON HARE, Dr. WILLIAM SMITH, and Dr. SCHMITZ. Fourth and Cheaper Edition. Three Vols., 8vo, 36s.
- Niebuhr's Lectures on Roman History.** Translated and Edited by LEONHARD SCHMITZ, Ph. D., Rector of the High School of Edinburgh. New and Cheaper Edition, in Three Vols. 8vo, 24s.
- Niebuhr's Lectures on Ancient History,** comprising the Asiatic Nations, the Egyptians, Greeks, Carthaginians, and Macedonians. Translated by Dr. L. SCHMITZ. Three Vols. 8vo, 1l. 11s. 6d.
- In reference to Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt, it is particularly interesting to notice how clearly the historian foresaw and anticipated all the great discoveries which have since been made in those countries. A thousand points in the history of ancient nations, which have hitherto been either overlooked or accepted without inquiry, are here treated with sound criticism and placed in their true light.
- Niebuhr's Lectures on Ancient Ethnography and Geography.** Comprising Greece and her Colonies, Italy, the Islands of the Mediterranean, Spain, Gaul, Britain, Northern Africa, and Phœnicia. Translated from the German by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ, F.R.S.E., Rector of the High School of Edinburgh, with additions and corrections from his own Notes. Two Vols., 8vo, 1l. 1s. cloth.
- A History of Rome; from the Earliest Times to the Death of COMMODOUS, A.D. 192.** By Dr. L. SCHMITZ, Rector of the High School of Edinburgh, Editor of "Niebuhr's Lectures." New Edition. With 100 Illustrations on Wood. One thick Vol., 12mo, 7s. 6d. cloth.
- Questions on Schmitz's History of Rome.** By JOHN ROSSON, B.A. 12mo, 2s. cloth.
- A History of Greece.** With Supplementary Chapters on the Literature, Art, and Domestic Manners of the Greeks. By William Smith, LL.D., Editor of the Dictionaries of "Greek and Roman Antiquities," "Biography," &c. Woodcuts and Maps. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d. cloth.
- "A good plan capitally executed, is the characteristic of Dr. Smith's introductory History of Greece."—*Spectator*.
- The Book of Almanacs.** With Index, by which the Almanac belonging to any year preceding A.D. 2000 can be found; with means of finding New and Full Moons from B.C. 2000 to A.D. 2000. By AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN, Professor of Mathematics in University College, London. Demy 8vo, oblong, 5s. cloth.
- "This is quite a novelty in chronological literature. It is an *universal almanac*—universal, that is, as respects time, past, present, and future. The main object of it is, as the compiler states, to supply the place of an old almanac, which is never at hand when wanted; of the older almanac, which never was at hand; and of the universal almanac in every shape! A more useful chronological handbook could scarcely be conceived. It will save an immensity of calculation, and is in many other respects invaluable as a chronological guide and instructor."—*Oxford Herald*.

Four Lectures on the Contrasts of Ancient and Modern HISTORY. By F. W. NEWMAN, Professor of Latin in University College, London. Foolscap 8vo, 8s. cloth.

A Numismatic Manual; or, Guide to the Collection and Study of Greek, Roman, and English Coins. Illustrated by Engravings of many hundred types, by means of which even imperfect and obliterated pieces may be easily deciphered. By J. Y. AKERMAN, F.S.A. 8vo, 21s. cloth.

POETRY.

DISCOVERY. A POEM. By EDWARD ALDAM LEATHAM, M.A. Foolscap 8vo, 2s. 6d. cloth.

"His execution is finished and of a good school."—*Spectator*.

"Mr. Leatham's style is vigorous, his lines are musical, and his versification is correct. * * His peroration is truly eloquent."—*Britannia*.

Love in the Moon; A POEM. With Remarks on that Luminary. By PATRICK SCOTT, Author of "Lellio." Foolscap 4to, 5s. 6d. cloth gilt.

Poetical Works of John Keats. Royal 8vo, sewed, 2s.

A Collection of Poetry for the Practice of Elocution. Made for the use of the Ladies' College, Bedford Square. By Professor F. W. NEWMAN. Foolscap 8vo, 2s. 6d.

The Georgics of Virgil. Translated into Verse by the Rev. W. H. BATHURST, M.A., Rector of Barwick-in-Elmet. Foolscap 8vo, 4s. 6d. cloth.

MISCELLANEOUS.

BUSINESS as it is and as it might be. By JOSEPH LYNDALL. Crown 8vo, 1s. sewed, 1s. 6d. cloth.

* * * This Work obtained the Prize of Fifty Guineas offered by the Young Men's Christian Association for the best Essay on "The Evils of the Present System of Business, and the Difficulties they Present to the Attainment and Development of Personal Piety, with Suggestions for their Removal."

Christian Philosophy; or, an Attempt to Display the Evidence and Excellence of Revealed Religion by its Internal Testimony. By VICESIMUS KNOX, D.D., late Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford; and Master of Tunbridge School. Foolscap 8vo., 2s. 6d., cloth.

Suggestions on Female Education. Two Introductory Lectures on English Literature and Moral Philosophy, delivered in the Ladies' College, Bedford Square, London. By A. J. SCOTT, A.M., Principal of Owen's College, Manchester, late Professor of the English Language and Literature in University College, London. Foolscap 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Guesses at Truth. By TWO BROTHERS. New Edition. Foolscap 8vo. First Series, 6s.; Second Series, 7s.

Mr. Frere's Works on Prophecy.

BRIEF INTERPRETATION OF THE APOCALYPSE. 8vo, 8s. 6d. cloth

GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE APOCALYPSE, chiefly relating to the Individual Antichrist of the Last Days. 8vo, 2s.

THREE LETTERS ON THE PROPHECIES. 8vo, 2s.

EIGHT LETTERS ON THE PROPHECIES; viz. on the Seventh Vial; the Civil and Ecclesiastical Periods; and on the Type of Jericho. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

GREAT CONTINENTAL REVOLUTION, marking the expiration of the "Times of the Gentiles." 8vo, 2s. 6d.

STEAM NAVIGATION AND RAILWAYS.

THE Steam Engine, Steam Navigation, Roads, and Railways.

EXPLAINED AND ILLUSTRATED. A New and Cheaper Edition, revised and completed to the present time. By DIONYSIUS LARDNER, D.C.L., formerly Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in University College, London. One Vol., 12mo, illustrated with Wood Engravings, 8s. 6d. cloth.

Railway Economy; or, the New Art of Transport. Its Management, Prospects, and Relations Commercial, Financial, and Social; with an Exposition of the Practical Results of the Railways in operation in the United Kingdom, on the Continent, and in America. By DIONYSIUS LARDNER, D.C.L. One Vol., large 12mo.

Sketch of the Origin and Progress of Steam Navigation. By BENNET WOODCROFT, late Professor of Machinery in University College, London. With 17 Lithographic Plates, Fcap. 4to, 12s. cloth.

The Pneumatics of Hero of Alexandria; from the Original Greek. Translated for and Edited by BENNET WOODCROFT, late Professor of Machinery in University College, London. Fcap. 4to, 12s. 6d. cloth.

NATURAL PHILOSOPHY AND ASTRONOMY.

THE Electric Telegraph Popularised. With 100 Illustrations. By DIONYSIUS LARDNER, D.C.L. From the "Museum of Science and Art. 12mo, 2s. cloth.

"The reader will find the most complete and intelligible description of Telegraphic Apparatus in Dr. Lardner's admirable chapters on the subject."—*North British Review.*

FAMILIAR Letters on the Physics of the Earth. By H. BUFF, Professor of Physics in the University of Giessen. Edited by Dr. A. W. HOFMANN, Professor in the Royal College of Chemistry, London. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Introduction.—Gravity and its Effects.—Tides.—Heat within the Earth.—Warm Springs.—Hot Springs and Jets of Steam.—Jets of Gas and Mud Volcanoes.—Volcanoes and Earthquakes.—Temperature of the Outermost Crust of the Earth.—Temperature of the Lowest Layer of the Atmosphere.—Lines of equal Heat.—Temperature of the Upper Layers of the Atmosphere.—The Snow Limits.—Glaciers.—Temperature of the Waters, and their Influence on Climate.—Currents of the Sea.—Winds.—Moisture of the Air and Atmospheric Precipitation.—Electricity of the Air, Lightning, and Thunder.

An Elementary Treatise on Mechanics, for the Use of Junior University Students. By RICHARD POTTER, A.M., Professor of Natural Philosophy in University College, London. Second Edition, 8vo, with numerous Diagrams, 8s. 6d. cloth.

An Elementary Treatise on Optics, PART I. By RICHARD POTTER, A.M. Second Edition, 8vo, corrected, with numerous Diagrams, 9s. 6d. cloth.

An Elementary Treatise on Optics, PART II., Containing the Higher Propositions. By RICHARD POTTER, A.M. 8vo, with numerous Diagrams, 12s. 6d.

This volume contains the discussions of direct and oblique pencils to the higher approximations according to previously known methods. Also new discussions of the *aberrations of oblique pencils* and the forms of the images produced; together with the application to the theory of Optical Instruments. Many other new investigations will be found in the volume.

Twelve Planispheres, forming a Guide to the Stars for every Night in the Year, with an Introduction. 8vo, 6s. 6d. cloth.

Ecliptical Charts, Hours, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, and 13, taken at the Observatory, Regent's Park, under the direction of GEORGE BISHOP, Esq., F.R.S., &c. 2s. 6d. each.

Astronomical Observations, taken at the Observatory, Regent's Park, during the Years 1839—1851, under the direction of GEORGE BISHOP, Esq., F.R.S., &c. 4to, 12s. 6d.

DR. LARDNER'S MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND ART.

a Miscellany of

INSTRUCTIVE AND AMUSING TRACTS ON THE PHYSICAL SCIENCES, AND
ON THEIR APPLICATION TO THE USES OF LIFE.

ILLUSTRATED BY ENGRAVINGS ON WOOD.

DOUBLE VOLUMES.

Volumes 1 to 4 may now be had, strongly bound, 2 Volumes in 1 with Indexes, cloth lettered, price 3s. 6d. each double volume.

"'Dr. Lardner's Museum,' one of the few works of the kind which can be recommended as at once popular and accurate."—*Sir David Brewster.*

"This series, besides affording popular but sound instruction on scientific subjects, with which the humblest man in the country ought to be acquainted, also undertakes that teaching of 'Common Things' which Lord Ashburton and every well-wisher of his kind are anxious to promote. Many thousand copies of this serviceable publication have been printed, in the belief and hope that the desire for instruction and improvement widely prevails; and we have no fear that such enlightened faith will meet with disappointment."—*The Times, Feb. 9, 1854.*

Contents of Vols. I. and II. (double), 3s. 6d. cloth.

VOL. I., price 1s. 6d., in handsome boards.

PART I., price 5d.

1. The Planets; Are they Inhabited Globes?
2. Weather Prognostics.
3. The Planets. Chap. II.
4. Popular Fallacies in Questions of Physical Science.

PART II., price 5d.

5. Latitudes and Longitudes.
6. The Planets. Chap. III.
7. Lunar Influences.
8. Meteoric Stones and Shooting Stars. Chap. I.

PART III., price 6d.

9. Railway Accidents. Chap. I.
10. The Planets. Chap. IV.
11. Meteoric Stones and Shooting Stars. Chap. II.
12. Railway Accidents. Chap. II.
13. Light.

VOL. II., price 1s. 6d., in handsome boards.

PART IV., price 5d.

14. Common Things.—Air.
15. Locomotion in the United States. Chap. I.
16. Cometary Influences. Chap. I.
17. Locomotion in the United States. Chap. II.

PART V., price 5d.

18. Common Things.—Water.
19. The Potter's Art. Chap. I.
20. Locomotion in the United States. Chap. III.
21. The Potter's Art. Chap. II.

PART VI., price 6d.

22. Common Things.—Fire.
23. The Potter's Art. Chap. III.
24. Cometary Influences. Chap. II.
25. The Potter's Art. Chap. IV.
26. The Potter's Art. Chap. V.

Contents of Vols. III. and IV. (double), 3s. 6d. cloth.

VOL. III., price 1s. 6d., in handsome boards.

PART VII., price 5d.

27. Locomotion and Transport, their Influence and Progress. Chap. I.
28. The Moon.
29. Common Things.—The Earth.
30. Locomotion and Transport, their Influence and Progress. Chap. II.

PART VIII., price 5d.

31. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. I.

32. Terrestrial Heat. Chap. I.
33. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. II.
34. The Sun.

PART IX., price 6d.

35. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. III.
36. Terrestrial Heat. Chap. II.
37. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. IV.
38. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. V.
39. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. VI.

DR. LARDNER'S MUSEUM (Continued):—

VOL. IV., price 1s. 6d., in handsome boards.

PART X., price 5s.

40. Earthquakes and Volcanoes. Chap. I.
 41. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. VII.
 42. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. VIII.
 43. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. IX.

PART XI., price 5s.

44. Barometer, Safety Lamp, and Whitworth's Micrometric Apparatus.

45. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. X.
 46. Earthquakes and Volcanoes. Chap. II.
 47. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. XI.

PART XII., price 6d.

48. Steam.
 49. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. XII.
 50. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. XIII.
 51. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. XIV.
 52. The Electric Telegraph. Chap. XV.

* * Continued in Weekly Numbers at 1d.; Monthly Parts at 5d.; Quarterly Volumes at 1s. 6d., and Half Yearly Volumes at 3s. 6d.

First Book of Natural Philosophy; or, an Introduction to the Study of Statics, Dynamics, Hydrostatics, and Optics, with numerous examples. By SAMUEL NEWTH, M.A., Fellow of University College, London. 12mo, 3s. 6d.

Elements of Mechanics and Hydrostatics. By SAMUEL NEWTH, M.A. Second Edition, small 8vo. 7s. 6d., cloth.

Dr. Lardner's Handbook of Astronomy. From the "Handbook of Natural Philosophy." 37 Plates and 200 Woodcuts. Large 12mo. 16s. 6d. cloth.

Handbook of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy. By DRUMMOND LARDNER, formerly Professor of Natural Philosophy and Astronomy in University College, London. Three Vols., large 12mo, with very numerous Illustrations on Wood.

FIRST COURSE, One Vol., 12s. 6d. cloth, contains:—Mechanics; Hydrostatics; Hydraulics; Pneumatics; Sound; Optics.

"We have much pleasure in recommending Dr. Lardner's 'Handbook of Natural Philosophy;' it is one of the best popular scientific works that has yet appeared."—*English Journal of Education.*

"Our examination of the work leads us to speak most favourably of it as a handbook for students; it will be a useful addition to the library of every medical student, as well as a serviceable guide to all who are about to commence the study of physics."—*Medical Gazette.*

SECOND COURSE, One Vol., 8s. 6d., contains:—Heat; Common Electricity; Magnetism; Voltaic Electricity.

THIRD COURSE, One Vol., 16s. 6d., contains:—Astronomy and Meteorology. With 37 Plates and 200 Woodcuts.

* * Any volume may be purchased separately.

MATHEMATICS, &c.

ELEMENTS of Arithmetic. By AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN, Professor of Mathematics in University College, London. Fifth Edition, with Eleven Appendices, Royal 12mo, 5s. cloth.

De Morgan's Elements of Algebra. Preliminary to the Differential Calculus. Second Edition. Royal 12mo, 9s. cloth.

De Morgan's Trigonometry and Double Algebra. Royal 12mo, 7s. 6d. cloth.

Barlow's Tables of Squares, Cubes, Square Roots, Cube Roots, AND RECIPROALS, up to 10,000. Stereotype Edition, examined and corrected. Under the superintendance of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Royal 12mo, cloth, 8s.

Arithmetical Books and Authors. From the Invention of Printing to the present time; being Brief Notices of a large Number of Works drawn up from actual inspection. By AUGUSTUS DE MORGAN, Professor of Mathematics in University College, London. Cheap issue. Royal 12mo, 2s. 6d. cloth.

"A great number of persons are employed in teaching Arithmetic in the United Kingdom. In publishing this work, I have the hope of placing before many of them more materials for the prevention of inaccurate knowledge of the literature of their science than they have hitherto been able to command, without both expense and research."—*Preface*.

A Course of Arithmetic as Taught in the Pestalozzian School, WORKSOP. By J. L. ELLENBERGER. 12mo. 5s. cloth.

The First Book of Euclid Explained to Beginners. By C. P. MASON, B.A., Fellow of University College, and Principal of Denmark Hill Grammar School. Fcap. 8vo. 1s. 9d. cloth.

Reiner's Lessons on Form; or, an Introduction to Geometry, as given in a Pestalozzian School, Cheam, Surrey. 12mo, with numerous Diagrams, 3s. 6d. cloth.

A First Book on Plane Trigonometry. Geometrical Trigonometry, and its applications to Surveying, with numerous Examples. For the use of Schools. By G. W. HEMMING, M.A., Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Author of a Treatise on the "Differential and Integral Calculus." With Diagrams, 12mo, cloth limp, 1s. 6d.

Ritchie's Principles of Geometry, familiarly Illustrated, and applied to a variety of useful purposes. Designed for the Instruction of Young Persons. Second Edition, revised and enlarged, 12mo, with 150 Woodcuts, cloth limp, 1s. 6d.

Tables of Logarithms, Common and Trigonometrical, to Five PLACES. Under the Superintendence of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge. Fcap. 8vo, cloth limp, 1s. 6d.

Lessons on Number, as given at the Pestalozzian School, Cheam, Surrey. By CHARLES REINER. The Master's Manual. New Edition. 12mo, cloth, 5s. The Scholar's Praxis. 12mo, 2s. bound.

GREEK.

THE Anabasis of Xenophon. Expressly for Schools. With Notes, a Geographical and Biographical Index, and a Map. By J. T. V. HARDY, B.A., Principal of Huddersfield College; and ERNEST ADAMS, Classical Master in University College School. 12mo, 4s. 6d. cloth.

Lexicon to Aeschylus. Containing a Critical Explanation of the more Difficult Passages in the Seven Tragedies. By the Rev. W. LINWOOD, A.M., M.R.A.S. Second Edition. Revised. 8vo, 12s. cloth.

New Greek Delectus; Being Sentences for Translation from Greek into English, and English into Greek; arranged in a Systematic Progression. By DR. RAPHAEL KUERNER. Translated and Edited from the German, by DR. ALEXANDER ALLEN. Third Edition, revised. 12mo, 4s. cloth.

Four Gospels in Greek. For the use of Schools. Fcap. 8vo. cloth limp, 1s. 6d. This part of the Greek Testament is printed separately for the use of Students beginning to learn Greek, the Evangelists being more generally read than the rest of the Testament.

- London Greek Grammar.** Designed to exhibit, in small compass, the Elements of the Greek Language. Edited by a GRADUATE of the University of Oxford. Fifth Edition. 12mo, cloth limp, 1s. 6d.
- Greek Testament.** GRIESBACH'S TEXT, with the various readings of MILL and SCHOLZ. Second Edition, revised. Fcap. 8vo, cloth, 6s. 6d.; morocco, 12s. 6d.
- Plato.** The Apology of SOCRATES, CRITO, and part of the PHAEDO, with English Notes, a Life of Socrates, &c. Edited by Dr. W. SMITH. Second Edition. 12mo, cloth, 5s.
- Robson's Constructive Greek Exercises.** 12mo, cloth, 7s. 6d.
. This Work, which was originally intended to be a new edition of "Allon's Constructive Greek Exercises," will take the place of that book. The general principles of both are identical.
- Introduction to the Art of Composing Greek Iambics,** in Imitation of the Greek Tragedians. Designed for the use of Schools. By the Rev. CHARLES TAYLER. 12mo, 2s. 6d.
- What is the Power of the Greek Article; and how may it be expressed in the English Version of the New Testament?** By JOHN TAYLOR. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

LATIN.

- NEW Latin Delectus;** being Sentences for Translation from Latin into English, and English into Latin; arranged in a Systematic Progression, on the plan of the Greek Delectus. By Dr. ALEXANDER ALLEN. Third Edition, 12mo, 4s. cloth.
- Constructive Latin Exercises,** for teaching the Elements of the Language on a System of Analysis and Synthesis; with Latin Reading Lessons, and copious Vocabularies. By JOHN ROBSON, B.A., late Assistant Master in University College School. Third Edition, thoroughly revised. 12mo, 4s. 6d. cloth.
- London Latin Grammar;** including the Eton Syntax and Prosody in English, accompanied with Notes. Edited by a GRADUATE of the University of Oxford. Fifteenth Edition. 12mo, 1s. 6d. cloth limp.
- First Latin Reading Lessons;** with complete Vocabularies. Intended as an Introduction to Caesar. By JOHN ROBSON, B.A., Assistant Master in University College School. 12mo, 2s. 6d. cloth.
- The Principal Roots of the Latin Language,** simplified by a display of their Incorporation into the English Tongue; with copious Notes. By HENRY HALL. Fifth Edition. 12mo, 1s. 6d. cloth limp.
- The Germania of Tacitus.** With Ethnological Dissertations and Notes. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM. Author of the "English Language," &c. With a Map. Demy 8vo, 12s. 6d.
- Tacitus, Germania, Agricola,** and First Book of the Annals. With Notes Translated into English from RUPERT, PASSOW, and WALCH, and BOTTIGER'S Remarks on the style of TACITUS. Second Edition. Edited by Dr. W. SMITH. 12mo, 6s. cloth.
- Caesar for Beginners.** Latin and English; with the Original Text at the end. 12mo, 3s. 6d. cloth.
- Mythology for Versification;** or, a Brief Sketch of the Fables of the Ancients, prepared to be rendered into Latin verse. By the late Rev. F. HODGSON, M.A. (Provost of Eton). New Edition. 12mo, 3s. bound. Kew to Ditto. 8vo, 7s.

Select Portions of Sacred History, conveyed in sense for Latin Verses. By the late Rev. F. HODGSON, M.A. (Provost of Eton). Third Edition. 12mo, 3s. 6d. cloth. Key to Ditto. Royal 8vo, 10s. 6d. cloth.

Sacred Lyrics ; [or, Extracts from the Prophetical and other Scriptures of the Old Testament; adapted to Latin Versification in the principal Metres of HORACE. By the late Rev. F. HODGSON, M.A. (Provost of Eton). 12mo, 6s. 6d. cloth. Key to Ditto. 8vo, 12s. cloth.

Latin Authors. Selected for the use of Schools; containing portions of Phædrus, Ovid's Metamorphoses, Virgil's Æneid, Cæsar and Tacitus. 12mo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

HEBREW.

GRAMMAR of the Hebrew Language. By HYMAN HURWITZ, late Professor of Hebrew in University College, London. Fourth Edition, revised and enlarged. 8vo, 13s. cloth. Or in Two Parts, sold separately:—ELEMENTS, 4s. 6d. cloth; ETYMOLOGY and SYNTAX, 9s. cloth.

Book of Genesis in English Hebrew; accompanied by an Interlinear Translation, substantially the same as the authorised English version; Philological Notes, and a Grammatical Introduction. By W. GREENFIELD, M.R.A.S. Fourth Edition. Cheap Issue. 8vo, 4s. 6d. cloth. With the original Text in Hebrew characters at the end. 8vo, 6s. 6d. cloth.

MAPS.

TEACHING Maps:—I. RIVERS AND MOUNTAINS, of England, Wales, and Part of Scotland. 6d. II.—TOWNS of Ditto. 6d.

Projections. Three Maps. MERCATOR. EUROPE. BRITISH ISLES. Stitched in a Cover, 1s. Single Maps, 4d. each.

Projections; with Outline of Country. Three Maps stitched in a Cover, 1s. Single Maps, 4d. each.

ENGLISH.

THE English Language. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM, F.R.S., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Fourth Edition, greatly enlarged. 8vo. *In the Press.*

An English Grammar for the Use of Schools. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM, F.R.S., late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Sixth Edition. 12mo, 4s. 6d. cloth.

Elements of English Grammar, for the Use of Ladies' Schools. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM, F.R.S. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

Elements of English Grammar, for Commercial Schools. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM, F.R.S. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

A Handbook of the English Language. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM, F.R.S.
12mo, 8s. 6d. cloth.

The object of the "Handbook" is to present to students for examination, in a more condensed form, the chief facts and reasonings of "The English Language." Less elaborate than that work, it is less elementary than the "English Grammar." Like all the other works by the same author, it gives great prominence to the ethnological relations of our tongue; and insists upon historical investigation, and the application of the general principles of comparative philology, as the true means of exhibiting its real growth and structure, in opposition to the more usual method of treating it as a mass of irregularities. It has the further object of supplying a knowledge of those laws of speech and principles of grammar which apply to language generally.

History and Etymology of English Grammar, for the Use of CLASSICAL SCHOOLS. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM, F.R.S. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

First Outlines of Logic, applied to Grammar and Etymology. By Dr. R. G. LATHAM. 12mo, 1s. 6d. cloth.

New English Spelling Book. By the Rev. GORHAM D. ABBOTT. Second Edition, with Reading Lessons. 12mo, sewed, 6d.

First English Reader. By the Rev. G. D. ABBOTT. 12mo, with Illustrations. 1s. cloth limp.

Second English Reader. By the Rev. G. D. ABBOTT. 12mo, 1s. 6d. cloth limp.

FRENCH.

MERLET'S French Grammar. By P. F. MERLET, Professor of French in University College, London. New Edition, 12mo, 5s. 6d. bound. Or, sold in two Parts: PRONUNCIATION and ACCIDENCE, 8s. 6d.; SYNTAX, 8s. 6d. (KEY, New Edition, 3s. 6d.)

Merlet's Traducteur; Or, HISTORICAL, DRAMATIC, and MISCELLANEOUS SELECTIONS from the best FRENCH WRITERS; accompanied by Explanatory Notes; a selection of Idioms, &c. New Edition. 12mo, 5s. 6d. bound.

Merlet's Dictionary of the Difficulties of the French Language; containing Explanations of every Grammatical Difficulty; Synonymes explained in a concise manner; Versification; Etymological Vocabulary; Free Exercises, with Notes; Mercantile Expressions, Phrases, and Letters; Elements of French Composition. A new and enlarged Edition. 12mo, 6s. 6d. bound.

Merlet's French Synonymes; explained in Alphabetical Order, with Copious Examples. (From the "DICTIONARY OF DIFFICULTIES.") 12mo, 2s. 6d. cloth.

Stories from French Writers. Interlinear (from Merlet's "Traducteur"). 12mo, 2s.

GERMAN.

The Adventures of Ulysses; a German Reading Book; with a short Grammar and a Vocabulary. By PAUL HIRSCH. Twenty-four Woodcuts. 12mo, 6s. cloth.

Separately,

A Short Grammar of the German Language. 12mo, cloth, 2s.

ITALIAN.

First Italian Course; Being a Practical and Easy Method of Learning the Elements of the Italian Language. By W. BROWNING SMITH, M.A., Second Classical Master of the City of London School. Royal 18mo, cloth, 3s. 6d.

Panizzi's Italian Grammar. 12mo, cloth limp, 1s. 6d.

INTERLINEAR TRANSLATIONS.

Cheap Issue, at 1s. 6d. per volume.

LOCKE'S System of Classical Instruction, restoring the Method of Teaching formerly practised in all Public Schools. The Series consists of the following Interlinear Translations with the Original Text, in which the quantity of the doubtful Vowels is denoted; critical and explanatory Notes, &c.

. By means of these Works, that excellent system of Tuition is effectually restored which was established by Dean Colet, Erasmus, and Lily, at the foundation of St Paul's School, and was then enjoined by authority of the State, to be adopted in all other Public Seminaries of learning throughout the kingdom. Each Volume, 1s. 6d.

LATIN.

1. PHÆDRUS'S FABLES OF ÆSOP.
2. OVID'S METAMORPHOSES. Book I.
3. VIRGIL'S ÆNEID. Book I.
4. PARSING LESSONS TO VIRGIL.
5. CÆSAR'S INVASION OF BRITAIN.

GREEK.

1. LUCIAN'S DIALOGUES. Selections.
2. THE ODES OF ANACREON.
3. HOMER'S ILIAD. Book I.
4. PARSING LESSONS TO HOMER.
5. XENOPHON'S MEMORABILIA. Part I.
6. HERODOTUS'S HISTORIES. Selections.

FRENCH.—SISMONDI; the BATTLES OF CRESSY and POICTIERS.

GERMAN.—STORIES FROM GERMAN WRITERS.

. A Second Edition of the Essay, explanatory of the System, with an Outline of the Method of Study, is published. 12mo, sewed, price 6d.

ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

BARON Von Reichenbach's Researches on Magnetism, ELECTRICITY, HEAT, LIGHT, CRYSTALLISATION, AND CHEMICAL ATTRACTION, IN THEIR RELATION TO THE VITAL FORCE. Translated and Edited (at the express desire of the Author) by Dr. GREGORY, of the University of Edinburgh. Cheap Issue. One Volume, 8vo, 6s. 6d., cloth.

"The merits of this remarkable volume are great. The painstaking, conscientious, cautious, ingenious,—we had almost said the religious, and certainly the self-possessed enthusiasm with which the experimental clue is followed from turn to turn of the labyrinth, is surpassed by nothing of the same sort in the whole range of contemporary science."—*North British Review*.

ANATOMY, MEDICINE, &c.

DR. Quain's Anatomy. Edited by DR. SHARPEY and MR. QUAIN, Professors of Anatomy and Physiology in University College, London. Fifth Edition. Complete in Two Volumes, 8vo. Illustrated by four hundred Engravings on Wood. Price 2l.

Demonstrations of Anatomy. A Guide to the Dissection of the Human Body. By GEORGE VINEY ELLIS, Professor of Anatomy in University College, London. Third Edition. Small 8vo. 12s. 6d. cloth.

Lectures on the Principles and Practice of Midwifery. By EDWARD WM. MURPHY, A.M., M.D., Professor of Midwifery in University College, London. One Volume, 8vo, many Illustrations, 16s.

"The work will take rank among the best treatises on the obstetric art. By this work, Dr. Murphy has placed his reputation and his fame on a solid and durable foundation."—*Dublin Medical Press*.

A Handbook of Physiology. By WILLIAM SENHOUSE KIRKES, M.D., Demonstrator of Morbid Anatomy at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. Assisted by JAMES PAGET, Lecturer on General Anatomy and Physiology at St. Bartholomew's Hospital. Second Edition. One Volume 12mo, with Illustrations. 12s. 6d.

On Pain After Food; its Causes and Treatment. By EDWARD BALLARD, M.D., Lond., Lecturer on the Practice of Medicine at the School of Medicine adjoining St. George's Hospital. One vol. 4s. 6d. cloth.

Physical Diagnosis of the Diseases of the Abdomen. By EDWARD BALLARD, M.D., Late Medical Tutor in University College, London. Large 12mo, 7s. 6d. cloth.

"The profession is much indebted to Dr. Ballard for this unpretending little volume, which, we feel certain, if carefully studied, will accomplish its object of removing many of the difficulties at present surrounding the diagnosis of abdominal diseases."—*Lancet*.

A Practical Treatise on Diseases of the Heart and Lungs, their Symptoms and Treatment, and the Principles of Physical Diagnosis. By W. H. WALSH, M.D., Professor of the Principles and Practice of Medicine and Clinical Medicine in University College, London; Physician to University College Hospital, and Consulting Physician to the Hospital for Consumption and Diseases of the Chest. A new and considerably enlarged edition. One Volume, 12s. 6d. cloth.

"This work is what its name indicates it to be—eminently practical. That it will add largely to the already great reputation of its author, no question can be entertained. It is far in advance of any other Treatise on Diseases of the Chest, either in this or any other country. Every page—we were about to say every line—contains a fact, often new, and *always resting on the Author's own observations*. Cases are quoted to prove every new statement, and to support every argument advanced in opposition to others. To the practitioner, the clinical teacher, and to the student, this work will prove alike invaluable."—*Medical Times*.

The Nature and Treatment of Cancer. By W. H. WALSH, M.D., Professor of Medicine in University College, Physician to University College Hospital, and Consulting Physician to the Hospital for Consumption and Diseases of the Chest. One Volume, 8vo, with Illustrations. Cheap Issue, 6s. 6d.

The Diseases of the Rectum. By RICHARD QUAIN, F.R.S., Professor of Clinical Surgery in University College, and Surgeon to University College Hospital. With Lithographic Plates. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d. cloth.

"This Treatise is eminently of a practical character, and contains much original and valuable matter. It is not indeed a literary compilation, but rather an exposition of the author's opinions and practice in those diseases."—*Association Journal*.

The Science and Art of Surgery. Being a Treatise on Surgical Injuries, Diseases, and Operations. By JOHN ERICHSSEN, Professor of Surgery in University College, and Surgeon to University College Hospital. 250 Wood Engravings. 8vo. 11. 5s.

"The aim of Mr. Erichsen appears to be, to improve upon the plan of Samuel Cooper; and by connecting in one volume the science and art of Surgery, to supply the student with a text-book and the practitioner with a work of reference, in which scientific principles and practical details are alike included.

"It must raise the character of the author, and reflect great credit upon the College in which he is Professor, and we can cordially recommend it as a work of reference, both to students and practitioners."—*Medical Times*.

The Microscopic Anatomy of the Human Body in Health AND DISEASE. Illustrated with numerous Drawings in Colour. By ARTHUR HILL HASSALL, M.B., Fellow of the Linnæan Society, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, &c. &c. Two Vols., 8vo, 21. 5s.

Hassall's History of the British Freshwater Algae, including Descriptions of the Desmidiæ and Distomææ. With upwards of 100 Plates, illustrating the various species. Two Vols. 8vo, 21. 5s.

Morton's Surgical Anatomy of the Principal Regions.

Completed by Mr. CADGE, late Assistant Surgeon, University College Hospital. Twenty-five Lithographic Illustrations Coloured, and Twenty-five Woodcuts. Royal 8vo, 21s. cloth lettered.

"The work thus completed constitutes a useful guide to the student, and remembrancer to the practitioner. We can speak very favourably of the general execution of the work. The coloured lithographs are, for the most part, well drawn, and faithfully represent the broad features of the several parts. The woodcuts are well engraved, and very clearly exhibit the points which they are intended to illustrate."—*Medical Gazette*.

A Series of Anatomical Plates in Lithography. Edited by JONES QUAIN, M.D., and ERASMUS WILSON, F.R.S.

"*.* A remarkably cheap issue is now in course of delivery to Subscribers at the following low prices:—

	To Subscribers.		Former Price.	
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.
THE COMPLETE WORK, in Two Volumes, Royal Folio, Half-bound Morocco	5	5 0	8	8 0
THE SAME, Full Coloured, Half-bound Morocco	8	0 0	14	0 0

The Work may also be subscribed for in separate portions, bound in Cloth and Lettered, as follows:—

	PLAIN.				COLOURED.				
	To Subscribers.		Former Price.		To Subscribers.		Former Price.		
	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	£	s. d.	
Muscles. 51 Plates	1	5 0	1	18 0	—	2	4 0	8	12 0
Vessels. 50 Plates	1	5 0	1	18 0	—	2	0 0	8	8 0
Nerves. 38 Plates	1	1 0	1	10 0	—	1	14 0	2	16 0
Viscera. 82 Plates	0	17 0	1	5 0	—	1	10 0	2	8 0
Bones and Ligaments. 30 Plates	0	17 0	1	5 0	—	1	0 0	1	11 6

"*.* Proposals with full particulars may be had of the Publishers, by whom and by all Booksellers, Subscribers' names will be received.

On Gravel, Calculus, and Gout; chiefly an Application of Professor Liebig's Physiology to the Prevention and Cure of those Diseases. By H. BENGE JONES, M.D., F.R.S., Physician to St. George's Hospital. 8vo, 6s. cloth.**CHEMISTRY, &c.****FAMILIAR Letters on Chemistry.** In its relations to Physiology, Dietetics, Agriculture, Commerce, and Political Economy. By JUSTUS VON LIEBIG. A New and Cheap Edition, revised throughout, with many additional Letters. Complete in one Volume, Foolscap 8vo, price 6s. cloth.**Annual Report of the Progress of Chemistry,** and the Allied Sciences, Physics, Mineralogy, and Geology; including the Applications of Chemistry to Pharmacy, the Arts, and Manufactures. By PROFESSORS LIEBIG and KOPF, with the co-operation of Professors BUFF, DIEFFENBACH, ETTLING, KNAPP, WILL, and ZAMMNER. Edited by DR. HOFMANN and DR. BENGE JONES. Vols. 1, 2, and 3, for 1847, 1848, and 1849, 2l. Vol. 4 (1850), 1l. 1s.**Practical Pharmacy.** The Arrangements, Apparatus, and Manipulations of the Pharmaceutical Shop and Laboratory. By FRANCIS MEHR, Ph. D., and THEOPHILUS REDWOOD, Professor of Chemistry and Pharmacy to the Pharmaceutical Society. 400 Engravings on Wood. 8vo, 6s. 6d., cloth.**Gregory's Handbook of Inorganic Chemistry.** For the use of Students. By WILLIAM GREGORY, M.D., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Edinburgh. Third Edition, revised and enlarged. 12mo, 5s. 6d.

"A young man who has mastered these few and by no means closely printed pages, may venture to face any board of examiners on Chemistry, without fear of being posed by any fair question."—*Association Journal*.

Gregory's Handbook of Organic Chemistry; being a New and greatly Enlarged Edition of the "Outlines of Organic Chemistry, for the Use of Students." One volume, large 12mo, 9s. 6d. cloth.

Handbook of Organic Analysis. By JUSTUS LIEBIG. Edited by DR. HOFMANN, Professor in the Royal College of Chemistry, London. Large 12mo. Illustrated by 85 Wood Engravings. 5s. cloth.

"The work now before us is a most valuable contribution to our knowledge on this most important subject. The style is lucid, and the processes are not only explained to the mind, but are made manifest to the eye by a profusion of beautiful illustrations."—*Medical Times*.

Handbook of Inorganic Analysis. By FRIEDRICH WÜHLER, M.D., Professor of Chemistry in the University of Gottingen. Translated and Edited by DR. HOFMANN, Professor in the Royal College of Chemistry, London. Large 12mo, 6s. 6d. cloth.

"Next to Rose of Berlin in the ranks of living analytic chemists, particularly in the inorganic department of the art, stands Friedrich Wöhler, who has in this book given us a compendium of inorganic analysis, illustrated by examples of the methods to be pursued in the examination of minerals, both of a simple and complex constitution, which, if followed out by the student with ordinary care and patience, and with some little practical instruction, will not fail to render him a thorough master of this division of chemical knowledge."—*Association Journal*.

Elements of Chemical Analysis, Qualitative, and Quantitative.

By EDWARD ANDREW PARNELL, author of "Applied Chemistry; in Arts, Manufactures, and Domestic Economy." Second Edition, revised throughout, and enlarged by the addition of 200 pages. 8vo, Cheap Issue, 9s. cloth.

Animal Chemistry; or, Chemistry in its Applications to Physiology and Pathology. By JUSTUS LIEBIG, M.D. Edited from the Author's Manuscript, by WILLIAM GREGORY, M.D. Third Edition, almost wholly re-written. 8vo, Part I. (the first half of the work) 6s. 6d. cloth.

Chemistry in its Application to Agriculture and Physiology.

By JUSTUS LIEBIG, M.D. Edited from the Manuscript of the Author, by LYON PLAYFAIR, Ph. D., and WM. GREGORY, M.D. Fourth Edition, revised. Cheap Issue. 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Dyeing and Calico Printing. By EDWARD ANDREW PARNELL, Author of "Elements of Chemical Analysis." (Reprinted from Parnell's "Applied Chemistry in Manufactures, Arts, and Domestic Economy, 1844.") With Illustrations. 8vo, 7s. cloth.

Outlines of the Course of Qualitative Analysis followed in the

GIESSEN LABORATORY. By HENRY WILL, Ph. D., Professor Extraordinary of Chemistry in the University of Giessen. With a Preface by BARON LIEBIG. 8vo, 6s., or with the Tables mounted on linen, 7s.

Turner's Elements of Chemistry. Edited by Professors LIEBIG and GREGORY. Eighth Edition. 1 Vol. 8vo, 11, 10s.

COMMON-PLACE BOOKS AND LITERARY DIARIES.

THE Private Diary. Arranged, Printed, and Ruled for receiving an account of every day's employment for the space of one year. With an Index and Appendix. Cheaper Edition. Post 8vo, strongly half-bound, 8s. 6d.

The Student's Journal. Formed on the plan of the "Private Diary." Cheaper Edition. Post 8vo, strongly half-bound, 8s. 6d.

The Literary Diary; or Complete Common-Place Book, with an Explanation and an Alphabet of Two Letters on a Leaf. Cheaper Edition. Post 4to, ruled throughout, and strongly half-bound, 8s. 6d.

A Pocket Common-place Book. With LOCKR's Index. Cheaper Edition. Post 8vo, strongly half-bound, 6s. 6d.

DRAWING; &c.

- LINEAL Drawing Copies for the Earliest Instruction.** Comprising 200 subjects on 24 sheets, mounted on 12 pieces of thick pasteboard. By the Author of "Drawing for Young Children." In a portfolio. 5s. 6d.
- Easy Drawing Copies for Elementary Instruction.** By the Author of "Drawing for Young Children." Set I. Twenty-six Subjects mounted on pasteboard. Price 8s. 6d., in a Portfolio. Set II. Forty-one Subjects mounted on pasteboard. Price 8s. 6d., in a Portfolio.
- * * The Work may also be had (two sets together) in one Portfolio, price 6s. 6d.
- Drawing Models.** Consisting of Forms for Constructing various Buildings, Gateways, Castles, Bridges, &c. The Buildings will be found sufficiently large to be drawn from by a numerous Class at the same time. In a Box, with a small Treatise on Drawing and Perspective. Price 2l. 10s. Length of the Box, 18½ inches; breadth 18 inches; height 8½ inches.
- Drawing Materials.** A Quarto Copybook of 24 leaves, common paper, 6d. A Quarto Copybook of 24 leaves, paper of superior quality, 1s. 3d. A Quarto Copybook of 60 leaves, 1s. 6d. Pencils, with very thick lead, B.B.B. 2s. per half dozen. Pencils, with thick lead, F. at 1s. 6d. ditto. Drawing Chalk, 6d. per dozen sticks, in a Box. Port-crayons for holding the Chalk, 4d. each.
- Perspective.** Its Principles and Practice. By G. B. MOORE. In two parts, Text and Plates. 8vo, cloth, 8s. 6d.
- The Principles of Colour applied to Decorative Art.** By G. B. MOORE, Teacher of Drawing in University College, London. Fcap., 2s. 6d.

SINGING.

THE Singing Master. People's Edition. (One-Half the Original Price.) Sixth Edition. 8vo. 6s., cloth lettered.

"What chiefly delights us in the *Singing Master* is the intermixture of many little moral songs with the ordinary ones. These are chiefly composed by Mr. Hickson himself; and we could scarcely imagine anything of the kind better executed. They relate to exactly the class of subjects which all who wish well to the industrious orders would wish to see imprinted on their inmost nature—contentment with their lowly but honourable lot, the blessings that flow from industry, the fostering of the domestic affections, and aspirations for the improvement of society."—*Chambers' Journal*.

* * Sold also in Five Parts, any of which may be had separately as follows:—

- FIRST LESSONS IN SINGING AND THE NOTATION OF MUSIC.** Containing Nineteen Lessons in the Notation and Art of Reading Music. 8vo, 1s. sewed.
- RUDIMENTS OF THE SCIENCE OF HARMONY OR THOROUGH BASS.** 8vo, 1s. sewed.
- THE FIRST CLASS TUNE BOOK.** A selection of thirty single and pleasing airs, arranged with suitable words for young children. 8vo, 1s. sewed.
- THE SECOND CLASS TUNE BOOK.** A selection of Vocal Music adapted for youth of different ages, and arranged (with suitable words) as two and three-part harmonies. 8vo, 1s. 6d.
- THE HYMN TUNE BOOK.** A selection of Seventy popular Hymn and Psalm Tunes, arranged with a view of facilitating the progress of children learning to sing in parts. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

The words without the Music may be had in three small books as follows:—

CHOIRAL SONGS, from the FIRST CLASS TUNE BOOK, 1d.

CHOIRAL SONGS, from the SECOND CLASS TUNE BOOK, 1d.

HYMNS, from the HYMN TUNE BOOK, 1½d.

The Vocal Exercises, Moral Songs, and Hymns, with the Music, may also be had printed on Cards, price Twopence each Card, or Twenty-five for Three Shillings.

