

THE  
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1868.

---

No. I.

---

---

ART. I.—*The English Language*.\*

LINGUISTICS is gradually acquiring the consistency of a science. If not so definite as mathematics and other pure sciences, it has yet made good its claim to be regarded as a science, both by the character of its methods and the wide generalizations which it has reached. Languages have long, almost always indeed, been a subject of study. But one may be an accomplished linguist, reading and speaking many tongues, without being an adept in the science of language. This science, in its more recent and exact form, differs perceptibly even from philology. The material, or subject matter of the science, is not one language, or any one class of languages, ancient or modern, living or dead, but language itself, in its entirety. Its methods are to observe, arrange, and classify all the forms of speech that are, or ever have been, in use, and from them to deduce the necessary laws of speech for a race constituted as the human race is. It aims to show how language originated, that is, to show why we speak at all, and why we speak as we do, to show what is the inner life of language,

\* *Language and the Study of Language*. By William Dwight Whitney, Professor of Sanskrit in Yale College. Charles Scribner & Co. New York. 8vo.

how its changes are effected, to trace the relations between language and thought, and finally, as the geologist is able from existing phenomena to read the history of the globe far back anterior to human records, so from the existing forms of speech to travel back into the prehistoric annals of the race, and to trace the doings and the character of races of whom there is no other record.

The science of language, as thus understood, is the youngest of the sciences, younger even than geology, being yet hardly half a century old. Among its cultivators are two particularly noticeable by those of the English speaking race, both as being on the foremost wave of the advancing science, and as using our language in their investigations, and being therefore the more accessible to English and American students. These are Prof. Max Müller, of the University of Oxford, and Prof. Whitney, of Yale College. Prof. Whitney's book has for some time been known to be in preparation, and has been expected with the liveliest interest. The Professor has not as yet made much noise in this country, but he is familiarly recognized, by those eminent in linguistic science abroad, as the highest living authority in America on the subject of which he treats. His book, the result of long years of silent investigation and research, cannot fail to place him in a position of most honourable distinction before the eyes of his countrymen. If not so brilliant and fascinating in style as are the volumes of Max Müller, the work is equally learned, and is decidedly more sober and trustworthy in its conclusions.

The recent contributions to the study of English by Prof. Marsh\* and Prof. Schele de Vere, of the University of Virginia,† and by Trench, Alford, and Moon, in England, as well as the elaborate reviews which have appeared in nearly all the leading periodicals in both countries, show that the subject has awakened public attention. All the works referred to have been received with marked favour, and they have done much towards making the genius and resources of our language better understood by those who use it. But the works

\* *Lectures on the English Language*, 8vo.; *Origin and History of the English Language*, 8vo.

† *Studies in English*, 8vo.

of Prof. Müller and Prof. Whitney, while necessarily dealing largely with English, and while of great interest and value to the mere student of English, yet take a much wider range than those of the other writers who have been named. The difference between them is like the difference between a work on geology and a work on trilobites or on the carboniferous era. As a matter of course, a work which professes to be the exponent of a science in its totality, cannot be original in the same manner as a work which gives only a special study of some particular point. Prof. Whitney's volume, crowded as it is with matter, is and claims to be only a compend of a vast science, giving in briefest outline the results of many workers and thinkers, living and dead. And yet it is rare to find, in a work which is professedly and in its nature a compend, so much that is original. The method of evolving the subject from the simple inquiry, Why do we speak as we do? is entirely his own, and a large proportion of the facts and observations employed by him in the development of his theories are of the nature of original contributions to the science. His work, in short, is not only a masterly exhibit of the science, but it has actually placed the science perceptibly forward. It is at once the ablest exposition, and the largest addition, that the science has yet received from any single contributor among those who use our English tongue.

One feature of the work that will make it particularly acceptable to the ordinary reader, is that, in establishing the general laws of language, the author draws his illustrations very largely from the mother tongue. It is evident indeed, from every chapter of his book, that he has been an attentive student of his own language, and we could not recommend a better course to one who wished to make himself thoroughly master of whatever is difficult and recondite in English Grammar than to read Prof. Whitney's book, which does not profess to treat of the subject at all. His remarks, for instance, upon the production of form-words, in Chapter III., ought to settle for ever the logomachies of the schoolmaster-grammarians about most of the disputed questions respecting the conjugation of the English verb. The perfect freedom with which Prof. Whitney walks among all the intricacies of English

idiom, makes it evident that he has given to this department of science very special attention, and we cannot but express the wish that he will favour the public from time to time with further illustrations of the subject drawn from the same rich storehouse. Special studies in English from one who has shown himself such a master of the general subject, could not fail to be valuable.

The publication of Prof. Whitney's volume seems to afford a fitting occasion for stating briefly the accepted theory in regard to the origin and character of the English language, and of its relation to the other languages of the earth. In doing this, it will be necessary first to take the reader to regions apparently remote from the topic named. But in many things, a comprehensive survey of a whole subject is the shortest way of getting at a precise knowledge of a particular division of it. Some idea of the general grouping of the languages of the earth is necessary to a proper understanding of the place which English holds, both in history and in general philology. This is the more necessary, because the whole science of language has been revolutionized, or rather it has been created, in times within the memory of persons still living. The old theory, which until lately nobody even questioned, was, that the Hebrew was the original language of the earth, and that all other languages in some way sprung from it. "All antiquity," says Jerome, "affirms that Hebrew, in which the Old Testament is written, was the beginning of all speech." When, therefore, attempts began to be made at a scientific classification of languages, the problem which presented itself to scholars was, "Hebrew being undoubtedly the mother of all languages, how can we explain the process by which it became split into so many dialects, and how can we trace back the words in all the various languages of the world to their original Hebrew roots? The amount of learning and ingenuity bestowed upon the solution of this problem was prodigious, and has well been compared to that bestowed by the earlier astronomers in undertaking to explain the movement of the heavenly bodies on the assumption that the earth was the centre of the universe. The foundations of the old theory of language began to be shaken as far back as the time of Leibnitz

in 1710, and primarily by Leibnitz himself. But no great and certain advance was made in the way of establishing a true theory, until near the close of the last century. The steps which then led to the discovery and the establishment of the science of language, as now understood, originated in undertakings not by any means scientific in their aim. The English East India Company, in the government of their Indian empire, have always had in their employ a number of eminent jurists, to act as judges in the civil administration. These judges early found that the jurisprudence which they were called upon to administer, was interwoven with a vast body of national traditions of unknown, but certainly most venerable antiquity, and that to interpret these traditions rightly, it would be necessary to become acquainted with the old original language, in which they were contained. The English and American missionaries in that country made a similar discovery. The people of India were found to be in this respect very much in the condition of the nations of southern Europe, which have survived the disintegration of the Roman empire. As France, Spain, and Italy look to ancient Rome for the basis both of their several languages and their system of jurisprudence, so in modern India many nations and tribes were found with languages distinct indeed but closely affiliated, and having a common basis in a tongue which ceased to be spoken more than two thousand years ago. This dead language, existing in India as the Latin does among the nations of southern Europe, is known by the name of the Sanskrit.

The jurists and civilians of the East India Company found, that in order to acquire the necessary authority as interpreters of Indian law, they must acquaint themselves with the Sanskrit language. The missionaries were obliged to study it for a like reason. It was the only way in which they could obtain a hearing as instructors of the people, or in which they could, satisfactorily to themselves, explain and confute the system of theology and philosophy on which the vast superstructure of Indian religion was based. These two classes of Europeans, therefore, addressed themselves with zeal to the study of this ancient tongue. Their labours in this line first took shape in the formation of the Asiatic Society at Calcutta, in 1784, from

which event indeed the history of Sanskrit Philology as a European study may be dated. As the results of their studies were transmitted from time to time to the learned of western Europe, it became gradually apparent that the facts disclosed were likely to have an important bearing upon the entire science of philology. A surprising coincidence, for instance, was found between this ancient language at the foot of the Himalayas, which had been a dead language for more than two thousand years, and the languages of western Europe. More surprising still, this language was found even more like to the Latin and Greek. This coincidence included not only a vast number of words of like meaning, but most wonderful similarities in declensions, conjugations, and syntax. Grammatical forms and constructions in Latin and Greek, which had become anomalous and unexplainable before the time of Julius Cæsar and the grammarians of Alexandria, were found to be explained by corresponding forms in Sanskrit, where they existed in a state less impaired, or more fully developed.

Such results as these necessarily led to a careful re-examination of the whole theory of the affiliation of languages. It would not comport with the object of the present article to enter into a history of the investigations and discussions which followed, nor to state the discrepancies of opinion which still exist among philologists, as to the general classification and the geographical distribution of the languages of the earth. The examination of the subject has led, however, to some well ascertained results, in regard to which the learned are pretty much agreed. All the leading languages, from the Himalaya mountains in Asia, on the east, to the Atlantic shore of Europe, on the west, are found to have numerous affinities and points of resemblance too strong to be accounted for in any other way than by supposing an historical and ethnical connection. The ethnographical theory, by which these extraordinary analogies and identities are explained, we will proceed to state in the briefest manner possible. It will be understood to be the merest outline.

The principal nations embraced in the immense space of longitude that has been named, are supposed to have all sprung originally from the same central hive in Asia, the precise loca-

tion of which it is not necessary to the theory either to establish or assume, and to have proceeded thence, in very early times, in successive swarms, to the several countries where they are found within the historic periods. These tides of population are supposed to have followed each other at distant intervals, and to have proceeded, as migratory nomads usually do, in the direction of their original impulse, until the impulse was spent, or until it met with some obstacle sufficient to arrest its further progress. The earliest wave rolling westwardly would necessarily be arrested by the Atlantic, and would eventually become stationary in the regions along the coast and in the adjacent islands. The next succeeding wave in the same direction would be compelled to pause on reaching the range of countries occupied by its predecessor. The earliest easterly wave seems to have been arrested by the formidable obstacle presented by the Himmalaya mountains, and to have settled at its feet among the plains of Hindustan. So on with the several emigrations, east and west, and more or less remote, until we imagine the whole area occupied between our two extreme points.

Taking this general idea, which is admitted to be in the main purely theoretical, we find the following distinct groups of languages, marked off and yet connected by well-defined characters, and by well-known and indisputable facts.

I. The **INDIC**, or the languages of India. The ancient original language of India is the Sanskrit. It ceased to be a spoken language at least 300 B. C. Its earliest form is to be found in the Vedas, the most ancient of the sacred books of the Hindus. Between the Sanskrit and the present living languages of India, are two successive stages, or dialects (both however dead), namely, the Pali, containing sacred books less ancient than the Vedas; and the Prakrit, containing various remains, both literary and religious, and approaching to more modern times. The chief modern dialects sprung from the above, but largely mixed with the languages of the successive conquerors of the country, are such as the Hindi, Hindustani, Bengali, Mahratti, &c.

II. The **IRANIC**, the language of Iran, or Persia. The ancient language of the Zoroasters, or Fire-worshippers, the

inhabitants of Persia, which was originally called Iran, is the Zend. Its earliest form is in the Zend-Avesta, the most ancient of the sacred books of the Persians. Two stages of this also are found, the Pehlvi, some centuries after the Christian era, and the Parsi, or old Persian, about 1000 A. D. The chief living representatives of the Zend are the Persian and the Armenian.

III. The **CELTIC**. The tribes found by the Romans in Spain, Gaul, Britain, and Ireland, and in the smaller islands along the Atlantic coast, had certain remarkable points of coincidence, showing them all to belong to the same race. They are called Kelts or Celts, and they have been divided into two branches, the Cymric and the Gælic. From the Cymric branch are derived the Welsh, (the lineal descendants of the old Britons,) the Cornish (inhabiting Cornwall), and the Armorican, in the province of Brittany or Armorica on the coast of France. From the Gælic branch came the Erse or Irish, the Highland Scotch, and the Manx, on the Isle of Man.

IV. The **ITALIC**. With the ancient language of this family, the Latin, we are all familiar. The Roman power and civilization carried their language into all those provinces which were thoroughly subdued. The chief modern Latin languages, or Romance languages, as they are generally called, are six, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, French, Wallachian, (spoken in Wallachia, Moldavia, and parts of Hungary, Transylvania, and Bessarabia,) and the Romanese (spoken among the Grisons of Switzerland.)

V. The **HELLENIC**. This is represented by the ancient Greek, the modern Greek usually called Romaic, and perhaps the Albanian.

VI. The **TEUTONIC**. The oldest of the languages belonging to this class is the Gothic. It became extinct in the ninth century. Ulfilas, a bishop of the Mæso-Goths, about A. D. 350, translated the whole of the Scriptures, except Kings, into the Gothic. Of this translation a considerable portion of the New Testament and a small portion of the Old, have survived, and constitute a most important relic of this ancient tongue. The modern Teutonic languages may be divided into two dis-



tinct groups, the Scandinavian and the Germanic. The Scandinavian includes the tribes north of the Baltic, and is represented by the Danish, the Swedish, the Norwegian, and the Icelandic. The Germanic includes the tribes in central Europe south of the Baltic, and is subdivided into two branches, the High German and the Low German. From this latter has sprung the Hollandish or Dutch, and the Anglo-Saxon, the parent of English.

It has been conjectured that the Italic and Hellenic races entered Europe south of the Euxine, following the coast of the Mediterranean. In like manner the Teutonic tribes are supposed to have passed north of the Euxine, and in the course of their wanderings westerly to have become gradually separated into two streams, part verging north, to and beyond the Baltic, forming the Scandinavian nations, and part going more centrally, pressing upon the Romans on the south, and upon the Celtic nations on the west. This at all events is the position in which we find them in the times of Livy, Cæsar, and Tacitus.

VII. The SLAVONIC. The last of the great waves of population that we shall notice, the last perhaps in point of time in its western exodus, is the Slavonic. It is found in the north-eastern parts of Europe and the conterminous regions of Asia, pressing westerly upon the Germanic and Scandinavian peoples, and southerly upon the Greco-Roman. The languages of this group are very numerous. The principal are the Russian, Bulgarian, Illyrian, Polish, Bohemian, Lusatian, Lettish, Lithuanian, and Old Prussian.

The seven groups of languages, that have been thus briefly described, form one of several great Families of Languages, into which the numerous varieties of human speech have been divided. This family has been variously named. It has been called the Japetic, because the nations included in it are supposed to have descended from Japhet, one of the sons of Noah. Another name is the Indo-European, which is a purely geographical name, and has been given purposely to avoid mixing up the philological question with the ethnical one. Of the linguistic affinities, there is no doubt. The ethnical connection has not been so clearly established. Still another name has

been given to the family, and has been much insisted on by those eminent scholars who have pushed their inquiries into the subject farthest. This name is the Aryan. It is so named from an ancient country in central Asia, called Arya in the Sanskrit-books, and known by this title among the Greeks and Romans, and supposed to be the starting point from which these various nations migrated.

Besides this family, there are two or three others, which we need not describe, as they are not connected, except in a most remote degree, with our present subject. One of these is the Semitic family, so called because the nations embraced in it are descended from Shem, the oldest son of Noah. The principal languages included in this family are the Hebrew, Samaritan, Syriac, Chaldee, Arabic, and Ethiopic. The other families of languages are not as yet sufficiently defined, and therefore need not be named in this extremely cursory review.

The English language, it will be seen, bears intimate relations to two of the groups of the great Indo-European or Aryan family, namely, the Teutonic and the Latin. More than nine-tenths of English words are derived from one or the other of these sources. At the same time, there are numerous words in English that cannot be claimed as being exclusively either Teutonic or Latin, but are common to both sources. Some words, indeed, are found running through all the seven groups of the Indo-European family, showing that they existed before the great dispersion. A few words are found even common both to the Indo-European and the Semitic families, bearing in this fact a history that carries us back to the ark itself.

It would be impossible, in such a review as this, to give the induction of particulars that are proper in the way of illustrations even, much less of proof, of these generalizations. A very few familiar examples will be quoted.

### THREE.

1. Sans.; *tri*.
2. Zend; *thri*.
3. Celt.: Erse, *tri*; Welsh, *tri*.
4. Ital.: Lat., *tres*, *tria*; Fr., *trois*; It., *tres*; Sp., *tre*.
5. Hell.: Gr., *τρεις*, *τρια*.

6. Teut.: Goth., *thri*; Ger., *drei*; Sw., *tre*; Dan., *tre*; Sax., *threo*, *thri*; Eng., *three*.

7. Slav.: Russ., *tri*; Let., *tri*.

## SEVEN.

1. Sans.: *saptan*.

2. Zend: *haptan*; Per., *heft*.

3. Celt.: Welsh, *saith*.

4. Ital.: Lat., *septem*; It., *sette*; Sp., *siete*; Fr., *sept*.

5. Hell.: Greek, *ἑπτα*.

6. Teut.: Goth., *sibun*; Ger., *sieben*; Du., *zeeven*; Dan., *syv*; Sax., *seofen*; Eng., *seven*.

7. Slav.: Rus., *sem*; Let., *septyni*.

## FATHER.

1. Sans.: *pitri*.

2. Zend: *paitar*; Per., *pader*.

3. Celt.: Ers., *athair* (initial consonant elided).

4. Ital.: Lat., *pater*; It., *padre*; Sp., *padre*; Fr., *père*.

5. Hell.: Gr., *πατήρ*.

6. Teut.: Goth., *vatar*; Ger., *vater*; Du. *fader*; Dan., *fader*; Sw., *fader*; Sax., *faeder*; Eng., *father*.

7. Slav. (doubtful).

## MOTHER.

1. Sans.: *matri*.

2. Zend: Per., *mader*.

3. Celt.: Ers., *mathair*.

4. Ital.: Lat., *mater*; It., *madre*; Sp., *madre*; Fr., *mère*.

5. Hell.: Gr., *μητήρ*.

6. Teut.: Ger., *mutter*; Du., *moeder*; Sw., *moder*; Dan., *moder*; Sax., *moder*; Eng., *mother*.

7. Slav.: Rus., *mat*.

## TO BEAR.

1. Sans.: *bri*, *bhar-adi*.

2. Zend: *bairan*; Pers., *ber*.

3. Celt.: Ers., *bear-adh*.

4. Ital.: Lat., *fero*, *pario*, *porto*; It., *portare*; Sp., *portar*; Fr., *porter*.

5. Hell.: Gr., *φερω, φορρω, βαρος* (a thing borne, a burden), *βαρος*.
6. Teut.: Goth., *bairan*; Ger., *föhren*; Du., *beuren*; Sw., *bæra*; Dan., *bære*; Sax., *bæran*; Eng., *bear*.
7. Slav.: Rus., *beru*.

Some words, it is to be observed, not only run through the entire Indo-European or Japhetic group, but likewise appear in the Shemitic. Thus the numeral "seven," already quoted, is evidently connected with the *sheba* of the Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Ethiopic, and the *sabata* of the Arabic and Hebrew. In like manner, "bear," seems to have an etymological connection with the Hebrew *parah*, which means to "bear," and perhaps with the Hebrew *bara*, meaning "to create," "to produce," "to bring forth," (comp. English *bairn*, that which is born or brought forth.)

This word "bear," both in its generic meaning of bearing a burden, and its specific meaning of bringing forth (as of animals, trees, earth, &c.) is probably more widely diffused than any other word to be found in the world. There is no word of which we would feel it safer to guess that it was used by Noah himself, and that it is verily older than the flood.

Let us look at a few of its forms in the English alone.

Here we have it both as a Teutonic word, coming directly from the Saxon *baeran*, and as a Latin word, in its three several forms of *fero*, *pario*, and *porto*.

First, let us enumerate some of the forms of Teutonic origin.

Bear, bearing, bearer, bearable, bearably, bier; forbear, forbearing, forbearingly, for-bearance; over-bear, over-bearing, over-bearingly; bore, over-bore, for-bore; borne, over-borne, for-borne; born, bairn, birth; burden, burdening, burdened, burdensome, burdensomely, burdensomeness; over-burden, over-burdening, over-burdened, unburden, unburdening, &c.

From the Latin *fero*, we have fertile (bearing freely, productive) fertility, fertilize, fertilization, fertilizer, fertilizing, fertilized. *Fors* (forts) comes from *fero*, as the Greek *φορτιον* from *φερω*, *τροπος* from *τρεπω*. *Fors, fortis* (whatever bears or brings itself along, *chance*) gives us fortune, fortunating, fortunated, fortunate, fortunately, fortuneless; unfortunate, unfor-

unately; misfortune; fortuitous, fortuitously, fortuity. *Fortis* (that which bears everything before it, *strong, brave*,) gives us forte; fort, fortlet, fortalice, fortress; fortitude, fortify, fortifying, fortified; force, forcing, forced, forcer, forceless, forceful, forcefully, forcible, forcibly; enforce, enforcing, enforced, enforcement; reinforce, reinforcing, reinforced, reinforcement. There is some connection evidently between *fero*, to bear, and *ferry*, to bear across a stream; hence we have ferry, ferrying, ferried, ferriage, ferryman, &c. *Fer* as an adjective termination, in conjunction with *ous*, is compounded with many hundreds of Latin nouns, giving rise to such words as somniferous, noctiferous, odoriferous, pestiferous, vociferous, &c., some of which again originate a new progeny, as vociferous, vociferously, vociferate, vociferating, vociferated, vociferation, &c., &c.

*Fero*, in composition with the Latin prepositions, gives a still more prolific progeny of words; as,

Circum-*fer*-ence, circumferential, circumferentor.

Con-*fer*, conferring, conferred, conference, conferrer, conferee.

De-*fer*, deferring, deferred, deference, deferential, deferentially.

Dif-*fer*, differing, differed, different, indifferent, differently, indifferently, difference, indifference, differentiate, differentiating, differentiated.

In-*fer*, inferring, inferred, inferrible, inference, inferential, inferentially.

Of-*fer*, offering, offered, offerer, offertory.

Pre-*fer*, preferring, preferred, preferrer, preferment, preference, preferable, preferably, preferableness.

Prof-*fer*, proffering, proffered, profferer.

Re-*fer*, referring, referred, referee, referrible, reference.

Suf-*fer*, suffering, suffered, sufferer, sufferance, sufferable, sufferably, insufferably.

Trans-*fer*, transferring, transferred, transferrer, transferee, transference, transferrible, intransferrible.

The connection between *fer-o*, and *par-io*, to bring forth or bear, may not be obvious at first sight; but the words are not more removed than are  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\varphi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$  in the Greek, in which case the connection is generally admitted. As the identity

of the stem depends upon its consonantal elements, the substitution of *p* for *f* is the only material change in passing from *fer* to the stem *par*, or *per* (*par*-io, *pe*-*per*-it,) and no etymological law is better established than the interchangeability of the labials *p*, *b*, *f*, and *v*. The same applies to *por*-to, to carry, to bear.

If these two words be admitted to belong to the group, we have from *par*-io, parent, parentage, parental, parentally, parentless, parturient, parturition, and very numerous compounds, such *viviparous*, *oviparous*, &c. From *por*-to, to carry, we have port, porte, portico, porch, porter, portly, portal, portage, portliness, portable, portableness, besides the compounds portmanteau, portfolio, &c., &c. Besides these, we have also the various prepositional compounds, com-port, de-port, ex-port, im-port, re-port, sup-port, trans-port, each of which gives birth to a numerous family, which need not be enumerated, as they are formed in the same manner as the derivatives of con-fer, de-fer, &c., already given.

It is not necessary to pursue the illustration further. From a careful count, we suppose there are in the English language alone, not less than four hundred and fifty words, dependent upon this one stem, in no one of which is the meaning of the primary root entirely lost.

What the count might be, if carried through each of the languages of the Indo-European family, to say nothing of the numerous traces of it in the Shemitic family, we are unable to say. It certainly reaches many tens of thousands.

One other remark before we leave this subject. In treating of such a class of words, it is obviously proper to say, first, that fertile, confer, defer, &c., are derived from the Latin *fero*; secondly, that bear, burden, borne, born, birth, &c., are derived from the Sax. *baeran*. But it is not proper to say that *baeran* and its derivatives come from *fero*, or that *fero* and its derivatives come from *baeran*. The two (*fero* and *baeran*) are independent of each other, and yet they are mutually related. The generic stem, which pervades them all, is not strictly a Teutonic word, or a Latin word, but an Indo-European word.

Having thus given a general outline, showing what is meant

by the Indo-European family of languages, with a few examples in illustration of the theory, we will pass briefly in review some of those historical facts, which show more particularly the exact place of the English language in this family.

According to the theory, then, the first of the great waves of population that rolled westward from central Asia, was the Celtic race. At what particular time this great emigration took place, we know not. We only know that it was many centuries before the Christian era. The Celts, or Kelts, appear to have been originally nomadic in their character, and to have journeyed westerly, or to have been driven westerly by the Teutons or some succeeding race, through central Europe, until their further progress was arrested by the Atlantic ocean. We find remains of this race all along the Atlantic coast of Europe, though they were chiefly congregated in Spain, Gaul, Britain, and the adjacent islands.

The Latin or Roman race, shortly before the Christian era, extended their dominion northward from Italy, until they had subdued nearly all the countries occupied by the Celtic race. In Spain, and in Gaul (or France), this dominion was so complete, that those countries became integral parts of the Roman empire. Not only Roman laws and customs were introduced, but a Roman population extended itself into those provinces, and intermingled largely with the original population, so that finally the Roman or Latin language was substituted for the original Celtic throughout the provinces of Gaul and Spain.

We have a modern instance very analogous to this, with which we are familiar. The state of Louisiana was originally settled by the French. The principal inhabitants were of that race, and the French language was the one mainly spoken in the settlement. But since the acquisition of the territory by the United States, the Americans have spread themselves through the country, have mingled their race with that of the original inhabitants, and finally the English language has, to a great extent, displaced the French.

In the year 55, B. C., the Romans, under Julius Cæsar, passed from Gaul into Great Britain. From that time until

426, A. D., a period of nearly five centuries, the Romans continued to regard Great Britain as a part of their empire.

At length, in the fifth century of the Christian era, the Teutonic or Germanic race, then occupying eastern and central Europe, under various names, as Goths, Vandals, Franks, &c., began to be agitated by a great and steady impulse southward and westward. These fierce northern barbarians precipitated themselves with fearful violence upon the now corrupt and imbecile Roman provinces. The Roman empire, tottering to its fall under these repeated assaults, was obliged to withdraw its forces from the distant provinces for the defence of the imperial city itself. The Roman legions were finally withdrawn from Great Britain in the year 426, A. D., just 481 years after the invasion of Cæsar, and the native Britons were left thenceforth to defend themselves, as they best might, from the barbarians that on all sides threatened them.

The Roman occupation of Great Britain differed materially from their occupation of Gaul and Spain. These latter countries were thoroughly subdued and made part of the great Roman commonwealth, almost as much so as was Italy itself. They were Romanized or Latinized almost as thoroughly as Louisiana is now Americanized. But in Britain the case was different. The Romans there held at best only a military occupation. They maintained one or more legions in the island. They constructed roads, they fortified camps, and had, of course, considerable commerce with the natives. But the Roman people themselves never settled in great numbers in the island.

The connection between the Romans and the Britons was somewhat similar to that between the present English and the natives of India. There was a state of military subjugation, and, to some extent, of civil administration and government; but there was no general intermixing and fusion of races. There was no extension of the language of the conquerors over the region of the conquered. On the final withdrawal of the Roman legions, in the fifth century, the original Britons are found to have retained hardly any traces of the Roman or Latin language. It is asserted that less than a dozen words altogether remain upon the island, as the result



of these five centuries of military occupation, and these few words are so much corrupted as to be with difficulty recognized.

Among the Latin words left in Great Britain by the Romans, may be mentioned, by way of illustration, the proper name Chester, both as occurring by itself, and as a part of many compounds, such as West-Chester, Win-Chester, Chi-Chester, Col-Chester, &c. Chester is a corruption of the Latin word *castra*, a fortified camp. These fortified camps of the Romans, in the distant provinces, were often permanent establishments, remaining in the same place for a series of years. Of course, the natives resorted to these camps for the purpose of traffic, bringing for sale provisions, clothing, and whatever else was needed for the support of the soldiery. Booths were erected, then huts, and finally more settled habitations, arranged in rows, or streets, and so each camp, "castra," or "chester," became the nucleus of a town, giving us Westchester, Manchester, Grantchester, and all the other Chesters.

The Latin words, however, that were left in Great Britain by the Romans, during their early occupation of the island, are very few in comparison with the whole number of Latin words that now exist in English. We know not how many Latin words we now have in English, certainly not less than thirty thousand. But this vast number was not introduced by the Roman conquest. Not a hundred altogether are found that came in as the result of that event, and those few are, like the word Chester, so much altered as scarcely to be recognized. The large ingredient of Latin words now existing in English, is to be attributed to causes of much later date, some of them indeed coming down to the present day. Of these we shall speak more fully a few pages further on.

The year 451, A. D., is generally assigned as the date of an event that has affected, more than all other causes, the destiny of Great Britain. This was the coming of the Saxons under the two brothers Hengist and Horsa.

The Saxons were a branch of the great Teutonic race. They lived along the southern shores of the Baltic, in the countries now known as Holland, Jutland, Hanover, Sleswick,

Holstein, &c., extending from the Rhine to the Vistula. Their position along the coast of the North Sea and the Baltic, and the numerous bays, creeks, and rivers with which that coast is indented, determined in a great measure their occupation, and separated them perceptibly, both in character and destiny, from their Teutonic brethren of the forests of central Germany. They were the navigators of their age. They spent their lives almost entirely upon the waves. Bold, buccaneering, and piratical, they were the terror equally of the Roman and the Celt.

The various tribes of this race were known by different names. Those with which history is most familiar are the Jutes, the Angles, and the Saxons. That part of Britain which was settled by the Angles, was called Angle-land, changed afterward into "Engle-land," and then into England. This name, applied primarily to a single province, was ultimately extended to the whole country. The compound term, "Anglo-Saxons," taken from the two most notorious of the piratical tribes, is used by historians to distinguish those of the race that settled in England, from those that remained on the continent. "Anglo-Saxons" are English Saxons, while the term alone, without prefix, usually means continental Saxons.

The Saxons did not come into England all at one time, or in one body. Their first arrival was under Hengist and Horsa, A. D. 451. One part of the race having obtained a secure foothold in the island, other swarms followed from time to time, for several hundred years. In the year 827, nearly four centuries after the first settlement, seven independent Saxon kingdoms had been established in the island, which were then united under one government, known as the Saxon Heptarchy.

The policy of the Saxons in Britain differed entirely from that of the Romans. The Romans had merely a military occupation of the island. They held it in subjection by their legions, and when those legions were withdrawn, the native Britons remained on the same soil where Cæsar found them, improved and civilized indeed by contact with the Romans, but still unmixed as to race, and uncorrupted as to language. The Saxons came with a far different purpose, and in a far different manner. The Saxons took, not military, but popular

occupation of the island. They came, not as an army merely, but as a people. They came, not to conquer merely, but to settle. They made England their headquarters, their home. Their policy, therefore, was one of extermination. The Romans held the Britons in subjection. The Saxons butchered them, or drove them out. The Roman soldiery and the Britons covered the same area of territory, mingling freely together. The Saxons wanted, not subjects, but soil. The conflict, therefore, between these two races was one of the bloodiest upon record. The result was the expulsion, almost the extermination, of the feebler race. When the Saxon Heptarchy was fully established, the great mass of the native Britons had been literally butchered. Of those that survived this fate, some few had settled in Armorica or Brittany, on the coast of France, but the great majority had taken refuge in the secluded and inaccessible mountain fastnesses of Wales, where they remain as a distinct race to this day. The Welsh of the present day are the lineal descendants of the ancient Britons.

The most striking evidence of the extent to which this exterminating policy of the Saxons was carried, is to be found in the language. Had the Saxons come into the island as the Romans did, and mingled with the natives, even though it had been as conquerors, the original British or Celtic language would have remained substantially unchanged, or at most, there would have been a mixture of the two languages—the British or Celtic, and the Saxon. So far is this, however, from the fact, that after the Saxon conquest was completed, there remained upon the soil scarcely a vestige of the original language of the island. According to Latham, the only common names retained in current use from the original Celtic of Great Britain are the following, basket, barrow, button, bran, clout, crock, crook, cock, gusset, kiln, dainty, darn, tenter, fleam, flaw, funnel, gyve, grid (in gridiron), gruel, welt, wicket, gown, wire, mesh, mattock, mop, rail, rasher, rug, solder, size, tackle.

We know of but one instance in history of an extermination so complete, and that is, of the Indian race who originally occupied this country, and whose fate presents a curious parallel to that of the ancient Britons. As there now linger

among our hills and valleys a few Indian words which we have adopted and Anglicized, such as tomato, potato, tobacco, calumet, wigwam, tomahawk, hominy, mush, samp, mocasson, &c., so among the Saxons, after their bloody work was over, there remained a few of the words of the old Britons. As the remains of the Indian tribes are now gathered into a body in the west, where they retain and keep alive their native dialects, so the remnants of the miserable Britons were collected into the western part of England, in what is now the Principality of Wales, where they retain with great tenacity their ancient language and many of their ancient customs.

The original language of Britain, then, the old British or Celtic language, that which was spoken by the half-naked savages that Cæsar saw, still exists. It is a living, spoken language. But it is not our language. Though spoken in parts of England, it is not the English language. It is not that with which we are materially concerned in our present inquiry. We, Englishmen and Americans, are lineal descendants of the Anglo-Saxons, and our language is the Saxon language. The English language, whose history we are now sketching, though it has received large admixtures from various sources, is in the main the same that was spoken by Hengist and Horsa, and by their countrymen along the southern shores of the Baltic, before their arrival in England in the fifth century.

During the ninth and tenth centuries, the Saxons in their turn were invaded by the Danes. The Danish invasion, however, does not assume much importance in giving the history of the language, because the Danes, although for a time victorious, were finally expelled, leaving the Saxons in possession of the country. The Danes, moreover, were of a race cognate to the Saxons, and their language belonged to the same group of languages. A considerable number of Danish words were retained in the island, and have been incorporated into the language. They are not, however, so numerous, nor do they differ so much from the Saxon words, as to make any special consideration of them necessary.

The first historical event which impaired seriously the integrity of the language, was the Norman conquest. Wil-

William, Duke of Normandy, generally known as William the Conqueror, invaded England, A. D. 1066, and by the decisive battle of Hastings, routed the Saxons, and gained the English throne. By this event the Normans became, and continued to be, the governing race in England. Let us trace briefly the influence of this event upon the language.

The policy of the Normans differed both from that of the Romans and that of the Saxons, and it was this difference of policy that caused such a difference in the effect upon the language. The Normans did not, like the Romans, merely send over an army to subjugate, but came over as a people to occupy. On the other hand, they did not, like the Saxons, exterminate the conquered, but sought to keep them on the soil as a subject and servile race. William divided the island among his followers, giving to each a portion of territory, and of the Saxon population which was upon it. In this manner, two races were diffused side by side, over the surface of the island, and kept in constant juxtaposition. The effect of this continued contact between the two races, soon became apparent.

The Normans were superior to the conquered race in military skill, but were greatly inferior in numbers. They sought, therefore, to perpetuate their authority by depressing the social and political condition of the Saxons. They introduced Norman laws and customs. None but Normans were appointed to any important office, either in church or state. Above all, a strenuous attempt was made to spread the Norman language throughout the island. No other language was spoken at court, or in camp, in parliament, in the baronial hall, or in the lady's boudoir. In this language the laws were written, and judicial proceedings were conducted. No civil contract was binding, no man could sue or be sued, no right could be enforced, and no favour won, except in the language of the governing race. The first step to every Saxon serf, who wished to rise from his state of inferiority and servitude, was to forget his native language, and train his tongue to the accents of his foreign masters.

But the laws of nature are stronger than the laws of man. The Normans attempted an impossibility. It is impossible for

two races to maintain permanently a separate existence, when kept in constant contact and juxtaposition, as were the Normans and the Saxons. A mingling of race is sooner or later the uniform and inevitable result. So it was here. The Saxons gradually intermarried with the Normans, and rose to an equality of legal rights and social position. With the elevation of the race, the Saxon language resumed its rightful position. It had always been the language of the masses, while the Norman had been spoken only by the governing few. When two races become thus blended into one people, they cannot long continue to speak different languages. In this case, the Saxon, as being the language of the many, displaced the Norman, which was the language of the few, notwithstanding all the weight of authority and fashion that had been exerted in favour of the latter.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that no changes in the language occurred during this fiery ordeal. As there was a mingling of race, so there was to some extent a mingling of language. If we take a survey of the authors that wrote two or three centuries after the conquest, we find, not the pure Saxon of Alfred and Cædmon, nor yet the Norman parlance of William and his barons, but a mixed language, like the race, predominantly indeed Saxon, but with a large foreign ingredient. This mixed language is our modern English. Its main element is Saxon. But it has another element, amounting now to nearly one-third of the whole, the first introduction of which is to be attributed to the Norman conquest.

But who were the Normans, and what was their language? The word "Norman," is a corruption of Northman. The "Northmen" were the inhabitants of the ancient Scandinavia, that is, of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. They were, in the ninth and tenth centuries, precisely what the Saxons had been in the fifth century. The Saxons, after their establishment in Great Britain, had been converted to Christianity, had acquired the arts of peace, and become comparatively civilized. The Northmen were still unlettered pagans, whose home was in their ships, and whose whole life was warfare. For the greater part of two centuries, they ravaged all the more civilized countries of Europe, bordering upon the coast, until

their very name was a terror. Rollo, a leader of one of those adventurous bands, penetrated into the very heart of France, and finally obliged the king to cede to him and his followers an entire province, amounting to no inconsiderable part of the kingdom. This province, thus ceded A. D. 912 to the victorious Northmen, or Normans, was thenceforward called Normandy.

Rollo and his followers were comparatively few in numbers. They gradually intermarried with their subjects in the province which had been assigned them, and adopted their manners, religion, and language. In less than a century after the advent of Rollo, his descendants in Normandy were, as to language, scarcely distinguishable from other Frenchmen. But the French language, as we have seen, is in the main that introduced into the province of Gaul by the Romans. It is in short a corrupt form of the Latin language. And the Norman French is the same as other French, only with the addition of some northern or Scandinavian words, which the descendants of Rollo retained after their settlement in Normandy.

The Norman French, therefore, which William the Conqueror tried to introduce into England, was mainly a Latin language. The Normans did not eventually succeed in displacing our native Saxon. But they did succeed in introducing into it a large number of Norman-French words, and these Norman-French words, introduced into English after the Conquest, are generally words of Latin origin. These Latin words, thus introduced through the Norman-French, constitute the first important item in the Latin element of the language.

The importance of the Norman conquest, in its influence upon the language, is not to be estimated by the actual number of words then introduced. In point of fact, much the larger number of Latin words have been brought into the language since that time, and by other causes. The chief effect of the conquest in this respect was, first, that it broke down the old grammatical inflections, which constituted a dividing wall between the two languages, and, secondly, that it created the tendency to adopt foreign words. There is in all nations naturally a strong aversion to the adoption of foreign terms. The natural and spontaneous disposition, when a new word is

wanted; is to make it out of roots or stems already existing in the language, and by modes of combination with which the popular ear is familiar. The terrible shock of the Conquest, and the wholesale use of foreign words to which the people thereby became accustomed, overcame this natural dislike, and opened a wide door through succeeding centuries for a continued influx of Latin words from a great variety of sources.

The extent of this influx may be estimated, if we call to mind that England, both from its position and from its natural policy, has always maintained the closest commercial relations with the nations of southern Europe, and that those nations, the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian, all speak languages that have descended directly from the Latin, and that have consequently the closest affinity with each other. The Norman conquest having brought a large number of Latin words into the language, and having opened permanently the door for the introduction of others, by overcoming the national prejudice on the subject, and by making such foreign importations fashionable and popular, there has been ever since an uninterrupted stream of Latin words setting in upon us, like a tide that knows no ebb. Whenever, in the progress of commerce or of the arts, it has become necessary to have new words for the expression of new wants, or new ideas, instead of making these new words by a process of home manufacture, we have resorted to the easy credit system of borrowing them from our neighbours. Almost every musical term in the language has been taken from the Italian, most of our terms of etiquette and punctilio from the Spanish, and the entire nomenclature of cookery, dress, and fashion from the French. Italian singers and fiddlers, and Parisian cooks and milliners have levied a tax upon our tongues no less than upon our purses. These foreign words, when first introduced, usually appear in a foreign dress. They are printed in italics, or with quotation marks, or in some way to indicate that they are foreigners, and not yet entitled to the full rights of citizenship. But in a few years, the popular ear gets accustomed to the lingo, the popular lip learns to sound it trippingly, it becomes a part of staple English.

But there is another source, from which Latin words have



been brought into the language, even more prolific than those from mixture of race and from national intercourse. We refer to learning and education. From an early period in English history, long indeed before the time of the Conquest, all ecclesiastics were instructed in the Latin tongue, because in that tongue all the church services were conducted. Besides this, the Latin language then was, and indeed until comparatively modern times it continued to be, the general language of scientific and literary intercourse throughout Europe. Every treatise intended for general dissemination was written as a matter of course in Latin. Latin was the only medium by which an author could make himself known to those for whom alone books were intended, namely, the learned few. In addition to this, it has been, for more than a thousand years, and it still is, the settled practice, that the study of the Latin shall form a leading part in every course of liberal education. All educated men, of whatever profession, have been, as a matter of course, Latin scholars. The language of Cicero and Virgil has been as familiar to Englishmen of education, as that of Chaucer and Spenser. Indeed, as to a critical knowledge either of authors or of language, Englishmen have been far more proficient in the Latin than in their native English. The mother tongue has been left to take its chance in the nursery and the playground, while Latin has been interwoven with every element of their intellectual cultivation.

The effect of such a system must be obvious. The wall of partition between native words and foreign having been broken down by the rude shock of the Conquest, scholars have completed what warriors, teachers, and artists began. Hence the strange anomaly, that with us learned men have been the chief corrupters of the language. The Germans, and other Teutonic nations, have been as much addicted to the cultivation of classical scholarship as we have. But with them the national instinct has never been rudely blunted, and it has resisted with a great measure of success the Latinizing tendency which has so marked all classical studies with us. Our scholars have found, not only no resistance, but every facility which the established habits of the people could afford, for the introduction of Latin words. Out of this abundance of their hearts, therefore,

they have freely spoken. Steeped from boyhood in the diction of the most polished nations of antiquity, they have but followed a natural impulse, when they have used "dictionary" for "word-book," "science" for "knowledge," "fraternal" for "brotherly," "maternal" for "motherly," "paternal" for "fatherly," "felicity" for "happiness," and so on, to an extent which may be already counted by tens of thousands, and which is constantly increasing.

If now, from a review of the whole subject, the question be asked, What are the main elements of the English language? the answer will be obvious. There are, indeed, as we have seen, a few old Celtic words, which have come down to us directly from the ancient Britons. Among the thousands of words, also, that have come to us from France, Spain, and perhaps Italy, there are doubtless some few of Celtic origin, because the original population of all those countries was Celtic, before they were overrun by the Romans. We have also a few Scandinavian words, introduced by the Danes during their invasions of England in the ninth and tenth centuries, such as, bait, brag, dish, dock, doze, dwell, flimsey, fling, gust, ransack, rap, whim, &c. There are too, without doubt, not a few Scandinavian words brought by the Northmen into France, and thence by their descendants, the Normans, into England, after the Conquest. We have also, as every nation has, occasional words, derived from every country, no matter how remote, with which we have commercial intercourse, or with whose literature our scholars have been conversant. Thus, we have tariff from Tarifa, a town on the Mediterranean, where import duties were once levied; tamarind, from Heb. tamar and *ind-us*; damask, damascene, and damson, from Damascus; spaniel, from Hispaniola; ratan, bantam, and sago, Malay words; taboo, Hawaiian; algebra, almanac, alchemy, chemistry, talisman, zero, zenith, coffee, sugar, syrup, sofa, mattress, from the Arabic; caravan, dervish, scarlet, azure, lilac, from the Persian; gong, nankin, from China; muslin, chintz, and calico, from India.

But all these together are few and inconsiderable, in comparison with the whole number of our words, and they do not affect the organic character of the language. The overwhelm-

ing majority of our words are still of two classes. They are either Saxon or Latin. These are the two main elements which constitute the language.

No mention has been made thus far of Greek words, of which we have a large number in the language. The omission has been intentional, and for the purpose of simplifying the historical survey of the subject. The Greek language is so nearly allied to the Latin, that in a discussion like this, they may be considered as one. It is only necessary to remark, that very few Greek words have been introduced by mixture of race, or by commercial intercourse. The Greek words which we have, were introduced almost entirely by scholars and books. Nearly all of them are scientific terms. Indeed, nine-tenths of all the scientific terms that we have, are Greek.

Of the relative numbers of these two classes of words, Saxon and Latin, it is impossible to speak with certainty. If we exclude all compound and obsolete words, and all purely scientific and technical words, the ratio of Anglo-Saxon words to the whole body of words in the language, would probably be about six-tenths, or 60 per cent. If we examine, however, the page of any ordinary English book, the Saxon words will be found to bear a much larger preponderance than this. One reason is, that all the small connecting words, the articles, pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and most of the adverbs, are Saxon. These small words occur at least ten times as often as any other class of words in the language. For example, "wickedness," which is Saxon, may not occur more frequently perhaps, than "malice," which is Latin. But "the," "and," "but," "if," &c., will be found a hundred times, where either "wickedness" or "malice" will be found once. Again, some writers are noted for their partiality to the Latin vocables, others for their partiality to the Saxon. But, taking the average of different writers, and excluding works of science, in which sometimes the words are almost entirely Latin and Greek, we suppose that the Saxon words on any page of ordinary English will be found to be nearly nine-tenths of the whole number.

The Latin words that have found their way into the Eng-

lish may be again subdivided into two well-defined classes, viz., those that have come to us by national intercourse and admixture, and those that have come through learned men and education. The former have come to us indirectly, from languages that are not pure Latin, but are the modern representatives and descendants of that tongue, viz., the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian. The others have come directly from the fountain head, the Latin itself. Words of the former class are all more or less corrupted, either in those modern languages in which the English found them, or in the transition from those languages into the English. Words of the latter class, taken from the Latin directly, are changed very little, or not at all.

The difference between these two classes can be best illustrated by a few examples. It exists mainly in the stem, or root of the word. Both classes are obliged to conform to the English idiom as to the termination. But in the stem, while those coming from the Latin directly are almost without change, those from the other languages, particularly those from the French, are almost invariably changed in the spelling. Thus :

Latin Stems.	Words coming from the Latin directly.	Words coming from the French, or some other modern descendant of the Latin.
Curs-us,	curs-ive,	course.
Cur(r)o,	cur(r)ent,	cour-ier.
Reg-is,	reg-al,	roy-al.
Fruct-us,	fruct-ify,	fruit.
Fragil-is,	fragil-e,	frail.
Pung-ens,	pung-ent,	poignant.
Punct-um,	punct-ual,	point.
Recept-um,	recept-acle,	receipt.
Decept-um,	decept-ion,	deceit.
Diurn-us,	diurn-al,	journ-al.

It is a common opinion, that the language has deteriorated in consequence of this multitude of foreign admixtures. Some purists have gone so far as to recommend an entire disuse of words of Latin origin,—to put upon them the ban of public odium, to stigmatize them as foreigners and intruders. It

cannot be doubted, indeed, that many writers have been beguiled into an excess in their partiality for the Latin vocables.

Dr. Johnson was a great sinner in this line. "Our Father, who art in heaven," translated into Johnsonese, would read on this wise, "Parent Divine, who existed in the celestial regions"! "If a body kiss a body, need a body cry," is a piece of as good English as was ever written. Turned into Johnsonese, it would run somewhat on this wise: "On the supposition that an individual salutes an individual, does an individual lie under an obligation to exclaim in a vehement and plaintive voice"? A boy in an English charity-school was once asked, "what king David did, when the servants told him that his child was dead?" "Please, sir, he cleaned himself and took to his victuals." The admirers of the high-polite style would be quite shocked at such home-spun talk, and would array the matter thus: "What course of action did king David pursue when he received intelligence of the demise of the infant? Answer, He performed his ablutions, and immediately proceeded to partake of refreshments."

Perhaps the happiest hit upon this style, is the imitation of Dr. Johnson in the Rejected Addresses. A single paragraph will give an idea of the performance.

"Professions lavishly effused and parsimoniously verified are alike inconsistent with the precepts of innate rectitude and the practice of internal policy; let it not then be conjectured, that because we are unassuming, we are imbecile; that forbearance is any indication of despondency, or humility of demerit. He that is the most assured of success will make the fewest appeals to favour, and where nothing is claimed that is undue, nothing that is due will be withheld. A swelling opening is too often succeeded by an insignificant conclusion. Parturient mountains have ere now produced muscipular abortions; and the auditor who compares incipient grandeur with final vulgarity is reminded of the pious hawkers of Constantinople, who solemnly perambulate her streets, exclaiming, 'In the name of the Prophet,—figs!'"

But among our great authors Dr. Johnson is not the only sinner in this respect. Gibbon, for instance, is quite his

equal. No book in the language is more free from this Latinism, or is in purer English in all respects, than the English Bible. The writers who come nearest to the Bible, in the purity of their English, are Shakespeare and Bunyan. Next to these, we suppose, is Addison. Poetry uniformly is freer from Latinism than prose is.

That part of the domain of English letters in which words of classical origin most abound, is in the field of science. With the exception of a few Arabic terms, almost our entire scientific nomenclature is derived from the Latin and Greek, particularly the latter. Not less than nine-tenths of our scientific terms are Greek. Medicine, geology, mineralogy, grammar, logic, mathematics, physics, and metaphysics, are all in a state of utter dependence upon languages with which none but the learned are familiar. This has been undoubtedly a hindrance to the communication of knowledge. To any one acquainted with the Greek and Latin, the terms used in the different sciences almost of themselves describe the objects to which they are applied, without further study. If now these terms, instead of being taken from a dead language, had been drawn from the resources of the mother tongue, the very structure of the word would show its meaning even to the unlettered, and with the meaning of the word would be conveyed a knowledge of the thing.

When, for instance, the anatomist speaks of the "systole" and "diastole" of the heart, he talks Greek. He must consequently explain himself. He must give in different words a description of the thing meant, and after you have learned from these other sources the nature of the subject, you infer vaguely what must be the meaning of the words. Now, suppose the anatomist had been called to explain the same point to a native Greek. The words themselves would have conveyed the idea which is meant, and nothing more would have been necessary to convey this idea, even to an unlettered man, than a mere enunciation of the terms. To a native Greek, systole and diastole, apogee and perigee, hydraulics, hydromatics, clepsydra, creosote, isomeric, isomorphic, metamorphic, and all the other thousands upon thousands of scientific terms, which so puzzle the mere English student, are just as intelligible

and expressive in themselves, as to the native Englishmen are our homespun compounds, inkstand, penhandle, moonlight, notebook, sunrise, woodland, hilltop, cornfield, snowflake, pitchfork, daylight, forenoon, afternoon, and so on, to any extent. We cannot doubt, therefore, that if the terms of science had been, from the first, and throughout, carefully elaborated out of our own native materials, the difficulties in the communication of science would have been much lessened.

The actual number of foreign words in the language, great as this may be, is not the worst feature of the case. A still greater evil is the national tendency to adopt others as fast as they are wanted, without reluctance, and apparently without limit, instead of producing them by a process of home-manufacture. In some languages there appears to be a perfect reliance upon their own resources for the expression of new ideas. Whenever, in the progress of the arts, or in the wide ranges of human thought, it becomes necessary to employ some new words for the expression of some new shade of meaning, it is always done in such languages by some new combination or fresh moulding of the materials already existing. Such a process begets a habit, and with the habit a facility, in the formation of compound and derivative words, that in the end render a language in the highest degree flexible and expressive. Such is the truly infinite power of combination in a language so formed, that it is impossible to conceive an idea which the language does not furnish within itself the means of completely expressing. But, how different is this from the condition of the English. Every new fashion from the French milliners, every new dish from the French cooks, every new dancing woman from the French stage, every new singer or fiddler from the Italian opera, every discovery in science, every invention in art, even too often the arts, and wants, and inventions that spring up indigenously among ourselves, have to be made known to the public under some foreign term. Such is the fashion, and fashion in language, as in most things, is supreme. Even Morse must needs call his far-off-writer a telegraph, and Webster himself, our great lexicographer, with all his temerity, had not the courage to call his Dictionary a Word-Book.

How different have been the fortunes of the English from those of the German. These two languages, in the beginning of the race, started even. They were both of the same common stock. Their parents, the old Saxon, and the old German, have a common ancestor in the venerable Gothic. Cradled in the impenetrable forests of the elder Europe, they were, in the fifth century, in the same incipient formative condition. The German, hemmed in on all sides, but not invaded, was led by circumstances to draw upon its own resources for the invention of new terms to express the new ideas which became evolved in the onward progress of civilization. Hence has resulted a language capable of expressing, by combinations of its own native words, every shade of meaning required even by the teeming brains of that nation of students—a language uniting infinite diversity of forms with entire simplicity of materials. How different the English!—a conglomerate of materials from a dozen different sources; affluent, indeed, almost beyond comparison, in its multiplicity of words, but wanting in that noble simplicity which might have been the result of a different course of political events.

But let us not be among the croakers. Bad as the case is, it is not entirely hopeless. There are in various quarters, symptoms of a growing partiality for words of native stock. Besides this, the very evil complained of is not without compensating advantages. One advantage of this facility with which we borrow foreign words, is that we have thereby become, beyond all nations, rich in synonyms. For the same idea, in almost numberless instances, we have two, and sometimes even three terms, exactly equivalent and equally legitimate. This is a decided advantage, saving oftentimes tiresome and inelegant repetitions. The writer who has tired his readers with the term “native language,” may take refuge, as in this article we have had frequent occasion to do, in the “mother tongue.” The idea is kept up, but the tautology is spared. Moreover, it frequently happens in these cases, that of two words of different origin, used to express the same general idea, the one has acquired by usage a slight shade of meaning different from the other, so delicate and evanescent as scarcely to be defined, and yet perceptible to a cultivated taste,



and beautiful in proportion to its delicacy. How logically the same, for instance, and yet how different to the loving heart, are the words "maternal" and "motherly." It was his skill in availing himself of this peculiarity of the language, that among other things enabled our own Washington Irving to express with such marvellous exactness the endlessly varying shades of human thought and feeling—that enabled him to pass from the grave to the gay, from the didactic to the playful, from the humorous to the sublime, with an ease that seems only equalled by the movements of the mind itself.

Far be it from us then to join the ranks of those who would dismiss with a rude rebuff these Latin-English intruders. They are now here. They form a large and valuable element of our language. They are a part of our national wealth, and they should be cherished and protected accordingly. All we would ask, is to protest against the unnecessary introduction of more, and to insist upon making the native element of the language a subject of more distinct attention than it has hitherto received in our schemes of education.

---

ART. II.—*Report on the Prisons and Reformatories of the United States and Canada*, made to the Legislature of New York, January, 1867. By E. C. WINES, D. D., LL.D., and THEODORE W. DWIGHT, LL.D., Commissioners of the Prison Association of New York.

THE administration of penal justice is a department in social science, attractive to the jurist, the statesman, the philanthropist, and the Christian. The science of punishment opens a field as broad as the domains of virtue and vice, for it affects the whole human race. It affects the right of property, the sacredness of human life, public tranquillity and public morals. The supreme aim of public punishment being the prevention of crime, it is apparent that the well-being of society—the peace and order of states and nations—indeed the moral and political character of the world, are intimately connected with the sys-