

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

others method may be beneficial to both sides. If this Article shall exert any favorable influence toward that result, it will be greatly due, as we take pleasure here and elsewhere in recording, to the truly Christian courtesy, both in matter and manner, with which the present writer has repeatedly been editorially invited to furnish it for these pages. We are happy to acknowledge the eminent style of piety often attained under the teachings of Calvinism. We place very high in the calendar of true Christian saintship the names of a Calvin, a Baxter, an Edwards, and a Payson. Candid Calvinists will place in the same rank the names of Arminius, Henry More, Fletcher of Madely, and Francis Asbury.

ARTICLE II.

ENGLISH ETYMOLOGY, AS ADAPTED TO POPULAR USE: ITS LEADING FACTS AND PRINCIPLES.

WITH A BRIEF SYNOPSIS OF ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES.

BY BENJAMIN W. DWIGHT, LL.D., CLINTON, N. Y.

THERE is a great neglected science of etymology, awaiting the day of thorough exploration; when, under the skilful hands of those who shall gather together its blocks of quarried marble, from out of the rubbish amid which they now lie confused, it shall rise as if by magic into a grand structure of columnar and turreted beauty, to be the joy of every eye that shall gaze upon it. English, as now used, is, in the comprehension of even our educated men generally, but a mass of opaque arbitrary conventionalisms; utterly destitute of any of those pictorial elements, which belong to language in its own true living forms. Modern words accordingly which once were in themselves veritable thought-pictures, are now without coloring to most eyes, and are but mere skeleton-drawings, instead of being life-like sketches of the things which they represent.

Multitudes, from mere idle ignorance, imagine that etymology is foredoomed in its very elements and essence to be, at the best, but a mass of elegant vagaries and fancied surprises; and that anything beyond the range, where the testimony of the eye or of the ear is decisive in its favor, must be all a matter of uncertain guess-work. But truth has here, as elsewhere, a deeper significance than any of its mere superficial aspects would indicate.

As chemistry is not only a beautiful science by itself, but pours wonderful light also on geology, natural philosophy, and almost all the practical arts of life, — so, etymology, by its analyses and syntheses and its manifold beautiful evolution of the ideas enwrapped in words, as their very substance, gives large illumination, both in its exact definitions and in the elementary ideas still treasured in its brief expressive symbols, to the truths of theology, metaphysics, history and social experience, as well as to all the debatable elements of human inquiry and of human progress.

It is often said with truth that "ideas rule the world," as also that men generally act to a surprising degree on the greatest questions of duty and interest, according to mere theory; but might it not be declared also quite as positively, that mere words themselves after all rule mankind? The widely expanded and ever newly expanding power of a mistake contained in the single word of some creed or dogma or dictum, is certainly one of the greatest of all marvels in the history of human opinions. Words acquire by long use a potency that is almost inexplicable, and retain their hold, as descriptive of human rights in law or of human interests in religion, upon the minds of generations that have long ceased to use them, in the ordinary currency of social intercourse. Thus words come to be regarded as sacred in themselves, when their function for the ordinary purposes of life has ceased. What scholar does not for this reason feel that, however much he may himself desire it, or however great the boon would be to the mass of thoughtful Christian readers, there cannot be attempted with success, for the present at least, any new translation

of the scriptures into our language. And so, who can justly expect that the advancing light of human faith will suffice, for a long time in the future, to expel from the church any of the set phrases, so valued now for their antiquity, that have been used for ages in describing the great doctrines of revelation, however imperfect may have been the vision, at so much earlier a period, of those who contrived them; or however hastily or selfishly dogmatical¹ their spirit. Many of the greatest differences, controversies, and litigations of the world have been mere wars of words. Indeed, while the question is not yet settled, and is not likely soon to be to universal satisfaction, whether men always by necessity think in words, or can and do think without them,—it is manifest enough that words mean things, to such a degree that most persons accept them as such. The remark of Farrar, a recent English writer on “the origin of language,” is as beautiful as it is true: “When two men converse, their words are but an instrument; the speaker is descending from thoughts to words, the listener rising from words to thoughts.” Whewell also, in his “History of the Inductive Sciences,” well observes that “language is not only the instrument of thought, but also the nutriment of thought.” Whoever accordingly succeeds in turning attention to the concealed riches embosomed in the study of words; and so, much more, any one who carefully explores himself its mines of wonder, and furnishes to others the results of his researches in all their varied utility and beauty, is so far a benefactor to the great community of thoughtful minds; as, in enlarging to any one the means for greater facility and power of expression, he adds so much stimulus and strength to the exercise and habit of thinking itself.

¹ Of how many of the foistings of human arrogance, or at least of human weakness, into the pure text of Christian doctrine, as furnished from above, must something very similar be said, if the truth were told just as it is, to what Alford so justly says of the Received Text of the Greek Testament, which is that of the second Elzevir edition, founded on the third edition of Robert Stephens, which was itself founded on the fifth edition of Erasmus. “Erasmus,” he says, “besides committing numerous inaccuracies, tampered with the readings of the very few manuscripts which he collected; and Stephens’s work appears to have been done with levity and carelessness.”

The main object in this Article is to show most conspicuously the hither or English side of English etymology as such, rather than the thither or classical side: with the hope that some may thus come to see in a new light the lexical wealth of our mother-tongue and be allured to enter with gladness upon the wide and inviting field of study here opened before them.

The ideas which we would detail to the reader on this subject are expressed in the following analysis:

I. Some of the applications of general philology to the study of English etymology.

II. First principles and facts of leading interest, in the study of words themselves.

III. Specific facts particularizing English etymology as such.

What then are:

I. The applications of general philology to English etymology.

1st. The English is one of the Teutonic family of the Indo-European languages. Of this branch of languages, which is large and noble both in itself and in its varied literature, Danish, Dutch, German and English, — as the spirit of art is the all-animating genius of the Greek and that of law, authority and mechanism pervades the Latin as its inward life, — the one great ever-present element of its distinctive vitality is the spirit of individual freedom, in the language itself, as in the hearts of those who speak it.

2d. Grammatical identity is the basis of all linguistic analysis. According to their grammar, which is in fact their inward osseous structure, all languages are readily classified into distinct determinate families. The English is very largely Latin in its vocabulary, but not at all in its grammar. Its outward order of architecture is therefore wholly German, although its inward furnishings are of various sorts besides German, although chiefly Latin.

3d. The earlier grammatical elements of lingual structure and development were more numerous and minute than in the later derived languages. The tendency in the onward

progression of lingual forms is always from the complicated to the simple. The style of changes that language has undergone from the past to the present, will be understood at a glance by the statement of the mutual alternation of its two great elements in the ancient and recent forms of language. Anciently, grammar was rich in forms, and lexicography poor; while recently grammar is poor in them and lexicography rich, not only in respect to the absolute volume of its vocabulary, but also in its multiplied resources for expressing the most minute and subtle relations and articulations of thought.

4th. Indo-European philology is in itself a system of high philosophical verbal analysis; and its relations as such to English are as definite and practical in their results as those of chemical analysis to the forms of vegetable and animal life or those of mathematical analysis to the abstractions of arithmetic or geometry. But in English that analysis is applicable rather to derivation chiefly, than, as in the classical languages, to inward structure also. The genetic rather than the progressive and pathological history of forms is here the one chief element of etymological interest; and phonology which is so large a solvent of difficulties in the ancient languages, has here far less scope and function, and cannot be reduced to any scientific treatment by itself on account of its small action on the language in any determinate manner. No such analysis for example can be traced in English as in the verb-forms of Greek and Latin: as

	Augment.	Verb- Stem.	Tense- Charac- teristic.	Mood- Vowel.	Person- Ending.	Union- Vowel.	Voice (Passive)
Greek,	ε	βουλευ	σ	a	ντ		ο
Latin,		ama	ba		nt	u	r .

The separate elements of original grammatical forms have been wonderfully borne away in English. In the person-endings of verbs, the obliteration of the primordial elements of verbal declension, mi, si, ti, mus, tis, nti (I, thou, he, etc.), is very marked. In Greek we find them with few changes variously defined in the verbs ending in -ω and -μι

alike and in both the present and preterite tenses, and especially of the passive voice; and in Latin they appear with wonderful distinctness, especially in the imperfect tenses. But how greatly have they disappeared in German and English! The only remaining traces left of them in English occur in the endings of the second and third persons singular of verbs in which the original endings *si* and *ti* have become *st* and *th*, as in the forms, thou lovest, he loveth. The ending *th*, of the third person, has become also interchangeably *s*, in more recent use; as in the double forms, new and old, of the third person present active of all verbs, as doth and does, loveth and loves; which change of *th* to *s* is like that of the change of the ending *τι* to *σι* in the third pers. sing. present of verbs in *-μι*. Thus *δίδωσι* is for the earlier form *δίδωτι*, he gives. So too in the possessive case, the only one of the separate original eight cases of the noun which is found in English, and the most important case-form in itself of any language, we have in the case-sign *s* not only a genuine, but also a beautiful, relic of the same characteristic mark of the genitive in the ancient classical languages. The suffix *s* in the word friend's, possessive case of friend, is exactly the same as in the corresponding genitive form *Freundes* in German, or as in the genitive *σοφίας* of Greek and *sermo-n-is* of Latin. There is moreover no such apparatus of tense-systems outwardly, as there is no such genius for tense-organism inwardly, in any of the modern languages as in the ancient; although in the French and Spanish, auxiliaries are used much less than in German and English; and in respect to verb-forms as to person-endings, these languages are constructed very obviously after the fixed models of their parent Latin tongue. In English, as we have abandoned separate case-forms, for prepositions, so have we separate tense-forms also, for auxiliary verbs. Contingent and conceptional ideas, or the forms of subjunctive modality are expressed in English by an abundant variety of conjunctions, and therefore with great versatility and exactness compared with the system of distinct moods for their expression, as in Greek and Latin.

5th. The graphic symbols of all languages are in every case of one common Phœnician origin. The first step in the evolution of alphabetic characters was that simple step, which so many rude tribes in all ages have taken, but have never left behind them, for one above it: that of a picture in outline, more or less exact in itself, and more or less filled up in detail, by different people according to the breadth and strength of their ideas. The next step onward towards the invention of the alphabet was that of shortening-in the picture, so as to make it in effect but an abbreviated symbol, rather than as at first a pictorial image. Thus the Hebrew, or rather Phœnician, א, aleph, which means an ox, is a symbol of that animal; in which we have certainly, besides the merit of brevity and simplicity, an ingenious combination of the horns of the animal with the plane of his structure, and, that according to his general habit when erect, prone towards the ground. So in the letter ב, beth, a house, we have the most compact possible symbol of a house, containing the four elementary ideas of it, as a piece of architecture: a base, an upright support, a covering, and an entrance within. The same analysis might be applied to each of the letters of the Phœnician alphabet, seriatim. The last and successful step in the invention of alphabetic letters, and in itself the greatest stride of all towards the consummation of this greatest of all human inventions, was that of making the abbreviated symbol when obtained, representative, not of the material objects themselves for which they were at first designed, as a sort of system of short-hand pictures, but of the individual sounds and letters used to denote them.

II. First principles, and facts of leading interest, in the study of words themselves.

1st. Words are in no language in any case, however strong the seeming, mere arbitrary symbols of thought.

There is no real contingency in matters of human speech, any more than anywhere else in the wide realm of causation divine or human; but only what is apparently such, from our ignorance of instrumental causes; as we speak of apparent motion, in common parlance as real, respecting

the heavenly bodies. Each word has had not only a distinct designed origination somewhere in the past, but also a sufficient reason for it, in some specific use that it was to answer: as truly as each one of the various dramatis personae of a tragedy is purposely introduced, for the sake of the part that he is to fill in the development of the grand whole; or, as every portion of a complicated machine answers some intended service, in the production of the final result, for which it is all employed. The tendency is in practice indeed uniform, if not resistless, for words to become altogether conventional and mechanical, in their general use. Language is in itself an imitative art and goes down by as necessary laws of sequence and inheritance from one generation to another, as men themselves; and mankind generally, moreover, are far more interested in results than in processes; or, in utilities and practicalities, than in the philosophy of them.

2d. A given part of every word, variously called its root, stem, base, or crude form, contains all its absolute sense as such; and whatever other accretions are formed upon it, in the shape of prefixes or suffixes, have come there, as a purposed increase or modification of that fixed signification. Such after-growths upon the simple elementary constitution of words are not parasitical or accidental, but are the determinate results of determinate wants, in their use and growth.

3d. Mutilations of original word-forms are to be everywhere expected, if not indeed assumed as an almost historical necessity, in the transmigrations of words from age to age and from one language to another. The wear of time shows itself on words as on things; and there is besides an ever-present tendency in all departments of human experience to take the shortest route to any desired result, and in every way possible to save needless labor.

4th. Each word, in order to be put in its right etymological attitude, must be set in full correlation with other cognate words, not only in the same language but also in the various kindred languages.

The almost universal instinct of biographers to place the subjects of their sketches amid those family surroundings, as in a clear harmonious setting for the better display of their characters and fortunes, under the influence of which they became what they really were, is both practically and philosophically a true one. Each individual man is stamped, inwardly as well as outwardly, with strong hereditary aspects; but the same energetic interplay of determinate influences from one class, family or generation of words upon another, is apparent as among the different tribes and families of men. Words must be studied in their many correlations like the scattered facts and elements of any of the natural sciences, or the mutually connected doctrines of theology, or the several parts of a deep-sounding harmony. They are thus correlated, not only in one language compared with another, but in each separate language also by itself; so that they not only grow in clusters from one parent stem; but also, as often in nature, growths of the most opposite character are frequently found united in a common vitality. Words fix themselves in constellated groups, like the stars themselves: they shoot out from a common centre, like crystals overlying each other and reflecting light one to the other in endless beauty: they grow in masses like trees in the forest, and greatly affect by their height and breadth each others progressive fulness.

5th. The etymology of a word decides its real radical signification, as an absolute historical fact. Specific *usus loquendi* is indeed the proper rule for the interpretation of given words and phrases; but that "usus loquendi" is itself amenable to definite canons of verbal criticism, in the form of clear decisive etymological facts and principles. While there is but little opportunity for improving the spelling of our words; and while, whatever alterations may be made, should be those, for etymological reasons, involving as close a return as possible to original forms, instead of any such iconoclastic processes as Webster sought to initiate,—there is abundant scope for a large reformatory improvement of the natural derivations, and consequent natural definitions of words in English lexicography.

6th. No two separate words, whether from the same or different roots, however alike in their general sense, or in any of their specific uses, are yet precisely alike in their entire signification; so that one can be substituted in each and every case for the other. From this remark some half dozen technical words, like dictionary and lexicon, circumlocution and periphrasis, which, one from the Latin and the other from the Greek, have come in scholarly usage to be interchanged one with the other, must be excepted. The statement made however, with these exceptions, is as true as it is sweeping, and can be verified to any extent whatever, at one's leisure, of mingled conviction and humor.¹

As our language is, in its very elementary constitution, the full round blended union of two wholly distinct hemispheres of lingual development, Anglo-Saxon and Norman Latin; many synonyms occur in it, from the self-retentive power or tenacity of life possessed by great numbers of kindred words, in each of the component languages. They are such as hate and despise, liberty and freedom, love and charity, understanding and intelligence, strength and power; and they serve greatly to enrich our facilities for varied and precise expression. So also in some cases we obtain through the French and Latin two separate adjectives, synonymous in their origin and fundamental sense; but descriptive in particular, one of the inward or subjective relations of the word, and the other of its outward objective or formal aspects: as from the Lat. *lex*, Fr. *loi*, the words *legal* and *loyal*, and from Lat. *rex*, Fr. *roi*, *regal* and *royal*.

7th. The same word will readily take upon itself different variations and shades of its fundamental meaning, according to the different classes of minds that use it, or the different ages or periods of civilization in which it is found in common use. As the human face and form, while in their

¹ The author would suggest, for the reader's self-amusement in such a way, the following synonyms as specimens: see and perceive; think and reflect; know and understand; seize and grasp; give and bestow; escape and run away; sick and diseased; speak and talk; change and alter.

great aspects always grandly human, are yet so impressible to climatic, local and personal influences as to be able to bear, at one and the same time with their proper generic qualities, all the specific diversities of national, family and individual characteristics; or, still again, as the hard bony skull indeed accommodates itself to the size and growth of the soft brain within, — so, language, although fixed and rigid in its forms, yet agrees in its outward capacities of sense and use, with the wants of the ever growing public mind that works consciously and actively within its living bands.

8th. As different words are often alike in outward form, a supposed identity of derivation may be arrived at by a guess, which is yet utterly unsubstantial. This style of etymologizing has been much practised by random strollers in the field of etymology, who have thereby brought the real truths and riches of this great but yet undeveloped science into much disfavor. A seeming resemblance of bases, however minute, is not enough to establish an actual derivation or correspondence. Phonetic analogies and discordances make strongly for or against alleged connections of words. Minor correspondences also in specific derived forms from the same base are greatly helpful to the same result; and, in the case of English words derived from the Latin, much determinate light is often obtainable from intermediate forms in the other modern tongues.

9th. Some words in every language, and they are absolutely if not relatively many, cannot be traced to any satisfactory derivation.

They are isolated in their own existence, without any of those accompaniments of connected forms which enable one to resolve them satisfactorily to their primal condition. The wonder is, not that they are so many but so few; when we remember, that no one, of all the millions that have used these words in the past, has had any direct purpose to preserve them or their history for critical inspection. Literature however conveyed from one generation to another, and particularly the printed page, have been the great preservers of words, especially as used by the more educated and con-

siderate minds of the day. But on how few words, since the common affairs of life come so little within the pale of literary art or endeavor, has their preserving power been exerted in the ancient languages. Exact criticism and careful scholarship have passed very few of the world's mental products in the past through their scales and under their measuring-rod to our eyes.

10th. Words are always by necessity as such retrospective in their bearings, and conservative of the results and influences of the past; instead of being anticipative or prospective in their signification.

They are not in themselves prophetic but historical. They are the coins used in the exchange of preceding generations; representative of what has been, instead of what is agoing to be; and, as the human mind grows from age to age and human wants multiply, they must yield to the strain of new uses; or, rather, like the skin which expands or contracts according to the fulness or leanness of the body which it covers, language is in itself elastic, and dilates or contracts in the dimensions of its use and sense, just as necessity requires.

11th. As the senses are the inlets of knowledge, and sensation is preliminary to speculation, and the physical always anticipates the intellectual and the spiritual, in the order of development, — so, all those words, which form in fact the great mass of language, that describe the estimates, wants, acts and states of the human mind, are in themselves figurative and pictorial in their sense. Language therefore, which to us moderns appears at first sight so unadorned, and indeed quite arbitrary in its elements, is yet full of concealed and also partially obliterated pictures. It is, in other words, metaphorical and so, poetical, to a vastly greater extent than it is philosophical in its elements; which yet is now its more leading form of manifestation.

12th. As words are the symbols of things, and things themselves are full of multiform analogies; so, the words that represent them are and must be full of irrepressible tendencies to the expression of analogical ideas and im-

pressions. The ultimate words accordingly of a language have a sort of ganglionic vitality and value in them, and show at every point an ever active tendency to burst forth into continually new forms of life.

And the same word also, in instances almost without number, shows in itself a ready convertibility to a great number of secondary related senses.

13th. Words, like vegetable and animal organisms, are in perpetual processes of change, or, of growth and decadence.

Words pine away and die as truly as men themselves or books. Many whole languages have disappeared in other days, as in every language many words are perpetually losing their vitality, like Autumn leaves that have fulfilled their use, and when their occupation is gone drop useless to the ground themselves. The greatest preservative antiseptic influence that can be secured for a word is its use in works of standard literature.

14th. Great, silent yet determinative laws of criticism and so, of general acceptance or condemnation, are ever at work upon words, deciding their position among mankind at large; as if before a court without any appeal.

Their action is certain, although undefinable to our vision, like the seemingly blind laws of the weather; which yet, however multiplied in their sources or subtle in their action, rule infallibly not only the questions of human labor and of human harvests, but also to a great extent those of human health, power, and enjoyment.

15th. As the spelling of words is manifestly designed to represent to the eye their real sound to the ear; the number of silent letters in the present forms of any language is a striking index of the greatness of the changes wrought upon the substance and volume of those forms by time.

16th. The osseous fabric or elementary structure of words consists in their consonantal parts; and the vowels are but the needful filling-up of their framework. Changes and obliterations in the vowel-elements of words are therefore much more frequent than in the consonantal.

17th. The revealing power of language, as a sure medium of historical interpretation, is one of its most striking peculiarities. We see plainly each nation as it is, for aim and effort, for spirit and achievement, for power and progress, in the intellectual rush or tramp or pace of its words and phrases, as well as each different age in every nation, according to its varying moods of energy and aspiration. The Greek is full of deep aesthetic elements, as were the people that spoke it; the Latin, of martial pomp and of the busy stir of active life; the French, of sprightly glancing turns of thought and of much sweet honied phrase; the German, of dreamy revery indeed, but also, and far more, of the rich and tender satisfactions of beauty; and the English, of all large full-freighted stores of free thought and divine truth, and of large sympathy with human rights and human interests.

18th. Climatic influences, direct and indirect, which are ever also at work in modifying more or less the living languages of the world, have very decisively modified all languages in the past; and more than now, as there was less social intercourse then, to make their forms of speech trite and fixed; and the influences of a more narrow and incomplete literature than ours were also less decisive in the same direction, in respect to both the phonetic and dynamic qualities of words. Even in the same language, at the same period of its development, whether early or late, physical individualities of soil, climate and occupation have always sufficed to distinguish, more or less distinctly, according to various geographical divisions, different dialects, one from the other. The impressibility of language to external influence of all kinds is one of its most remarkable facts; as well as its wonderful reflex power, in imagining to view the local and historical, as well as also both the inward and outward, peculiarities of those who speak it.

19th. Nowhere is the fact of an "imperium in imperio" more manifest than in language. Not only has every science, art, trade, and employment its own technics, inside of the general sweep and circuit of every language; but the

various circles of fashion have their different circulating media of words and phrases, down to the most unfashionable portions of society, whose slang language advertises their rudeness wherever they go. Thus scholars, lawyers, merchants, farmers, mechanics, miners, sailors, all have their own separate forms of speech.

There are also large sections of every language, from which no one man, in whatever employment, ever takes a word for use, any more than if it were an utterly foreign language; and even of the common stock of unprofessional words, which constitute the great average staple of any language, the difference of use among men, of the higher and lower forms is quite remarkable. As the poorer classes in society do not partake of the dainties of the market, and the world's rich garniture of fruits and flowers is practically not at all for them; so, they pass by unused, because unnecessary to them, all the higher and better portions of their mother-tongue.

20th. The facility and certainty with which words, having in themselves a broad capacity of sense, can be permanently specialized to a confined contracted use, is a very noticeable point in the natural history of words.

All technics, doctrinal, scientific, legal and professional, have been formed out of such material in such a way. As a few simple specimens from a great abundance of such a sort, take the following: a minister is in Latin (cf. minor and minimus) any servant, as deacon is in Greek (*διάκονος*); a presbyter (*πρεσβύτερος*) is literally an older person, as is also a senator (Lat. *senex*), and the ecclesiastical word elder (Germ. *älter* comp. of *alt* old, Lat. *altus*), and a priest is also etymologically but an elder, being but a contracted form of *πρεσβύτερος* (Germ. *Priester*, Fr. *prêtre*, originally *prestre*).

21st. Onomatopoeic words, or those that are formed in imitation of some sound or set of sounds in nature, occur in all languages and are quite as apt to be indigenous in them as to be derived.

They are of quite a variety of classes such as the follow-

ing: (1) Those indicating mere sound as such: as, in Latin, susurro to whisper; murmur, the noise of running water etc.: and in English, gobble, buzz, cackle, caw, quack, hum, hiss, growl. (2) Those indicating sudden or startling motion or excitement as, dash, flash, gash, gnash, rash, smash, splash; so, crack and crackle, hack and haggel, smack and whack and clasp, gasp, rasp. (3) Those descriptive of pain, as, groan, howl, shriek, scream, wail. (4) Those descriptive of a mixing-up of things together, to whatever sense the fact is addressed, as huddle, muddle, puddle, fuddle. (5) The nasal words, *nose, nasal, sneer, sneeze, snicker, snore, snout, snooze, snub, snivel, sniff, snuff.*

22d. The self-defining power of words in English is as remarkable, in the light of recent etymological research, and as useful, as in any of the more primitive languages. The amount of interest to be found, in the proper study of this element in Greek and Latin, is far beyond any general appreciation of it. Thus: *cash* (Fr. cacher to hide) was something hidden carefully from view when the word was first adopted for the thing. Cf. the word coffer, as in the phrase "the coffers of the rich" (Fr. coffre, Ital. cofano, Gr. *κόφινος* a box, Eng. coffin).

Sick (Lat. siccus, dry, thirsty) describes as no other one word could so well, the one almost universal symptom of all serious disease, undue heat or fever.

Pay (Lat. pacare to pacify, Span. pagar, Fr. payer) reminds us strongly of the urgency of men to have their debts or dues rendered to them; this is the only way to *satisfy* them the word says. *Hut* (Germ. hütte) and *hat* (Germ. hut) and *hide* (Ger. haut), all agree in the common idea of being a covering, and are all from one common root (Germ. hüten to cover, Gr. *κεύθειν* with which cf. *σκήτος* and *κύτος* and Lat. cutis). A *pearl* (Lat. pirula dim. of pirus, a pear) is a little pear in shape. *Fangs* and *fingers* are seizers (from Germ. fangen, fing, etc. to catch). A *hinge* (Germ. hangen, hing, etc. to hang) is a contrivance for hanging a door. A *hilt* of a sword, like a *halter* (from Germ. halten, hielt, etc. to hold) is a holding place as this is a

holding thing. A *fashion* (Lat. factio, from facio to do, Fr. façon) is the general way of doing things. *Treasure* (Fr. trésor, Lat. thesaurus, Gr. *θησαυρός*, from *τίθημι* to place aside and *αἶρον* gold), is wealth garnered for future use. A *garnet* is a shining *grain*, as *granate* is a rock full of grains and a *pome-granate* (pomum granatum) is an apple full of the same. Examples of such words in common use, that define themselves in their own etymology, might be endlessly multiplied. The foregoing have been selected for their commonness; with the design, that the implication which they bear with them should be seen and felt as real; — that, if such words carry their own sense distinctly within them, however latent at first sight to the common eye, so do, much more, most of those higher words, which pertain to the more important elements of human experience and the mutual intercourse of men.

23d. Words are in themselves the most permanent of all human records and relics.

Homer often calls words, and well, “winged words.” They are winged and, much as they fly through many storms and changes from one land and age to another, their wings are seldom much broken. As language is one of the chief imitative arts; and as the growth of the public mind of the world has been hitherto slow in the mass; and as reverence for the past is an instinct that nowhere, except in religious forms, has a stronger hold on mankind at large, than in respect to both words themselves and set forms of words also: it is manifest that we should naturally expect to find language a firm vehicle for the sure conveyance of ideas, traditions, laws, customs and historic facts and memorials unimpaired from one generation to another. Horace said rightly, as all time since has shown, of the power of his written verse to perpetuate his memory: “exegi monumentum aere perennius.” “I have wrought out a monument more lasting than brass.” What a petty fragment of all the glorious magnificence of Greece could we find anywhere in the world, if all the “in memoriam” records of the thoughts and deeds of her great men had perished from the eyes and hearts of mankind!

But such thoughts alone do not express the full scope of the general statement, which they are adduced to illustrate. It is also true, that, in the very fabric of a language itself, aside from any and all forms of literature inwrought into its substance, there is in the texture of its elements, as such, a wonderful self-perpetuated power of continued identity; preserving with itself all the influences stamped upon it, in whatever way, by the myriads that have breathed their thoughts and feelings through its manifold combinations.

24th. The true centre and pivot of all modern etymological research is the Latin language, which mediates, in its forms, between those of the more primitive languages and those of a recent date, which owe so much of their parentage directly to the Latin. In English especially is it necessary to make thorough scholarship in Latin etymology the preparation, for an adequate etymological handling of its forms.

III. Specific facts pertaining to English etymology, as such.

1st. Generally.

(1) English etymology is in itself, as such, a vast unity in diversity. Our language is indeed a conglomerate, but one of great firmness and of the finest possible working qualities, for all purposes of word-masonry and of word-ornamentation. No figure, however, drawn from mere inorganic matter will describe the inward characteristics of our mother-tongue, which is full of organic life and strength, quite individually its own. While the Teutonic and Latin elements greatly prevail over the rest, a number of other elements, in greater or less proportion, are connected with them in the same unique vital structure. Nor are the two cardinal elements of its composite unity, themselves of one single definite type. The Latin element, while it is often pure in its manifestation, is also often strongly Normanized; and sometimes it has besides a distinct Spanish or Italian modification; while the Teutonic element is sometimes thoroughly Saxon, or High German, and sometimes altogether Danish, Swedish, or Low Dutch.

But, however diversified in the various elements of its origination, there is in the very genius and vital force of the English language itself, as such, an ever-present, and an all active, assimilative energy at work, which binds them all into one grand comprehensive, thoroughly harmonized unity. In the wonderful energy of its self-assimilating action upon the materials of which it is composed, it shows, in the most conclusive of all ways, the reality and power of its own individuality as a language.

(2) In English, far more than in the three classical languages, Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, the facts and principles pertaining to both the genetic structure and pathological affections of words are much concealed beneath the surface. Euphonic changes and substitutions are of so infrequent occurrence, and have so little scope and definiteness as such, as not to be open to any thoroughly discriminative analysis.

(3) The English allows, in its present mature state of development, no license to the caprice or choice of individual minds, in the making of new words; or, in the putting of any new arbitrary senses upon old ones. An academy instituted here, as in France, with a sort of plenary power over the forms of the language, "to kill and to make alive" at their pleasure, would be regarded as an immense social absurdity.

(4) The English is, like the Latin and French languages, beyond all others ancient or modern, owing to the practical business habits of the people, addicted to abbreviations of its forms. In Greek and Latin, whatever abbreviations occur, are made by the actual rejection of different letters and syllables; but in English and French the letters themselves are retained, while their sounds are dismissed: the abbreviation made is orthoëpical only, instead of being also orthographical. Such almost sacred reverence had the Greeks for the original or normal forms of words, that, in making euphonic changes in them, which sometimes involved a contraction of their elements, they made them on such analogical principles or left such obvious traces purposely of the changes wrought, that neither an antiquary's tastes nor a

scholar's wants were left unsatisfied. But in Latin the contractions which abound in derived forms are not at all, as in Greek, self-announced. It is a matter often of much scholarly research to find and determine them. As to the multitude of orthoëpical contractions in French and English, one, who would deepen his sense of their number and greatness, can readily do so, by comparing the vast array of their silent letters with the full-volumed, vocal forms of the stately Spanish and the exact German. An iconoclastic spirit like Webster's, however narrow its range of operations, is quite foreign to the genius of all the etymological traditions of the language; and both will be resisted, and should be, in its attacks upon the time-honored forms of our words.

(5) The extent to which many Latin-English words have been unjointed from their original form, or *de-Latinized*, in coming to us through the French, Spanish, or other Romanic languages, is quite remarkable. Two or three examples must suffice. It is through the Spanish *jamon* (j being pronounced as h) that we get *ham*, from the Latin *gamba* a leg; while through the French *jambe*, from the same root, we get also the word *jamb*. Our word *ambassador*, which is thus rightly spelled (Mid. Lat. *ambasciator* from *ambascia*, entrusted business; derived from part. *ambactus*, with which cf. Germ. *ambacht*) is often wrongly spelled *embassador* as indeed Webster advocates that it should be, because of the kindred word, *embassy* (from the Spanish form, *embaxada*, which is special to itself). *Much* (Span. *mucho*) represents the Latin *multus*; *rent* (Fr. *rendre*) Lat. *reddo*; *dupe* (Fr. *duper*) Lat. *decipere* (cf. *dû*, owed, part of *devoir*, to owe from *debere*, and *duire* to suit, from *decere*); *beauty* (Fr. *beau* and *bel*) from Lat. *bellus* (dimin. of *bonus*, being contracted from *benulus*).

As many Latin words came into our language, as such, not by Roman or clerical but strictly Norman influence; it is natural that they should have some Norman mark upon them whose removal without damage, as a blemish, true scholarly taste would both sanction and demand

Thus who does not approve Webster's restoration of those pure Latin words in English, *honor, favor, labor*, etc., to their true form, by dropping out the *u*, which they used to have and have still in Walker, from the spelling of the equivalent French forms, *honneur, faveur*, etc. Of the same acceptable nature is the substitution of *s* for *c*, in the former mode of spelling such words, as *defense, offense, pretense*, all directly derived from Latin supines spelled with an *s*. Here obviously the original Latin should rule the orthography of the English, rather than the degenerate French form. But is not the change of *-tre* to *-ter*, in such words as *centre* (κέντρον), *lustre* (lustrum), *theatre* (θέατρον), utterly abnormal in itself and offensive to all true scholarly feeling, not to say conscience! Can the combined efforts of all the type-setters of our newspaper offices, although so pertinacious in the attempt, succeed in making this purposed abuse into a law? We trow not. And here a word concerning Webster: its etymology is, simply and plainly described, horrible; and of course its exegesis, or the whole department of its definition of words, both practical and philosophic, rests on no adequate basis in the words themselves. Unless it be utterly renovated, and that in the most radical and critical manner, it must fall dead by its own weight from the hands of the next generation of scholars.

2d. Particularly.

(1) Many English words are of the same identical origin, and so of the same fundamental sense, which yet present in themselves no such appearance of such a fact. Examples: § 1. *Day* and *diary* (Lat. dies) on the one hand, and on the other, *journal, journeyman, adjourn, sojourn* (Lat. diurnus, Mid. Lat. jornus, It. giorno, Fr. jour). § 2. *Captain* (Fr. capitaine) and *chief* (Fr. chef, cf. also *achever*, and Eng. *achieve*) are both from Lat. *caput*, the head; as from *capitulum* (a diminutive of *caput*) a small head, are our words *chapter* (Fr. chapitre) and *capitulate*; and from *capitalis* (pl. *capitalia*, principal forms of property) come our words *cattle* and *chattels*. § 3. *Aperture, aperient, and April* (the month of the earth's opening for new seed) are from

perio, to open, as is also *overt* and *overture* (Fr. ouvrir) and *open* (as well as the corresponding German *offen*).

4. *Propitious* (Lat. propitius), *propinquity* (propinquus), *property* and *propriety* (proprietas), *appropriate* (Mid. Lat. appropriare) all have their common root and idea in the word *prope*, near, near to or by, as have also the following words. *approach* (Mid. Lat. appropriare), *proximity* (sup. proximus for propsimus), *approximate*, *proxy*. § 5. From Lat. canna a reed (Gr. κάννα a reed) come *can*, *cane*, *canon*, *law* or *rule* (Gr. κανών, a straight rod), *cannon* (Fr. canon, It. cannone), *canal* and *channel* (Lat. canalis, Fr. chenal).

6. From Lat. spatula (dim. of spatha, Gr. σπάθη, any broad blade, from σπᾶω to draw out — from which come also spasm, spavin and spay — Germ. spatel, a spade, Fr. epaule and epaulette), come our words *spatula* (an anatom. term), *paddle*, *spade* and *epaulet*. § 7. From Lat. unus, archaic oinos (cf. Gr. εἷς for εἷς, one, οἶος alone and also οἶνος and οἶνη ace or dice), come *onion* (Fr. oignon Lat. unio), *one*, *union*, *unit*, *atone* (at-one), *alone* (Germ. allein, lit. all one), *lone*, *lonely*, *lonesome*. Other specimens of the same sort might be added to any degree desired.

(2) Many words contrarily which seem to be of the same origin, and are often regarded as such, are of a totally diverse etymology. To *count* is from Fr. compter, Lat. computare (Eng. compute); but the noun *counter* is from Lat. contra, over against, from which comes also *country* (cf. Germ. Gegend, the country, and gegen, over against, i. e. the eye). *Just*, righteous, is from justus, and *just*, now, is from juxta. *Toil*, a net (Lat. tela a web, Fr. toile and toilette, Eng. toilet) has nothing to do with *toil*, labor, which is a word of Saxon origin. *Chance* (Fr. chance, Lat. cadens) has nothing to do with *chancery* (Lat. cancellaria Fr. chancellerie). *Tempt* and *attempt* (Fr. tenter, Lat. tentare to try) are of a different origin from *contempt* (Lat. contemno, sup. contemptum). The same fact is still more striking in several composite words. Thus compare *surface* (super + facio) and *preface* (praefatio from for, to speak); *explain* (ex + planus) and *complain* (con + plango); *suffuse*

(subfundo) and *refuse* (recusare, Span. rehusar, Fr. refuser); *prize*, as a token of honor (pretium, from which also, precious, appreciate etc.) and *prize* as something taken in battle (Lat. prehendere Fr. prendre, part. pris, lit. taken, from which also enterprize, reprisal, prison and misprision). How different the origin of the same terminational forms often in English, as in the following specimens of *-able*: *agreeable* (Ital. aggradevole = ad + gratum + volo); *parable* (Gr. παραβολή = παρά + βάλλω); *syllable* (συλλαβή = σύν + λαμβάνω); and *able* (Fr. habile, Lat. habilis, from habeo). The termination *-gale* in *nightingale* has no relation to gale a breeze, but is from the Lat. gallus, a bird (cf. Germ. Nachtigall) and signifies a *night-bird*. In the word *humbeeb* the prefix "humble" is not our ordinary adjective so named, but the German Hummel, anglicized (from hummen to sing, Eng. hum).

From what a vast variety of sources comes the termination *-ay* in English. Thus *decay* is from Lat. decadere, Sp. decaer; *day* is from Lat. dies, Germ. tag; *fray*, Lat. fricare, Fr. frayer; *gay* Fr. gai (perhaps from Lat. gallus); *lay*, Lat. locare, Germ., legen; *pay* Lat. pacare, Span. pagar, Fr. payer; *ray*, Lat. radius, Fr. raie; *stay*, Gr. ἵστημι, Lat. sto, stare, Germ. stehen; *way*, Germ. weg, Lat. via, etc.

(3) Many instances occur in English of double forms of the same radical word as *blaspheme* (βλασφημέω, to speak reproachfully) and *blame* (Fr. blâmer, originally blasmer); *example* (Lat. exemplum) and *sample*; *paralysis* (παράλυσις) and *palsy*; *history* (ἱστορία) and *story* (It. storia); *fantasy* (φαντασία, from φαίνω to appear), and *fancy*; *thorough* and *through* (a shortened form); *costume* and *custom* (a shortened form of stem consuetudin), for the double sense of which two words compare for analogy the two corresponding senses of the word habit (from habeo, to have); *plane* and *plain* (Lat. planus, Fr. plain) — for the varying modes of spelling which words, compare the two derived forms of manus in our words *manage* (manus + ago) and *maintain* (manus + teneo) — the word *piano* (It. piano soft or smooth, Lat. planus) is also a third modern form of the same root;

secure (se without, cura, care) and *sure*; *state* (Lat. status) and *estate* (Fr. état for estat, Span. estado); *spy* (Lat. specio, (It. spiare) and *espy* (Span. espiar); *regulate* (Lat. regulus) and *rule*; *seek* (Lat. sequor, Germ. suchen) and *beseech*; *repel*, *repeal*, and *repulse* (Lat. repello); *truth* and *troth* as in betroth; *construe* and *construct*. The adjective and adverbial suffixes, -like and -ly (Germ. lich) are duplicates of each other as in godlike and godly (Germ. gottlich), -like being in imitation of the spelling, and -ly, of the pronunciation of the syllable. So *captive* (Lat. captivus) and *caitiff* (Fr. chétif) are the same word, one describing his relations to others, and the other, the results of the same; and so likewise with *debt* and *duty* (Lat. debere, Fr. devoir part. dû); *canvas* and *hemp* (Gr. κάνναβις, Lat. cannabis, Fr. chanvre, Germ. Hanf, Eng. hemp); *chance* (Lat. cadens) and *cadence*; *gelid* (Sansk. jalitas, Lat. gelidus, Germ. kalt) and *cold*; *tierce* (Lat. tertius, Fr. tiers and tierce) and *third* and *tier*. *Emir* (a Turkish prince) and *admiral* are the same word (from Mid. Lat. admiralus which was also variously admiraldus). *Provident* (Lat. providens) *prudent* (from prudens a contracted form of providens), *prude* (Fr. prude) and *proud* (Fr. prud' homme), are all the same word in varied degrees of more or less. So is it with *compute* and *count*; *propound*, *propose* and *purpose*; *plum* and *prune* (Lat. prunum, Fr. prune, Germ. Pflaume).

(4) Some words, especially when combining with others in composition, lose nearly or quite their entire radical substance. Thus *ink* is from Fr. encre (Lat. encaustum, lit. burned in, Gr. κάω fut. καύω, cf. Eng. caustic). In the word *ease* (Lat. otium, Fr. aise, glad or at my ease, from otiosus) not a letter remains of the original form. Who would at first thought imagine that *negotiate* (= nec + otium) was of the same direct origin? To *couch* is from collocare (It. colcar, Fr. coucher). *Sue* is from sequor, (Fr. suivre); *autumn* (Lat. auctumnus) is from augeo, to increase, *strange* is from extraneus (Gr. ἕκ, Lat. ex, extra, etc. Span. extraño, It. stranio); *hotel* is from Lat. hospitalis, Fr. hôtel, originally hostel; *island* (Lat. insula) is from in sale (Gr. ἐν

ἀλί). *Other* is from French *autre* (Lat. *alter* — comparative form of *alius* — from which come also directly *alter* and *alternate* in English). *Sir* is from Fr. *sieur*, Lat. *senior*. *Soda* is from Fr. *soude*, Lat. *solida* nom. pl. neut. of *solidus* (from which also come Eng. *solder* to make solid, and *soldier*, Fr. *soldat*, Lat. *solidum*, a gold coin and *solidarius* [Mid. Lat.], a soldier). So do words hang, often, by only one remaining letter to their original parent stem. The wonder is that their true primal forms are so little injured as they are.

(5) Metathesis occurs occasionally in English, as in the ancient languages. This change in the relative order of the radical letters of a word, sometimes originates in our language itself, and sometimes it is brought with the word from some other modern language; as, *palsy* from *paralysis*; *larceny* (Lat. *latrocinium*, Fr. *larcin*); *almond* (ἀμυγδάλη, It. *mandola*, Span. *almendra*, Fr. *amande*); *mercy* (Lat. *miseri-cordia*, Fr. *merci*); *treasure* (Gr. *θησαυρός*, Lat. *thesaurus*, Fr. *trésor*); *spoil* (Lat. *spolio*); *foil* a leaf (Lat. *folium*, Fr. *feuille*) and *trefoil* or *clover*, literally having three leaves (*tria folia*); *tool* (Lat. *utilis*, Fr. *outil*); *morning* (Germ. *morgen*).

(6) Quite a large number of English words are simply Latin, Greek, German, French and Spanish, or other words, as such: or with only such little change as shall just suffice to remove the gender-sign or declension-form that is added to the stem. Indeed there is quite a manifest tendency in the English to use, if not to demand, the unencumbered stems of words, beyond most of the languages lying historically between it and the Sanskrit. Observe the following specimens. § 1. From the Greek: *harp*, ἄρπη, a sickle; *ache*, ἄχος; *ball*, βάλλω, to cast; *basis*, βάσις; *bomb*, βόμβος, a whizzing sound; *idea*, ἰδέα, form, semblance; *idol*, εἶδωλον, an image; *coffin*, κόφινος; *panther*, πάνθηρ; *scope*, σκόπος; *spleen*, σπλήν. § 2. From the Latin: *axis*, *circus*, *color*, *error*, *favor*, *honor*, *humor*, *miser*, *nausea* (Gr. *ναυσία* from *ναῦς* a ship), *nucleus*, *pauper*, *virus*; which are just as good Latin words as they are English, in their present form.

And what numbers are there of other words that have been changed only from their nominative form to their absolute stem-form into English as: alien, antique, angel, familiar, mortal, part, ration, spirit, vent, etc. § 3. From the French such words are imported bodily into English as, rendezvous (lit. render, or report yourselves); lieutenant (Lat. in loco tenens); revenue (that which comes back), mortgage (lit. security, in case of death); chemise (Lat. *camisia*); loyal (Lat. *legalis*) and royal (Lat. *regalis*); sage. § 4. From the German, as our language is in its grammar wholly German and in its vocabulary largely so, instances might be furnished to almost any extent.

Differences of form in English cannot be clearly resolved, as has been stated, by phonetic laws and principles, and classified as in the classical languages; but side-influences of all sorts, for variety and force, as of internal commotions, emigration, conquest, commercial intercourse, and sympathetic contact in whatever way with the elements of power and progress in other nations, have at different times struck our language and impressed themselves upon it. It bears as remarkable evidence of having been once in a grand chaotic state of wild interfused elementary agitation, which has been afterwards calmed and consolidated into one grand harmonious whole, as the geologic crust of the world itself. The one mighty all-assimilating energy, that has subdued its struggling elements to each other and to itself, has been the inward-working, divinely-illuminated, ever-advancing, gospelized, English mind, that has clothed itself in its living words, as in a garment of light and of praise.

(7) New words are introduced from time to time into our language; but they are uniformly names of new inventions and discoveries in the arts and sciences; instead of being descriptive of any new results or wants in the great sphere of abstract thought. Our language is competent in itself without any enlargement, as a vast, complicated, elastic instrument of thought and speech, to express all possible combinations of perception, conception, sensibility, desire and will. For, aside from the argument, that while combina-

tions are many in possibility, their elements are in actuality few and simple: — how have all the reaches of the human mind in all ancient times, even with the torch of revelation in its hand, been adequately transferred into English! and how has English thought itself already spread its wing in the upper blaze above!

Not more sensitively does the sea glass the sky in its broad bright mirror, than in the different historic phases of our language are reflected the different forms and stages of mental and moral progress, made by the common English mind. The different ends and objects of English thought, at various periods, in the mass; and so, the differences of expression that they have found in its national literature, whether in its own volumed vastness or in its mere verbal details, — may be grouped under several separate classifications, as sentimental, poetical, philosophic, practical, true or errant, substantial or fanciful, subjective or objective, aggressive, progressive, self-vindictory, or self-laudatory, just according to the style and measure of the balancings and counterbalancings of public thought, from age to age. The subjective period of perpetually self-measuring consciousness, as indicated here in intense Edwardeanism, and, in England, in the philosophy of John Locke, has happily well nigh passed away; and this age is not only one of more material practicality, as also of martial inspiration, but one at the same time of increasing poetic sentimentalism, as appears abundantly in the number and characteristic style of our essayists, historians, orators, and preachers, as well as poets. In our ever new and blooming literature therefore, rather than in any new growths of words as such, are the signs of advancement or decadence in our language to be found. Newspapers, novels, and periodical literature, from coming in contact, as they do, directly with the mass, can and do give favor or umbrage, under the strong magnetic influence of able glowing pens, to apt words and phrases, imported or imitated from the current literature of other languages, especially French and German. Such words as *cañon*, *canard*, *spirituelle*, *personnel*, *blasé*, *roué*, have thus

become almost or quite naturalized among us of late. So stand-point, and shimmer from the German, and from other sources, filibuster and squelch have been brought into new honor recently by the press. The use of the word *normal* also has gotten to be lately quite enormous. • Of all the new words sought to be introduced by some none is homelier than the word *resurrected*. So also new phrases appear from time to time, as within a few years past such as these: “manifest destiny,” “irrepressible conflict,” “glittering generality,” “bitter end,” “military necessity,” slaves as “contraband of war,” “the development theory,” etc.; which, like axioms, maxims, apothegms, and proverbs, have a value, when once strongly announced, for their perspicacity, brevity, and utility, which preserves them ever afterwards as a vital component part of the common speech of the land. Such indeed is the power of skilful cunning phrase for conveyancing error as well as truth acceptably from mind to mind, that pseudo-philosophy always seeks carefully to clothe its false theories in such a garb. Hence Auguste Comte calls his infidel reveries, “positive philosophy;” and, in explanation of what he means, declares that there are “three philosophies of things, or general systems of conceptions, each of which excludes the other: the theological or fictitious; the metaphysical or abstract; and the scientific or positive: the first being the necessary point of departure of the human understanding; the second, merely a state of transition, and the third its fixed and definitive state.” So, Darwin speaks of “*the struggle for existence*, amongst all organic beings, which inevitably follows from their high geometrical powers of increase,” the laws of “natural selection,” and their influence in “inducing divergence of character.” In such books, as also in “*The Vestiges of Creation*,” “*Mansel’s Limits of Religious Thought*,” “*Restatements of Christian Doctrine*” (in behalf of “the Broad Church of the future”) and in “*Essays and Reviews*” by seven English churchmen,—how much is falsely expected to be gained, by a mere phantasmagoric use of words. But, while words may be employed as

dishes and vases for containing and conveying truth, they cannot be used as corner-stones for any of its solid structures. They cannot constitute or support the truth in any form, but only represent it.

(8) Words have sometimes in English a totally different sense from that which their originals had. Thus, *carpenter* is from Lat. *carpentarius*, a wagon maker; *perspire* means literally to breathe through, from a false theory in vogue in ancient times, that one of the chief offices of the pores was the aëration of the blood. *Privilege*, which according to its etymology means a private or separate law, was originally a law not *for*, as now, but *against* a person. From *caballus*, a nag, come through the French *cheval*, a horse, our words *cavalier* and *chivalry*, both words of honor. From *pupus*, a young child come not only *pupa* (the chrysalis state of insects) and *pupil* (Lat. *pupillus*, dimin. of *pupus*), and *babe*, *bub* and *booby* (Germ. *bube*, Dutch *babyn*), but even also *pup* and *puppy*. For similar variations of sense, analogically, compare *πῶλος*, a colt and Lat. *pullus*, the young of any animal and a chicken, with English *pullet* and *foal* and *filly* (Germ. *Fohlen* and *Füllen*). So, in French *crin* means horsehair only, while in Latin *crinis* means any kind of hair, human as well as animal. *Sudden* is from Lat. *subitaneus* (*sub* + *eo*, to go under), Fr. *soudain*, and is in its original sense properly a military word and refers to coming slyly under the walls of a town, for the purpose of a quick successful attack. *Demon*, an evil spirit meant originally as in *δαίμων* (its Greek original) the divinity.

(9) A good many words in English, whose etymology neither demands nor suggests, any such sense, have acquired in usage a permanently depreciatory or evil signification. Consider the following specimens: *notorious* (Lat. *nosco* to know and *noto* to mark) with which compare notable and noble (Lat. *nobilis* for *noscibilis*, worthy to be known); *adroit* (Fr. *adroit* for Lat. *ad directam*, sc. *viam*, lit. towards the right direction); *animosity* (Lat. *animosus*, lit. full of spirit); *ambitious* (Lat. *ambitiosus*, lit. disposed

to go around among others); *artful* (lit. full of art or skill); *casuistry* (lit. the act, habit, or art of answering cases of conscience); a *cailiff* is etymologically but a captive; *conceit* (It. *conchetto* from Lat. *conceptio*) is in itself but a conception; *craft* is Germ. *kraft*, power, or faculty; *criticism* is (Gr. *κρίνω*, to discriminate, Lat. *cerno*, *discrimen* etc.) properly the mere act or art of passing judgment, and should be of course used to find excellences if possible and not blemishes, except so far as is necessary to truth and duty; *conspire* means lit. to breathe together; *cunning* is from Germ. *können*, to know how, to be able, from which comes also *can*; *cupidity* (Lat. *cupio*) means in itself only desire. The following words also exemplify the same fact: *despot* (lit. a master); *domineer* (to rule over), *desperate* (*de* + *spes*, lit. without hope), *empiric* (lit. relying on experience from *πειράομαι* to try or prove, from which comes also *pirate*, lit. an adventurer, Gr. *πειρατής*); and yet with *πειράομαι* is connected also Lat. *experior* and through it in English, *experiment*, *experience*, and *expert*); *emissary* (one sent forth from or by another); *jealous* (but another form of *zealous*, Gr. *ζηλος*); *lust* (lit. desire, merely); *officious* (performing service or duty); *plausible* (approvable); *pertinacious* (holding on throughout); *prejudice* (a judgment in advance); *persecute* and *prosecute* (following one onwards); *prostitute* (placing one's self before or in the way of another); *resent* (to think back on or towards); *retaliate* (*re* + *talio*, to give the like back); *wilful* (full of will); *vile* (lit. cheap); *vulgar* (lit. belonging to the common people).

So an ironical sense has been often permanently imparted to a word in certain connections, as if a component part of its essential meaning, as in the words, *respectable*, *considerable*, *fair*, *meek*, *pretty*, when applied to things considered as in themselves below par.

(10) Some few English words contain in them the names of places, in which the thing described first came into use or notice. *Bayonet* is from Bayonne where it was first made; *copper*, from Cyprus (Gr. *Κύπρος*, Cyprus, Lat. Cyprus; and *cuprum*, copper, Germ. *kupfer*, Fr. *cuivre*);

cherry, from *Cerasus* (Fr. *cerise*, Germ. *kirsche*); *crayon*, from *Creta* (Lat. *creta* chalk, Fr. *craie* and *crayon*, a pencil of chalk); *indigo*, from *Indicus* (an Indian dye); *meander*, from *Μαλαῦδος* (a winding river in Caria), *parchment*, (Lat. *pergamena*, Fr. *parchemin*) from Pergamum in Mysia, where it was first invented by Eumenes, its king; *peach* from *Persicum* (sc. *malum*), lit. the Persian apple (Germ. *pfirsche*, Fr. *pêche*, orig. *pesche*); *dollar* (Germ. *thaler*) from *Joachim'sthal* (Joachimsdale) in Bohemia where in 1518 thalers were first coined.

(11) Some of the special peculiarities of the English appear most strikingly, when being grouped in contrast with those of other languages, especially Greek and Latin; with which scholars of whatever nation are most apt to compare their own language.

Notice § 1. Our system of double names for the domestic animals, when viewed as such, and when used as food as: *ox* and *beef* (Lat. *bos*, *bovis*, Fr. *boeuf*, Eng. *beeves*); *sheep* and *mutton* (Fr. *moutons*); *calf* and *veal* (Fr. *veau*, Lat. *vellum*); *pig* or *swine* and *pork* (Lat. *porcus*); *fowl* (Germ. *vogel*, a bird), and *poultry* (Lat. *pullus*, from which also *pullet*); *deer* (Germ. *thier*, Gr. *θῆρ*) and *venison* (Fr. *venaison*, Lat. *venatio*, something hunted); so, similarly we call *grapes* (from same root with *grab*, *grapple* and *gripe*, Germ. *greifen* to clasp), when dried, *raisins* (Fr. *raisin*, a grape, Lat. *racemus* a bough, whence also Eng. *race*); and *plums* (Germ. *Pflaumen*) we call, when dried, *prunes* (Fr. *prune*, Lat. *prunum*, a plum). So in Spanish a fish in the water is *pez* (Lat. *piscis*) but in hand it is *pescado* and, if salted and dried, *pescada*; and the French call linen in the piece, *toile* (Lat. *tela* from which *subtilis*, Eng. *subtle*), but when made up, *linge*.

§ 2. The variableness or divisibility of some of our grammatical forms, compared with those of other languages. The English, and it is alone in this peculiarity, has three forms for the present tense active of every verb, as, I love, I do love and I am loving; while in other languages but one form is ever used. The English, like the Greek, has a

double form of the preterite (the perfect, have, and aorist, did), while the Latin has but one. The Latin is poorer also than the English, in having no article and no perfect active participle. In the subjunctive or conceptional mood, the mood for expressing all contingent suppositional and relative ideas, what a range beyond other languages, for both variety and exactness of expression, have we in our might, could, would, should, etc., which in Greek and Latin were but one indiscriminated form.

§ 3. The indifference to the minute modal analysis exhibited often in the forms of other languages. We express, by the word *know*, both the idea of being acquainted with, as a friend (which in German is *kennen* and in French *connaître*) and the idea of understanding anything, as a science; which in German is *wissen* and in French *savoir*. In those languages, those separate kinds of knowledge must have a separate designation; but not in ours. We can *take* a horse or a book equally well from one place to another; but the Germans *führen* a horse and *tragen* a bundle, as the French also are particular to *mener* a child or anything that can walk, and to *porter* a package or anything that they bear in their hands or arms. We can *receive* anything equally well, a call, a present, a message etc.; but the Germans *bekommen* a disease, *erhalten* a letter, *empfangen* a present, and *einnehmen* money. We can *ride* equally well on horseback or in a carriage; but they call the first *reiten*, and the second, *fahren*. Our language has many nice distinctions for philosophic uses but few for those of curiosity. So, our word *umbrella* (dimin. of *umbra*, a little shade) breaks in French into *parapluie*, as being used to keep off rain, *paravent*, to keep off the wind, and *parasol*, to keep off the sun.

§ 4. Some English words are in themselves elliptical, and so represent now former phrases or combinations of words, instead of single words.

So, in Latin, while many intransitive verbs are made transitive, by the force of prepositions combined with them by composition, the reverse process takes place sometimes,

and by omitting the reflexive pronoun *se* a transitive verb becomes by ellipsis intransitive, as, in the phrase, *nox precipitat* (sc. *se*). Thus to *couch* down is for *se collocare* in its original Latin form; to *interfere* is a short form of *inter* (alios) *ferre* (*se*).

In our compound forms of verbs, made after the model of that abundant class in German, whose combining particles are separable in practice from the verbs to which they are united in sense, we have ellipses of every kind of curious signification. If the reader will ask himself what nouns were used or plainly implied after these various adverbial appendages in their first and proper use as prepositions, he will find much to amuse if not instruct him. They are such as these: to burn up, to burn down, to swallow up and to swallow down, to fix up, dress up, hurry up, hurry on, come on, come out, look out, wake up, give in, give out, give up, talk up and talk down, starve out, scare up, dash out.

The adverbial particle most combined in this way with verbs is the word *up*; and the one verb that surpasses any and all others, in the variety and strangeness of the senses that it takes or gives in combination with other words, of whatever sort, nouns, adjectives and adverbs, is the verb *get*. In evidence of this remark, consider such adverbial combinations with this sort of polyglot verb, as these: to get along, by, in, on, out, up, down, over, through, off, away, behind, etc. etc.; and such different senses as this Protean word has, in such phrases as, to get a fortune, a cold, a blow, a fall, a wish; and to get well, clear, rid, warm, wet, dry, fixed, done. The word *keep* stands perhaps next to *get*, in variety of sense.

§ 5. Some English words have been much corrupted in their apparent etymology, by a false popular pronunciation of them as: *baluster* (Gr. *βαλαύστιον* the blossom of the pomegranate, It. *balaustra* of same sense, It. *balaustro* a small pilaster (from resemblance in its form), Fr. *balustre*), which is almost universally pronounced and spelled *banner*; *postumous* (Lat. *postumus*, Span. *postumo*) which is

elled posthumous (as if from post humum); *asparagus* (σπαράγγος from σπαράσσω to lacerate, referring to its irregular head) is extensively called and written sparrowgrass; *pumpion* (Dutch pompoen) is getting to be quite generally spelled, as it is pronounced, pumpkin; *cigar* (Lat. cicada, a grasshopper, Span. cigarra — and cigarron, a big cicada and big cigar, from resemblance of shape, Fr. cigare) is now quite often spelled segar.

§ 6. As in Greek and Latin there are verbs of double forms, modified by reduplication or nasalization, so as to express in the two classes of verbs themselves, in a condensed way, a weaker and a stronger sense; and as in Latin there are a few duplicate verbs having in particular a causative sense, (as sisto, reduplicated form of sto, meaning to cause to stand, and jacio to cast, or cause to lie, from caeco to lie), so in English there are a few duplicate verbs having a causative force; and they are all of German origin: as to *lay* causative of to *lie*, and so, *set* and *sit*, *fell* and *fall*, *raise* and *rise*.

§ 7. As there is a portion of every language, which is used as current coin by the cultivated classes only, and forms what is ordinarily termed their standard speech, or what in French is called "la langue oratoire," — so of course is it in English; and in as marked a degree, as can be found in any other language ancient or modern. And not only so, but, as in no other language unless it be the Latin, is it true that there is a large branch of the language that is used only or chiefly for the purposes of poetry. But for their rhythmical value, they would pass at once by general disuse out of the language, and this although having many of them the merit of brevity compared with other forms which are retained, as well as also being much more conformable to their originals. They are such as mount (Lat. mons) compared with mountain (Fr. montagne from the adj. montanus); fount (Lat. fons) and font, compared with fountain (Fr. fontaine); and so with eve and morn compared with evening and morning; and ere, yore, olden, son, sire, afar, reft, ire, clime, lave, lit (for lighted), spake,

writ (for written), eyrie, eaglet, sheen, marge, blithe, ween, etc.

§ 8. Abstract relations are expressed in English more copiously and exactly, than in any other language except the German.

It is especially rich in particles, as prepositions, conjunctions, and qualifying adverbs of every possible shade of sense and degree of force. There is, for example, in the precise use of a given preposition always in English, a closely defining power, which the Latin ablative, with its limited range of possible signification, though much more versatile in use than any other case in Latin, did not at all possess; nor the Greek dative, which was the Latin dative and ablative combined. And besides the greater variety of modal forms in the English subjunctive, already alluded to, even compared with the German, which is yet our chief parent-tongue, what a rich variety of minute, subjunctive senses have we at command, in what may be called our subjunctive conjunctions, or, those conjunctions which give to verbs in connection with them a contingent or relative sense.

We have with the German the two articles; which, while they are by true grammatical analysis, but shortened forms of the demonstrative and numeral pronouns with which they correspond, are yet almost or quite as useful as they, in particularizing objects; while the Greek has only one of them and the Latin neither.

In respect also to grammatical gender, while being less pictorial than the Latin, Greek, and German, we are more philosophical than they, in predicating sex only where it really belongs, and so in making all things, besides living beings, directly impersonal. We do not therefore, like the Germans, speak of a boot as *him*, nor, like the Latins, call a mountain masculine and a tree feminine. And as a proof how curiously extremes can sometimes meet in this world, the words in German for maiden, young lady, and wife (*das mädchen, das fraulein and das weib*) are all neuter, in obedience to the usual neuter character of the terminations in which they all end.

In conclusion. The grand inward, ever-working, ever-assimilative, energies of the English tongue and the accumulative influences and evidences of individual home-growth, do not show themselves, as in Latin and Greek, in any perfected grammatical forms as such, or in any phonetic harmony or homogeneousness of development, in even its lexical elements; but rather in an intense unity of bearing and sense in all the material elements of the language; making it a splendid unique product by itself, as it were, of all foregoing humanity and human progress:— so that it has in it, as the great ultimate language of the world in these times, all the power, for exactness, of the Latin; for versatility of expression, of the Greek; for range of beauty, of the German; and for solemn grandeur, of the Hebrew itself: with all the upper lights of revelation glowing full and strong in the vaulted sphere of its past and present literature.

The Latin roots selected for use in the continuation of this Article, as the “brief illustrative synopsis” promised in the title, will be chosen chiefly for two purposes: to exhibit the mode, in which words hang in clusters, as the true normal mode of their growth and at the same time to show what variations of form words of the same immediate origin may assume.

The connections of words in the same language, of the same ultimate origin, will be found to be as remarkable for their mutual strangeness of form and sense, as any one can have ever conceived the connections of various families of nations, or of languages, with each other to be.