



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### **Usage guidelines**

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### **About Google Book Search**

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

800.2

K9

800.2 K9

Krauss, C.

Signif. of the alphabet

157



800.2

K9



800.2

A9



1882

PRICE FIVE DOLLARS

SIGNIFICANCE

OR

THE ALPHABET.

By CHARLES KATTOID, M. D.

BOSTON.

PUBLISHED BY E. C. LEEBOLD.

1882.





SIGNIFICANCE

71810

OF

THE ALPHABET.

---

BY CHARLES KRAITSIR, M. D.

---

BOSTON:  
PUBLISHED BY E. P. PEABODY.  
1846.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1846, by  
E. P. PEABODY.  
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

1846. 12/16

## THE ALPHABET.

---

LANGUAGE is the image of the human mind, the net result of human culture : if it is Babel, it is because men have abandoned themselves to chance, and lost sight of the principles by which language was constructed. But these principles are inherent in their nature, and men cannot lose their nature. All men, however diverse they may become by conflicting passions and interests, have yet the same reason, and the same organs of speech. All men, however distant in place, are yet plunged into a material universe, which makes impressions of an analogous character, upon great masses.

Languages therefore have a certain unity. Differing superficially more or less, they begin to resemble each other, as soon as the observer goes beneath the surface ; and they unite at the centre into three fundamental articulations, symbolizing the three organs of speech by which they are severally made, and correlative to three obvious categories of nature :—cause, living and moving effect, dead or dormant effect.

In order to understand languages thoroughly, it is necessary to begin at the centre, and inquire what language is. Articulate language is the peculiarity of man, and his distinctive character in the visible creation. Undoubtedly the cries of animals have their meanings, and it would be interesting to study these voices of the instincts. It might throw light upon the vocalization of nations, especially upon the toning of the Chinese, and some languages of the Pacific Ocean. But the first and worthier object of inquiry is, into articulation, or those modifications of voice which are made with consciousness and intention by man, who, in speaking, brings the external universe into relation with the spirit within himself; making the one stand for the other, by means of a sound which symbolizes both.

There are three classes of sounds, in consequence of the harmony between our organs and the several categories, into which nature is divided in our conception. On examining languages we find the general fact, that the causal, or what appears causal, is not expressed without gutturals; what is living and moving not without labials and linguals; what is dead or dormant not without dentals. Gutturality, labiality, and dentality, floating in the element of euphony, and corresponding to the ideas men have of things material and moral, make up language.

But most objects of thought combine two or more of the categories of nature. Hence, these elementary articulations are often blended in words, even in roots; and in order to our seeing the force of a word, it is necessary to have a knowledge of the thing signified, or, what is sometimes more difficult to attain, a knowledge of that notion of the thing, which was held at the time the word was

appropriated to it. There may be found apparent exceptions to this rule, but there are few real exceptions, and these few confirm it, being evidently of anomalous character. Apparent exceptions, often, on being rightly explained, are found to be triumphant exemplifications of the principle in question.

Each of the three organs can make several articulations, differing in intensity, or in consequence of modifications, being more or less assisted by the other organs. Out of these primitive and modified sounds, a great many combinations, or groups, are composed. Hence the apparent infinity of words. But all combinations and modifications are reducible to their prototypes or germs, which are very limited in number. To inquire into the laws which regulate the combinations of sounds, and the laws for the appropriation of these combinations to the expression of thought, is the first and best discipline of the senses and mind; and this is the only learning of languages which is worthy of the name. By a more superficial method, the use of a language, as it is current at some particular era, may be attained; but not that philological science which is conservative of its life, and furnishes a key to all languages. It is owing to the want of this general science, that even persons who consider themselves educated, are abandoned to the influence of a single language; for the same reason, languages, after they have arrived at a certain point, invariably decay, and in the course of ages lose their primitive picturesque character, and elemental force. Languages should never decay, but advance in all their characteristics, with the unfolding mind of a people. Nor would they, if scientifically treated.

On the continent of Europe philology is still behind

other sciences. Only in the last century, it has made a start, which is hardly heard of, much less appreciated in America. Comparative grammars and polyglott lexicons are nearly unknown here. Therefore some Americans, of good common sense, looking upon the study of languages, as they have seen it carried on in the schools and colleges, where they have themselves wasted many years, learning nothing but dead vocables, have declared war against language-learning altogether, and contrasted it with the study of nature: as if language were not inseparably interwoven with every science; as if it were not the mediator between man and nature; and as if the neglect of it had not the direct and immediate effect, of putting to sleep the senses, and quenching intelligence.

Ideas, of course, must go before words, but thought, which is the analysis and demonstration of ideas, needs words in order to fix these demonstrations, as they are successively made in the mind, for stepping stones of its own further progress. In what period of life do minds make comparatively so great progress, as in those years when the child learns to speak, although it only learns by rote? Does not nature indicate that this is the period for language-learning, by the facility of verbal memory which it gives to early years? Is it not obvious that could nature's own method be seized, and applied to the acquisition of other languages, this enlivening effect might be prolonged through all the years of life, preserving that rapidity of perception, that disponibility of mind, which gives to the acquisitions of childhood the characteristic which is expressed by the word *intuition*? It is not necessary to have minds stereotyped while in their nonage, to effect any end whatever, even that of getting money. A gen-

er al presence of mind to every thing, is the desideratum for all men everywhere, pursuing whatever ends. Nothing can be gained by that stupidity which treats words as counters, making them shackles and dead weights upon thought, instead of a living furtherance of it. The superior intelligence of those nations which are polyglottic, and their advance in every department of science, should suggest ideas upon this subject. Neither does philology flourish alone; for it clears the element in which every science is expressed. Such advances as it has already made in Europe, where it is far from having attained perfection, have already been shown in the improved methods of presenting mathematical truths, so overlaid in the school books with clumsy and false formulas, that one might be tempted to believe it to be the object to use language, Talleyrandwise, to hide the truth.\*

The philosophers of antiquity had peculiar disqualifications for any adequate view of philology, by reason of that patriotic narrowness which was cultivated by them as a virtue. Yet it is remarkable how near the Platonic Socrates came to the true idea of language. Some great principles are distinctly recognised in the Cratylus. Socrates first makes Hermogenes admit, that names ought to correspond to the things named. Secondly, that this correspondence must exist between the elementary sounds that make up words, and the qualities of that which is spoken of. He even discovers that the letter *r* expresses motion, and *n* internality. In the third place he touches upon the *organic* harmony, by remarking on the motion of the tongue in uttering the letter *r*, and the place of the breath when we say *n*. And, although one object

\* Note A.



of the dialogue is to refute the sophist Cratylus, in his assertion that *whatever is said is true*, he does not fail to see that there is a subtle symbolism in articulate sound, by means of which the mind of man has made language so rich, in those parts which express abstract and moral ideas. In the practical pursuit of etymologies he is perplexed, because he has not yet laid his foundation in a just appreciation of a root on its three sides. He loses himself, as Bopp has done in our day, in considerations upon the vowels, though even here he shows his admirable sense; for he suggests — what is indeed the truth — that the Greek words were probably altered from their first forms, for the sake of beauty of sound; and, what is still more remarkable, he suggests that many words and parts of words which stood in Greek, apparently isolated, are *barbarian* words. Had he known German or Slavonic, he would hardly have failed to discover a comparative philology; nor would he have discredited the truths he certainly did see, with the fanciful etymologies that make up so large a part of the Cratylus. The Greek is the richest language, next to the Sanscrit, for its grammatical formation, but it is the worst for the study of roots. Euphonic laws prevail over the laws of root formations, and grammatical formations assimilate words of different roots, frequently forming a large number of syllables. In this luxuriance of the vegetation of the Greek language, the relation of sounds to the organs, as well as the correspondence of the organs to things and moral ideas, is difficult to be traced. It was reserved for men of less genius, belonging to nations whose creative reaction upon the raw material of language is less than was that of the ancient Greeks, to lay bare the roots of etymology, and build a foundation for the science of philology, broad enough to support the superstructure.

It is well known that there is a limited natural language for the deaf and dumb, who use other organs to express their meaning, than the delicate apparatus which is the common gift. The laws which regulate the motions of the head, eyes, hands, &c., to point out things, and symbolize thought, are the same which presided at the formation of spoken language, and are so obvious and uniform, that the deaf and dumb, from different parts of the world, always understand one another, and all persons around them learn to use their natural language. Can we doubt that the laws which regulate the combinations of sounds into words, unfold a more refined and expressive natural language which lies at the basis of all languages, and forms a large part of each one of them, notwithstanding the confusion of tongues? This natural language, which undoubtedly exists, is the object of philology, the foundation of which, is a knowledge of the elementary sounds, which are also expressed to the eye in the writing of different nations.

The Roman alphabet, with a few additions, is the representation of these sounds to most of the nations of Europe. This alphabet was not however the invention of the nations whose languages it writes. It was the Phœnician alphabet, which is very good for the Shemitic language it wrote, but was inadequate to the representation of the Greek; and in fact, the Greeks, in the course of time, added eight letters to the original sixteen attributed to Cadmus. The Russians have still further improved on the Greek alphabet, and their characters nearly approach the Sanscrit in perfection.

The written characters which express the elements of the Sanscrit language, are called the *Dēva nāgari*, or divine writing (writing of the Dives). And it is truly

worthy of the name. The Dēva nāgari is the only scheme of writing perfectly adapted to represent to the eye the Indo-European tongues. As the most intellectual and subjective nations necessarily divide sounds with proportional delicacy, to express a greater variety of meanings, it were to be wished that all the languages of the Indo-European nations had been written with characters framed and arranged according to the Sanscrit. The Roman Alphabet is so inadequate to the Polish language, that each character has to be repeated, sometimes more than once, with points marking variations of sound. We also find it inadequate to the French and English languages, and supply its deficiencies by combinations, as *ch*, *th*, &c. It is hardly possible, by combinations of Roman letters, to represent the sounds of the Sanscrit, so as to be understood.

Nevertheless here is an attempt at this, with the arrangement a little altered. The cerebro-linguals are sounds to which our alphabets have no characters exactly correspondent.

Here we have thirty-three consonant sounds, which are expressed in Sanscrit by thirty-three different characters. And even in our own language we have several nasal sounds, although we only distinguish, by difference of character, the nasal before the labial, from the rest. If we listen carefully, we shall hear that *n* before *g* sounds differently from *n* before *ch*; and *n* before *t* or *d*, differently still: *king*, *clinch*, *flint*. This difference of the nasals is indicated in the scheme, by the letters in the parenthesis.

In Sanscrit there are, beside the thirty-three characters for consonants, five characters for vowels: *a*, *i*, *u*, *ri* and *lri*, with nine auxiliary marks; and for diphthongs,

CONSONANTS.					
	Surd.		Sonorous.		Sibilants.
	Aspir.		Aspir.		
	Nasals.		Semv.		
<b>Gutturals.</b>	ka	k-h-a	ga	g-h-a	ha
<b>Palatals.</b>	cha	ch-h-a	ja	j-h-a	sha
<b>Cerebro-Linguals.</b>	ta	t-h-a	da	d-h-a	
<b>Linguals.</b>	ta	t-h-a	da	d-h-a	
<b>Dentals.</b>	pa	p-h-a	ba	b-h-a	
<b>Labials.</b>					za, sa
					ya
					la, ra
					ma
					va
VOWELS.					
<b>Simple Primary.</b>	a	e	i	o	u
<b>Secondary.</b>					
<b>Peculiar.</b>					ri
<b>Diphthongs.</b>	ai			au	

two principal and two auxiliary. When the vowels become nasal, a point is written over them, called the *anusvara*, and the aspiration or sibilus at the end of words is marked by two dots, called *visarga*.

With this perfect scheme, it would be well to compare all other schemes of writing, more or less ingenious. But this would be impossible, except by means of an oral explanation of the several schemes; and we must omit it here, however interesting and important it is; although

it would throw a great deal of light upon our subject in various ways.

### ROMAN ALPHABET.

MUSICAL. VOWELS.	LOGICAL ELEMENTS OF LANGUAGE.				VOWELS.	
	CONSONANTS.					
	<i>Labia s.</i>	<i>Gutturals.</i>	<i>Lingual Dentals.</i>			
a	b	c	d		i	
e	f	g h			e	
i (y)	.....j k		l			a
	m		n	<i>Liquids.</i>		
o	p	q	r	s t		
u.....	.....v.....	.....w	x			o
(y)				z	u	

The Romans used at first only nineteen letters; but when *v* is used as a vowel sound, it is in modern times marked *u*; and when *i* is used as a consonant, it is written *j*, which makes twenty-one letters.

The *z* is also comparatively of later origin; for the Romans anciently wrote *cs* instead of it. It is consequently placed on the line. The *n* is on the line, be-

cause in fact it represents, at least, two nasals, the guttural-nasal and the dental-nasal.

Some thoughtless grammarians speak of *k*, *y*, *z*, as Roman letters. But they are not so, and are only found in proper names, introduced, as large as life, from the Greek language. When the sound *c* was corrupted in the modern European languages, by being softened into a sibilant before *e* and *i*, *k* was introduced into the English and other Germanic languages. The consonant *u* took the form of *w*. Several modern European languages also add the characters *z* and *y*.

We will now proceed to the examination of the Alphabet, as it is exhibited in the Table.

*First.* We observe that the vowels are cut off from the rest of the Alphabet by two lines. This is because the division of vowels and consonants is most important; the vowels being sounds not peculiar to man, and not expressive of his reason. Their interchange is so slight, that they may be considered as zero with respect to the signification of the roots. They never enter into the composition of a *genuine* root, but have secondary meanings at best, denoting the grammatical distinctions of voice, mood, tense, number, gender, comparison, derivation, euphonical variations, and dialectic differences. Time is naturally denoted by a change of the vowel sound, for it is no element of reason. The Greeks said for *forever*, *ἀεί*; hence *αἰών* and, with the digamma, the Latin *ævum*. Vowels cannot strictly be called inorganic sounds, for the organs of respiration are used to produce them. But they are not produced by the *articulating* organs. They can be produced by the wind in trees, on the Æolic harp, by all musical instruments, by animals; the cat produces all the vowels, as they are pronounced

on the continent of Europe and Asia:—*m-icau*, or shorter *miau*. For *i*, *a*, *u*, are the principal vowels, being simple: *i* the highest, *a* the middle, *u* the lowest. Consonants, or articulated sounds, are made by our organs, which modify the expired air with intention; the throat, the tongue striking the teeth and palate, and the lips, not only utter the sounds to the ear, but make them signify to the mind. An inarticulate sound is not worthy to signify a human thought; for thought is produced by the exertion of the brain, and must consequently be followed by an exertion of the organs of speech. Consonants are therefore the logical elements, because they are the result of reason (*logos*).

In the above-mentioned alphabet, the liquids *l*, *m*, *n*, *r*, belong respectively to all the columns, and divide the alphabet into two almost symmetrical portions. They are somewhat indefinite, being half vowels and half consonants. They express the flowing material of nature, *element; abiment, almus*. *M* expresses meeting, and this meaning is the basis of all its other meanings, such as *middle, means, measure, amity, multitude, might, mystery*. It is also a nasal sound expressive of wonder, especially alternating with *n*, the sound of interrogation and surprise, which expresses want of knowledge. *N* is on the line that divides the gutturals from the dentals, being sometimes considered as one, and sometimes as the other. This modification of the nasal with regard to dentals and gutturals, is shown in the Sanscrit by different signs. Both *m* and *n* are often used for euphony, without modifying the signification, or entering into the composition of the pure root. *N* is a root letter for *in*, and for the *nose*, and what pertains to the nose, in almost all languages. *M* shuts up the mouth and separates the life within from other

life; hence it expresses, in all languages the *me*, and that which is identified with the *me*, by the instinctive, and at first selfish love; thus *mama* in so many languages.

All the *liquids* express movement. *L* expresses soft and secondary movement, it also denotes the *linear*, *lengthened* and *fine*, *R* is the symbol of *rough* and *original* movement, of *repetition*, *trembling*, and *great vibration*; the phenomenon of activity, in contra-distinction to the cause of activity, the latter being expressed by the guttural. *L* and *r* are easily combined with both gutturals and labials. They are linguals rather than dentals, and the *l* is generally component of the word signifying tongue, *dingua*, *lingua*.

The *Labials*, in the first place, name the *lips* (*labia*, *labra*, *lip*, *lippe*, *lèvre*, &c.) and express all that the lips signify; that is, physically, the dimension of *breadth*, the *superficial*, the beginning of *motion*, the *fleeting phenomena of life*; and metaphorically, *love*, *life*, *liberty*; *the free opening*, *leaving*, and similar meanings.

The *gutturals*, in the first place, name the *guttur*, *gurgel*, *gorge*, *gosier*, *kehle*, *gula*, *collum*, and express what resembles the throat physically, the dimensions of *height* or *depth*, the *capacious*, *covering*, *hidden* or *hiding*, the *angular*, the *break* of a line, *connexion*; and, in the second place, they are symbolical of the *internal*, *essential*, *central*, *causal*; the *key*, the *unknown*, the *creative*; *growing*, *connecting*, *action*, the *cutting into anything*, the first personal pronoun, and the *interrogative*.

*Dentals*, in the first place, name the *teeth*, and express all that the teeth signify; the dimension of *breadth*, the *dead*, *stiff*, *standing*, *spent*, *sterile*, *stupid*, *dumb*, *dull*, *dim*, *dark*, *tedious*. They also change verbs into nouns, having made them *supine* first. They express refuse, and



*waste, the fixed, tight, what is out and demonstrable; locality, division, separation; the numbers 2 and 3; the second and third personal, and the demonstrative pronoun.* The highest and lowest vowels, *i* and *u*, become consonants, and are in some languages written *j*, *y* and *w*, and, as consonants, they have always the signification of gutturals. The dentals, together with the liquids, *m* and *n*, *r*, are used, not always as roots, but to express grammatical relations also. Grammar plays on these strings. A large number of roots, composed sometimes of two, sometimes of three classes, are found in all languages, forming natural words. An interchange of the letters of each column among each other does not alter the signification of a root. It is this interchange of the letters of the columns, together with certain laws of euphony and grammar, which individualizes languages from the raw material of natural language, represented in the alphabet. It stands to reason that it is not indifferent how the alphabet, or the *dēva nāgari* is pronounced. The *dēva nāgari* cannot be pronounced wrong, for it is evidently arranged in the nicest adjustment to the organs. Every alphabet also purports to be the synopsis of the elementary sounds of a language, and comes arranged according to the organs: after each vowel, in ours, comes a labial, and after each labial, a guttural (or two); after the gutturals dentals: and to have overlooked this natural succession, was the opening of a series of errors, in the teaching of languages, especially of the Latin and those depending on it.

But how are these labials, gutturals, &c. to be pronounced? Surely the sounds themselves are the most appropriate *names* for the sounds. When words have been formed out of particular sounds, because these sounds

symbolize certain meanings, which the word is to express, all is thrown into confusion, if the sounds come to be mis-pronounced. In the German alphabet, the names of the letters, with very few exceptions, are, as they ever should be, the sounds of the letters. Every German letter stands for one sound, always and every where, and to learn the alphabet of the German language, is to learn to read all genuine German words. An adult person can learn to read the German language in a day, if he can pronounce the alphabet: children also learn to read at once. The same may be said of all the languages of Europe, nay, of the world, except the French and English. The very thought of inventing a new phonography is in itself a phenomenon, which severely criticises the corruption of pronunciation, into which the French and English languages have fallen. But phonography, if it should prevail, would complete the ruin of these heterogeneous languages; cutting them off, forever, from their natural basis, and from the great family of languages to which they belong, and upon which they now hold, to the scientific eye, only by means of the written characters, which designate what the words were formerly, when they were pronounced fully and correctly. What is vulgarly called bad orthography is an attempt at phonography. The French and English are especially liable to this inelegancy. The Arabic letters, are so phonographic, that the writing of the vowel points is not deemed necessary, and an Arab of education would consider himself insulted, should he receive a letter with the vowel points inserted. He would take it as an intimation that he could not read!

And here it may be in point to remark, that on account of the capricious formation of English words, the

spoken language cultivates the minds of the people less than we should expect it to do, should we merely consider the great number of ideas it symbolizes. Thus, unless a man who speaks English, learn to read, he is in a state of extreme ignorance; for the words, as pronounced, do not symbolize ideas, and of course do not stimulate his mind. He must read in order to appreciate the difference between *know* and *no*; in order to see any angle in *knee*, any *ken* in *knowledge*, any *keenness* in *knife*, any *getting into things* by *gnawing*. The English viciously drop from the spoken language, the gutturals, which alike gave the old Anglo-Saxon, and the old Latin language their strength. But happily, these gutturals are in some measure retained in the written language. Hence arises an insuperable objection to that destruction of English orthography which the phonographists propose.\*

But the traces that the written English language retains of its original sounds, though of use, are yet, in comparison with what they might be, of no use; because those who have undertaken to treat the English language as lexicographers, grammarians, and elocutionists, have completely lost sight of the signification of elementary sounds; have treated words as altogether arbitrary signs; have sanctioned corruptions of form, violations of the genius of the mother-tongues of which it is composed, and allowed the caprice of custom and fashion to take the place of nature's law. There is no exception to be

\* This criticism does not mean to hinder the diffusion of phonography as a *script short hand*. It is the best that has appeared. The gentlemen that teach it in Boston, also intermingle with their teaching, exercises in enunciation of elementary sounds, which are extremely useful. The exercises of the voice and articulating organs, ought to constitute a prominent part of discipline in all primary schools, and might be connected with the meaning of sounds.

made in this criticism on English grammars, except in the case of Wallis's, published in Oxford in the middle of the seventeenth century. *Ioa. Wallisii, Gram. l. Angli. Oxon.* 1653, 64; *Hamburgi*; 1671, 74; *Londini*; 1765.

For the English language to recover its creative energy, its self-purifying power, and become the open-sesame to the science of language in general, and to the knowledge in particular, of the Indo-European family; it is necessary to treat it in a totally different way. Its corruptions and anomalies, although they may not be remedied in the written or spoken language, should at least be appreciated, and in every instance accurately defined.

It is not the purpose of the present essay, to write a treatise on the English language. But so much confusion is thrown over the whole subject of philology, by the peculiar condition, in which the English language finds itself; that these few remarks are thrown out to preclude a set of objections that frequently meet the writer on the threshold of his subject, from those to whom the English is the vernacular tongue.\*

In spite of all apparent objections which may be made by those who have never dived below the surface of English or French, it is true, that significant words are not made up of insignificant, but of significant sounds; that there is such unity in man, that the organic formation and the significance of elementary sounds is *one*; and that on a deep consideration of the development of human thought and feeling, under various circumstances, we shall see a reason for the development of these sounds,

\* I know that some philologists touch upon the errors of English pronunciation, but they have not courage enough to go to the heart of the difficulty, and they propose no radical cure.

into all the various languages spoken on the globe; and be enabled to follow out this development.

A mere statement of this method of studying languages, shows its vast importance; and places it in the fore-front of the objects which should engage the attention of men. For as universal language, in the light of ideas, is seen to be the image of man, particular languages become images of the special culture of the several nations.

Of many nations, their languages are the only monuments that have come down to us; and the use which Niebuhr has made of the fragments of these monuments of the ancient nations of Italy, is but a faint sign of what philology will contribute to history, when it is still more philosophically studied. And yet Niebuhr, by means of it, has restored the lost *origines* of Rome. The history of a nation, which a profound analysis of its language discovers, is not merely, or chiefly, the history of its origin and institutions, it is a history of its internal life, its peculiar passions, the peculiar external nature which environed it, and the various changes of its circumstances and feelings; — in short, languages betray all that those which speak them are, for they are the very expression of the speakers. Men express what they are impressed with. Even the corruptions of languages are significant. Languages express not only the progress, but the decay of nations. There are laws of sickness, as well as of health. Hence the study of languages leads out into the science of moral nature, as well as of intellectual. There is no subject connected with the mind or destiny of man, upon which a profound insight into philology will not throw a broad light. It is a science for the mother who teaches her infant to speak its native tongue; for the man of the

world, who wishes the convenience of speaking with the natives of other countries; and for the philosopher who would name the yet-to-be-discovered objects of nature, unfold the history of the past, or make manifest the laws of human progress and decay, in intelligence and morals.

Nor is this science unattainable. The science of philology, to the end of all these results, might be taught easily, in the time which is at present given, at school and college, to what *is called* the study of Latin and Greek, but which does not give a command of Latin and Greek; as all ingenuous persons, who have gone through this treadmill, will admit. And this true study of philology would be animating, not stupifying, to minds of ordinary intelligence; converting school-rooms from gloomy prisons, where natural activity is not so much trained as checked, into cheerful and busy scenes of intellectual enjoyment. For it is not true that enjoyment and a sybarite indolence are synonymous. The young do not hate intellectual work because it is work, or intellectual, but because it is made, by the *unreason* of teachers, unfit work for rational minds. There never was a child, who was not an idiot, that did not enquire into causes and laws. There never was a human mind, that did not experience keen delight at the discovery or first recognition of a law.

Is it too much to believe that a reform of the language-teaching of these United States is possible? Let us begin with very simple things; one of which is the introduction of the true pronunciation of Latin. It can be acquired by schoolmasters in a week, and taught with perfect ease; for the manual of it does not occupy a page of an octavo volume.

In naming the consonants, we should avoid mingling

vowel sounds. The labials are pronounced as in English; the dentals also are pronounced as in English; but the gutturals should be pronounced in all cases, as gutturals; *c* and *g* always hard, (*c* is surd, and *g* sonorous; ) the consonant *j* like the Italian vowel *i*, and *v* always like the vowel *u*, therefore almost corresponding to the English *w*. The *s* should always be pronounced hard, like the English sound of it in *sun*. The *t* never should be softened before *i*.

The vowel sounds, are as in Italian, Spanish, and German; — *a* always *ah*; *e* always *ay* in nay; *i* always like the English *e* in *meet*; *o* always *oh*; *u* always as *oo* in wood. All these sounds are both long and short.

The diphthongs are always diphthongs: *æ* pronounced like the English *i*; *œ* like *oi* in *coil*. But before leaving this subject, a few pages will be given to considering the sources of our certainty respecting the true pronunciation; and a few more to the precise relation it bears to the philological treatment of the other languages of the Indo-European family. See *Note B*.

We know the true pronunciation of the Latin elementary sounds, from the internal economy of the language, the intrinsic congruences of the derivations, compositions, &c.

In the compositions of verbs with prepositions, it is a law, that the first letter of the first syllable of the verb should attract the last letter of the preposition, and assimilate it, more or less, to itself. Thus *ad* and *fero*, becomes *affero*, *sub* and *fero* becomes *suffero*; and it would be easy to go through the language and find instances of verbs beginning with every consonant in the language, that, in this situation prevails to assimilate, more or less, to itself, the last consonant of the prefixed

preposition. What then is to be inferred from such instances as *accendo*, *accentus*, *accipio*, &c? If the original of these verbs began with a *sibilant*, would the preposition change its last letter into a guttural? Instead of assimilation, the vulgar pronunciation makes a dissimilation. In the conjugation of the verb and noun, (since conjugation consists only of a conjunction, a *ge-yoking* of the pronoun with the root syllable, — the personal in the instance of the verbs, and the demonstrative in that of the nouns,)\* there is no reason for changing the consonant sounds of the root. In *lego* the root is *leg*, and *o* is the remnant of the first personal pronoun *ego*. When, in the second person of the verb, we would conjoin the second personal pronoun, represented by the dental *s*, why should the *g* of the *leg* change? There is, of course, no reason for it. So in the word *pax*,† (or *pacs* as it was anciently written), the guttural *c* is of essential importance to the signification of the word, and it cannot be changed into a sibilant in the genitive case, for the meaning of the root does not change by the addition of the possessive *his*, (which is here indicated merely by the insertion of an *i*, as the repetition of *s* would make too much hissing.)

Other compositions lead up to the same principles. When the Romans wished to express a meaning very strongly, they often repeated the root; thus: *marmor*, *turtur*, *carcer*. The word *carcer* signifies the place where criminals are kept, *cared for*, *guarded*, *warded*; the guttural is repeated to strengthen the sound. Why, then should the guttural turn into a sibilant, which expresses nothing of the kind, and which is against all

\* See Note C.

† See Note D.



analogy? Of course, it should not do so. So in the word *coecus*, composed of the Greek word *οκος* and the privative *κ*, why should this word be transformed, so as to begin with a sibilant?

The Romans had the form *k* for a short period before *a*, but *c* was used before all the vowels, and when *k* was not used at all. And is it to be supposed, that they never put the sound of the hard guttural before *i* and *e*? There never was a language spoken, that was so effeminate, as not to have the sounds *ki* and *ke* in it. And can we believe it of the language of strength and law, the mighty all-conquering Roman? They had no letter *k*, because they sounded *c* as *k*, before these vowels, no less than before the others. The Greeks wrote the Latin name *Cicero*, *Κικερον*. If the Romans did not pronounce it so, why did not the Greeks write it with sigmas? What also becomes of the joke on the name of the great orator, which intimates that his name is sounded by the crowing chicken-cock? But this is intrenching upon the second source of our knowledge of the true pronunciation of Latin, viz. : the comparison of the Latin with other languages.

If we pronounce the *c* and *g* hard, and the *j*, as *i*, we shall find many identical words in the Latin, Sanscrit, Greek, Slavonic, Anglo-Saxon, Gothic and Celtic. We refer the reader to note (E) for these parallels, — and advise that they be carefully studied; and here merely remark that the proper English, which is Anglo-Saxon, does not soften the *g* and *c* before *e* and *i*, thus we say *finger*, *singer*, *girdle*. It is not therefore the true English pronunciation which has corrupted the Latin pronunciation. It will be seen on careful examination that every

word in the English language, in which we soften *g* or *c*, before *e* or *i*, is a word derived from the Latin, and pronounced according to the corrupted Latin pronunciation we are warring against. All parallel Anglo-Saxon words keep the gutturals : for instance *genus, kindred, gero, carry, &c.* *Token, teach, and taught* are words of the same root as *doc-eo*, beginning with a dental and ending with a guttural. They are genuine English. But *docile* was imported from the Latin after the Latin pronunciation was corrupted. The reader will please to observe that in this case the introduction of the sibilant destroys the significance of this word, and takes out the kernel of its meaning.

Languages of the same family also tell tales upon each other, and with a salutary influence upon our knowledge of principles. We have the word *candle* in English. Why do we not write the word *kindle*, which is from the same root, *cindle*? Is not the use of the *k* here a *trick*, to dodge the influence of the corruption? So we write *cat*, but the diminutive of *cat* we write *kitten*, instead of *citten*, as we should have done, had not the Anglo-Saxon *c* fallen into a sibilant. The words *candle* and *kindle* have the same root as *accendo*. But in order to preserve the root we must not make the second *c* of the Latin word into a sibilant. The Latins said *coquus*, the English say *cook*, and the place, where things are cooked, would have been written *citchen*, if the letter *c* had not so arbitrarily been softened. But as the common people preserved the sound of the root, the writers put in a *k*! Does not this exhibit a kind of moral obliquity?

Considerations derived from the internal economy of the Latin language, and the analogies of other languages

which belong to the same family might seem sufficient; but many consequences always flow from facts, and from these consequences we may reason back to the facts. Therefore we touch upon each class of proofs; for, on this subject, the minds of those who speak the English tongue in particular, are like oiled paper, which requires many layers of paint to be put on, before any paint at all will stick. There is explicit testimony on this subject from writers of undoubted authority, whose mother tongue was the Latin. They certainly knew how their native language was spoken; although they are not great authorities in philology, for they were as ignorant of the languages, as of the geography of other countries, and despised them as *barbarian*! For these extracts however, we refer our reader to the appendix.\*

With respect to the bearing of the correct pronunciation of Latin, upon the treatment of the other Indo-European languages in the education of the young, it is impossible to do justice to the subject in this pamphlet; since oral instruction is necessary, which, by its liveliness and *disponibility*, may stimulate a general presence of mind, to all the facts† which go to make up human experience. The only *book* which would be extensive enough to prevent cavilling, would be what is indeed the *desideratum* for philology — an organic system of the roots of the Indo-European languages. Such a work having collected the roots, and shown their simplest meanings, and then traced their vegetation in different nations, by means of the laws of mind which lead to the application of external facts of nature, to symbolize internal facts of the mind and heart, would make it evident, that the same

\* Note F.

† Note G.

raw material lies at the bottom of this great variety of tongues, notwithstanding superficial dissimilarities. Such a work would be a *promptuary*, in which the languages of the most successful portion of mankind, being concentrated, would be seen as if laid out as countries on a map.

Certain sounds have certain significations. But these sounds are not always represented in the same way. The guttural has many representations, even among those nations which pretend to use the Roman Alphabet: *c, g, h, q, k* and sometimes *j, y, and v*. Interchanges of these representations need not confound us. We can see that *guarded, garden, jardin, hortus, yard, warded, cared*, are the same thing. But if we pronounce *c* like *s* we lose the root; and *cervus* becomes *servus*; *cædo* and *cedo* become *sedo*; *cæpi* and *cepi* become *sepi*; *census, ascensus* become *sensus*; *cicer, siser*; *cygni, signi*; we confound *sceleris* and *celeris, scena* and *cæna*, and have no distinction between the syllables of *Cyzici*.

The individuality of a language is in a great degree in the pronunciation of it. Certain languages love certain sounds and certain combinations of sounds. The Italians love double consonants, and sacrifice even root letters to satisfy this morbid taste. They have an inordinate love of the letter *i*, and change many an *s* and *l*, of the Latin into *i*. On the other hand, the Portuguese love the letter *r*, and change many an *l* of the Spanish into *r*. The interchange of labials, gutturals, linguals and dentals respectively among themselves, with analogous facts, make the differences of languages of the same family. These changes are found on investigation to follow laws that may be seized, and the laws of mind, out of which these laws of language grow, impress themselves in other departments of their activity. If the Romans had pronoun-

ced the *c*, and *g*, soft before *e* and *i*, we should have other things in correspondence ; for, as it has been before remarked, even the corruptions of a language are significant. The search for roots is singularly bothered by a capricious foreign corruption of the Latin language, which has so predominated in a part of Europe, that several modern languages have even been considered as its daughters.

One of the chief reasons given for studying Latin, as the basis of a school education, is its use in unlocking languages nearly affiliated to it. And it is a legitimate reason. But the manner in which Latin is pronounced, so far from furthering this end, throws difficulties in the way. The elementary sounds of language are significant, and by neglecting the sounds and their signification, we lose all certainty with respect to the meaning of words, and all possibility of judging of the roots, or of deciding between different significations, attributed to the same word by different authors. We lose all possibility of judging of dictionaries, upon which we are at the same time made entirely dependent. Roger Ascham in his "School Master," regrets the introduction of dictionaries into schools, and predicts that the teaching of language will thereafter become superficial and dead. For he says, bye and bye masters will cease to teach, and leave pupils to learn their lessons by dictionaries, which must needs collect all the applications of the words to be found in literature, whether they are correct or not.\* A good dictionary is, nevertheless, a good thing. So is the *score* an admirable convenience for the musician. But who would know music by merely studying the score ?

\* I quote *memoriter*.

As little do people know languages, who study only with the eyes, in dictionaries. Language is primarily to be appreciated by the ear. A writing is merely a mummy. We should not undertake to learn physiology in mummies; but in living bodies. Neither should we expect to learn philology by the eye, but by the ear. If we follow a method which violates nature, nature will be revenged, and we shall not learn.

Nevertheless we must remember, that even articulate sound is not the whole of language. Language not merely represents external nature, but the ideas of man, and the operations of his mind. To determine a root, we must consider three things: the quality of the object, the idea of it, and the organ, by which it is expressed. A root may be a letter of one class, or composed of letters of two classes, or of letters of all three classes. An object or action which expresses the several dimensions of length, breadth and highth, or depth, will need one of each class; for the labials express breadth, the linguals length, the gutturals depth or highth: thus *crp, glb, grp, grb, blk, glm, krp, klp*, are roots of *corpus, globe, grope, crop, block, bulk, bulge, grab, group, conglomerate*, and words of similar meanings. These roots are essentially the same. So an object or action, which expresses free outward motion, or that in thought, which is naturally symbolized by free outward motion, will need labials and the liquids, thus: *lb, lv, lp, lf, fr, fl, pl, pr*, are roots, (or different forms of a root,) which vegetate into the words *labia, live, lip, liber, love, laub, life, free, flow, blow, bear, fare, plane, flat, pluvia, flamma, fire*. If the object or thing moves from within its own being, which implies deep, internal, essential action, we have a guttural and the liquid, thus *gl, ql, cl, gr, cr*, which are

roots of *glide, globe, glare, glance, vogel, eagle, volucris, creo, gradior, cylinder columna, columba, aquila, circle, &c.* The guttural alone is also a root, branching out into the word *ego*, corrupted into *I, io, je, yo, ya, ich, jag* and *ga* in different languages; and softened into *n* it makes *an, one, ein, un, unus*, which in Sanscrit is also *eka* and in Slavonic *geden, geden, &c.*

In the formation of words, and especially of words that mix roots, we often see analogous operations of mind. Thus the Germans say *ergründen*, where the English say *to fathom*. The first word bears the same relation to ground, that the second bears to *bottom*, and *ground* and *bottom* are words from different roots, that may apply to the same thing. For the same object, (thing or action,) may be looked at in different lights, and be expressed therefore by different roots, even in the same language. The Arabs have very many names for the lion, each name referring to some action it does, or quality by which it impresses them; and if one nation does so, much more do we see different nations use different names for the same thing, though these nations have the several roots in common. The English *hare* and German *hase*, both express the same hiding or hastening animal. But the Latins thought of him as *lightfooted*, which is equally true to his nature, and called him *lepus*; the Russians thinking of his swiftness called him *zayatz, &c.* The Greeks also call the stag *ελαφος*, because it is *lightfooted*; but the word *ελεφας-αντος* from *φαίνο*, with the *Α* expressing length, designates a very heavy footed animal, but which appears long. We see in this instance, that we must be careful not to be deluded by mere sound, unless the idea agree. It is the old sin of etymologists to go punning. We must not forget that we have few organs of speech, to

represent an infinity of ideas. A genuine etymology is a *truth-telling*, as old Cicero said. *Etymon* signifies *that which agrees with its type*.

In looking for roots, we also must not forget, that there are corruptions. It is only wonderful, there are not more. There is seldom one that may not be traced by a well read historian.

Having cursorily enumerated the sources of knowledge, upon the subject of the Latin pronunciation, it may still be well to answer the question, which indolence and a want of taste for truth so often put. Of what importance is this subject? If it is not enough to answer, that, in a universe which is a universe, because it turns round one centre, the truth must be useful, because it is truth; we can but refer our reader to all we have said of the science of philology, and all we have implied. The philosopher whose single aim is truth, and who devoutly believes that there is no fact which does not cover an infinite depth; no truth without infinite living consequences, will need nothing more. On the other hand, the man of the world, and the tender mother, will be satisfied to know, that the true pronunciation of languages brings out their intrinsic affinities, their approximation as they approach their origin in time, and their identification, at the centre of mind; so that many languages can be learnt, when treated in this way, at once more rapidly and more thoroughly, than any one language can be acquired isolated, and consequently cut off from the principles of universal language.

But a sufficient reason for recovering the true pronunciation of Latin is *its beauty*. To put the vowel sounds in such harlequin costume, as they are found in the English language, is a crime against Roman taste, which



should terrify us with the expected ghosts of a nation, so devoted to order and symmetry. And to pronounce *c* and *g*, and the *t* before *i*, with the soft sound, overloads the language with ugly sibilants. Already there are an enormous quantity of sibilants proper to the Latin : witness the conjugation of the verbs and nouns. To add to these the gutturals, and the hard dental, would be to turn the august senate of the Imperial Republic, into a nest of hissing snakes !

I have spoken of the pronunciation of Latin, because I consider Latin as a language most important to the general science of philology. But the Greek is also pronounced barbarously by the English and Americans. In Kühner's Grammar, lately translated at Andover, Kühner is made to belie his own convictions, and the chapters on pronunciation are accommodated to the prevailing errors of the English and American schools. Such things contribute to the greatest absurdity in the treatment of languages, because they isolate them ; whereas it is impossible to have any thing but a superficial knowledge of any language, unless it is studied in connection with other languages. To do this saves more time than it seems to lose ; for languages can be understood better and quicker, when seen in relation with each other.

Another absurdity in the common mode of learning languages is to study grammatical rules only. There are also euphonic rules, and rules for the formation of roots. In French the study of the euphonic laws would show, that there are no irregular verbs, except those composed of different roots, and would relieve memory of a most onerous task, by enabling the mind to see *a priori*, the reasons for conjugating each verb, as it is

conjugated. These euphonic laws pervade the whole language, and even alter the roots.

To study the laws of euphony which regulate the grammatical formations of the Greek, and even alter its roots, would also make a vast economy of time in the study of Greek, and put it into the power of every one who pretends to read any thing, to read Homer, and the Greek literature generally, in the original. It is absurd that a language, which is so rich for all who have the smallest interest in art, should be less commonly read by persons of taste, especially women, than French and Italian. On the other hand, if the laws of the formation of roots are studied, the lexicography of German is simplified to a great degree. It is then seen to be only identical with the best part of English, faithfully used, according to its nature, and trusted in to express every thing. In short, a treatment of languages, with direct reference to organic sounds, sharpens the senses, and reveals the original poetry of the unworn human mind; while the following out of the various national appropriations of these original pictures and this wild music, to the infinite variety of human thought and affection, is a real study of the mind, enabling us to obey the great Doric precept, engraved on the temple of Apollo's oracle: **KNOW THYSELF.**

For the languages of men are the image of man, as man is the image of God. And in the light of this fact, we learn to understand that ancient verdict: "*In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God; without which nothing was made that is made, and in which is the Life that is the Light of men!*"



## A P P E N D I X .

---

### NOTE A.

#### *Mathematical Phraseology.*

THE language used in mathematics is so inconsistent with the truths to be expressed, that it is not to be wondered at, that many persons are puzzled in making, and many more in understanding, the definitions of the principles and very object of the science.

A *line* is defined in many books to be *length without breadth and thickness*; a definition more indefinite and defective than that of *man* by Plato (“*a two-legged animal without feathers*”). In the first place, a definition ought never to contain negations; for if it be true that the line is a thing without breadth and thickness, it is not less true, that it is without skin, and hat, and potatoes, and all other things which are not a line; the enumeration of which would require an almost infinite collection of negations. In the second place, the positive part of the definition is nothing else but a tautology of the word *line* itself; for *length* is nothing else but the participle of the word *line* (*lined*). Hence, “*line is length*,” is a proposition identical with “*line is line*.” How is it possible to understand what *length* is, without understanding what *line* is? Therefore the definition, in its positive part, is a kind of *begging of the principle*; it defines by that which is to be defined. Moreover, the term *length* expresses in common use, the relative greatness of a line compared with other co-existing lines in a

---

body; the term *breadth* is another name of these correlative lines, and *thickness* is the name of the third of said lines; hence a line might as well be defined to be "*thickness without length, breadth, potatoes, gunpowder &c.*," or "*breadth without thickness, length, umbrella, conscience, &c.*" Others define a line to be "*a moving point.*" But if this be a definition, then the distance of two points, would be no line before one extreme point moving, should arrive at the other extreme point; hence the line would be a line and no line, at the same time; which is absurd. This latter definition is that of the representation of a line, drawn by the hand or otherwise; and as we cannot draw a line by moving a pencil from the earth to the Sun, the distance of the Sun from the earth is no line, and therefore the Sun is not distant from the earth! No line can exist without two ends which are co-existent, the one not being pre-existent to the other; but as soon as two points exist, their distance exists, and is the line. Why then, after having burdened the mind of the learner with would-be definitions of things not existing, after having played a kind of blind-man's buff with empty words, to come at last to the declaration that a *straight* line is "*the distance of two points?*" This latter expression is again incorrect, for no other line is the distance of two points but a straight one. Hence the epithet *straight* is entirely useless. Lines are *vulgo* divided into straight and curved lines: a new error, productive of great confusion in the mind; for *curve* means what is exactly opposite to *line*: — it is no line at all, being a complex of infinite directions, whereas *line* is one single direction. This distinction is exactly such a one as the following would be: *there are two numbers, the one is number one, and the other is all other numbers ad infinitum*; a manifest absurdity; for the so-called number one, is not a number at all, since the lowest number is *two*. A line is a unit of direction, hence not co-ordinate at all to a curve, which is an infinity of directions.

*Surface* is commonly defined to be "*length and breadth without thickness.*" This definition, besides containing the same logical monstrosities as that of the line, is evidently condemned

by the very measure of all surfaces, the *square*; which has no length in contradistinction to breadth, and which therefore could be no surface. The *circle* would also be no surface; for which of the diameters is long? which is broad? which is thick? The definition of a *solid* or *body* namely, "*length, breadth and thickness,*" is absurd in the same way; for which of the three dimensions of the *cube* (the measure of all solids), is long, broad, or thick? the same may be asked about the diameters of a *globe*. This would-be definition, therefore, excludes all round bodies, the smallest globules, and all celestial bodies, from the category of solids.

What is the remedy to all this confusion? An exact appreciation and use of words, expressing the very elements of all material existence and human knowledge. By defining the *line*, as the "*distance of two points,*" the surface as "*a complex of two lines,*" and the body as "*a complex of three lines;*" a clear idea is obtained of all geometrical magnitudes, limited by lines, or combinations of lines; and, whereas the curves are a different order of magnitudes, the circle and other surfaces, limited by curves, the globe, etc., require analogous definitions.

The simplest ideas of the simplest things should be simply expressed. The words *line* and *curve* are themselves definitions, if these words are understood, as they were meant by the first men who uttered them. I will endeavor to explain what I mean by this proposition; because it will serve to elucidate the life-principle of philology.

Why is the word *line*—*line*—and not something else? The *l* being produced by an elongation of the tongue (*lingua*), from its root as far as it can be stretched, without being protruded out of the mouth, is expressive of line (hence *long*, *loin*); it symbolizes distance. The sound so produced can, as a semi-vowel, be indefinitely lengthened. The tongue is the longest of the organs of speech. Hence its elongation designates also *light* (*lux*), which certainly does not proceed in a curve. It designates also *light* (*levis*), because the movement in a line is the easiest. It forms the Latin pronoun *ille*, from

which modern languages have borrowed their article and third personal pronoun, designating an object at a distance from the speaker. Why is a *curve* called *curve*? The *c* being produced in the curvature of the organs of speech (in the *guttur*), is the symbol of the *angle*, of the *break of a line*. The *r*, as a symbol of repetition, and of movement, inherent in *breaking*, denotes repetition of the angle designated by *c*, not only as to its geometrical qualities, but also as to our organs of hearing. Thence it comes that *curvus*, *circus*, *crux*, on the one hand, and *crepo*, *increpo*, *to cry*, are symbolized by the same combination. The difference between *crepo* and *frango*, is very delicate; for *crepo* is a kind of augmentative of *frango*, whose correlative, as to sound, is *fragor*, and so on.

Another error in the common treatment of mathematics, is the great neglect in the elucidation of the very first conceptions of this science; in consequence of which unphilosophical hurry, it becomes necessary to divide its field into a lower and a higher one. In the so-called higher mathematics, new and almost opposite definitions are again given of those very elements which have been so superficially passed over in the outset of the study. Some few examples will suffice to show this. There are very few of the votaries of the science of quantity who, after a study of years, have a clear idea of the signification of the *plus*, or *minus* itself. Some believe that *plus* is a kind of aristocrat, and *minus* a kind of helot; others that *plus* is something always and absolutely greater, and that *minus* is something absolutely smaller; or, that *plus* pre-exists to *minus*; or that *plus* is the sign of addition, and *minus* that of subtraction, and so on. All this is false, and an obstacle to a clear understanding of the simplest of human sciences. The students are never told that these two poles of all quantity, are, by the nature of the quantity, co-existing, co-ordinate; that they are not signs of operations, but also of the contrary tendencies of quantity, not to greatness nor littleness, but that they are rather symbols of the qualities of quantity. But to explain this interesting subject would require a particular treatise.

The terminology itself, of this science, which vulgar minds take to be the only canon of all knowledge, is very inconsistent. Some writers, for instance, call a *rhombus* that which others name *rhomboid*; *trapezium* what others call *trapezoid*; and many have no clear idea of a *parallelogram*. Almost all writers speak of the *hypotenuse*, without ever using the term *cathet*; thus mingling Greek with Latin terms. This point would require a book for itself.

As regards order, continuity, gradual development, and organic connection of the single parts of the system, there is such a mass of incongruities, chasms, and, at the same time, of useless details, and of clumsy roundabout demonstrations, that it is not to be wondered at, if to the liveliest minds, the very name of mathematics becomes a terror.

An analogous relation of philology to improved methods of teaching other sciences,—especially metaphysics, might be pointed out, but there is no space for it here.

#### NOTE B.

##### *Indo-European Languages.*

This most important of all the families of languages may conveniently be divided into the following six classes:

1. The INDIAN (by some writers called *Gentoo*). In this the *Sanskrita* (or the *perfect* language, the sacred l. of the Brahmins) bears the palm over all members of this family, respecting copiousness, beauty and development, as well as the antiquity of its literary monuments, which reach into almost the sixteenth century before our era. The graphic system of this language is used, variously modified, for almost all the languages of India, and for many others in the neighboring countries. The *Pracrita* (or the vulgar language), was a sister of the former. Another less rude dialect, the *Pali*, has been carried by Buddhist priests into Ceylon, Thibet, Tataria and China. In consequence of many invasions by various nations, and chiefly by the votaries of the Koran, these ancient tongues, in mingling with those of the conquerors, produced new ones. Of



these, the *Hindustanee*, a mixture of Sanscrit with Arabic, predominates on the Indus, in the Mogulic districts, and in all Mahomedan India. On the Ganges, the *Dringale*, which has less deviated from the original, is spoken by the worshippers of Brahma. The language of *Cashmir*, of the *Sikhs*, and *Mahrattas*, arose in the northern regions. The *Zigan* (*Zingak* or *Gipsy*) language has been introduced into Europe. The *Mahabharic*, *Tamulic*, and *Telinga*, are spoken on the sea-shores, the *Cingalese* in Ceylon, the *Maldivian* and many other dialects and jargons (for instance those of *Camara*, *Guzerat*, *Nepal*, *Multan*, the *Garrows*, etc.) in different provinces of the continent and on islands.

II. The *IRANIAN*, whose prototype, the *Zend* (the sacred language of the Magi, of Zoroaster) is preserved in the fragments of the *Zend-Avesta*; it was spoken by the ancient Persians. The *Pazend* was a dialect of it. To these succeeded the language of the Medians and Parthians, called *Pehlvi*. Both were written in wedgelike characters before the introduction of an alphabet. During the dominion of the Sassanides, the old rude idiom of *Paraistan*, which had developed itself at the commencement of our era, supplanted the *Pehlvi*, and was itself altered, by the influence of the Arabic, into the present *Persian*. This is the most polished of the living languages of Asia. The *Afghanic* in *Cabool* and *Candahar*, the *Belooches*, the *Curdic*, and the *Ossetic* in the *Caucasus*, resemble the modern *Persian*, more or less.

III. The *THRACO-PELAGIC* (or *Phrygian*) divisible into four branches, namely:

1. The *Thracian branch* used in *Asia Minor* by the *Phrygians*, *Bithynians*, *Paphlagonians*, *Trojans*, *Lydians*, *Carians*, &c., and in *Europe* by the *Thracians*, *Macedonians*, *Illyrians*, *Pannonians*, &c. in as many dialects. Some traces of these extinct idioms remain in the present language of the *Albatians*.

2. The *Pelagian* in *Thessaly*, *Epirus*, *Asia minor*, on the shores of *Italy* and *Greece*, and on the islands.

Out of these arose the *Hellenic* (or *ancient Greek*) on the pe-

cularities and dialects of which it is deemed superfluous to enlarge here. The *modern Greek* (or *Romanic*) is a modification of the Hellenic, by the Slavonic, Italian, Turkish, etc.

3. The *Etruscan*, which seems to have been an amalgam of the Pelasgic, Lydian and Celtic, and of which few monuments have reached our time.

4. The language of the *Romans* (the *Latin*), which is the result of a coalition of the *Umbrie*, *Oscan*, *Sabine*, *Etruscan* and other dialects of ancient Italy, modified by the Hellenic.

From the corruption of Latin and the admixture of Celtic, Teutonic, &c. arose the *Romance* (or language of the Troubadours), the *Italian*, *Rhaetian*, *French*, *Spanish*, *Portuguese* and partly the *English*, in the southwest of Europe, and the *Valachian* in eastern Europe. In the English, however, the Teutonic element predominates; while the Spanish and Portuguese have a touch of the Basque, Phenician, and Arabic, and the Valachian of the Slavonic, Magyar (Hungarian) and Turkish.

IV. The **CELTIC**, being most removed in space and time from its Asiatic sister, exhibits marks of the highest antiquity and of rude originality. It consists of two branches, to wit :

1. The *Gaelic* branch, of which the *Gaelic proper* is spoken in the Highlands of Scotland, while another idiom, the *Erse*, prevails in Ireland, and still another on the Isle of *Man*.

2. The *Cymric* (or *Britannic*, or *Cambrian*) the old language of the *Belgæ*, consisting of three dialects : the *Welsh* of Wales and some other portions of England ; the *Armorican* (or *Bas Breton*) in France, and the now extinct *Cornish* of Cornwall, only preserved in some writings.

V. The **TEUTONIC**, divisible into two departments, viz :

1. The *Southern*, which comprises the following idioms : the *Moeso-Gothic*, known by the translation of the gospels by *Ulfilas*, preserved in the Codex Argenteus at Upsala ; the *Franco-Theotistic*, the *Alamanic*, the *High-German*, or present principal language of Germany.

2. The *Northern*, which consists of the following tongues : the *Icelandic* (*Old-Norse*), the *Frisian*, *Anglo-Saxon* and *Jütic*,

the present *Hollandish* (vulgo *Dutch*) and *Flemish*, the *Danish*, *Swedish*; the *Platt-deutsch*, on the shores of Germany.

The languages of the *Alans*, *Heruli*, *Scirri*, *Gepids*, *Vandals*, *Burgundians*, *Langobards*, &c., people who stormed and overthrew the Roman empire, were Teutonic dialects, of which traces may be found in several countries of Europe, especially in Hungary, Transylvania, and in the Crimea. As to the dialects of the German, they correspond with the divisions of the nation, and are the *Saxon*, *Swabian*, *Austrian*, *Franconic*, *Swiss*, &c.

With the amalgam of Anglo-Saxon, Jütic and Danish, very slightly affected by the Celtic dialects, a barbarous kind of Latin and a portion of rude Norman-French, have been conglomerated into the present *English language*, which on account of that aggregation, and perhaps more in consequence of a sad want of taste and courage in its grammarians and lexicographers, has become the most motley of all existing languages.

The present languages of the South of the European continent owe their genius and grammatical forms to the Teutonic, while their maternal is for the most part Latin; both elements being modified, as stated under No. III.

VI. The *SLAVONIC* in eastern Europe and in some districts of northwestern Asia, is probably the latest immigrant from middle Asia into that part of it which is called Europe. It is most appropriately divisible into two groups, namely, into the *Slavonic proper* and *Lettic*.

1. The *Slavonic proper* is again subdivisible into :

(a) The *southeastern* section, to which belong the following tongues : the *Church* (or *ancient*)-language, the *Serbian*, *Prussian*, *Russniak*, *Croatian*, *Vendic*, &c.

(b) The *north-western* section which comprises : the *Chehic*, (*Czeski*, or *Bohemian*,) the *Slovak* (or *Slovenski*) in Hungary, the *Polish*, the *Sorabo-Vendic* in Lusatia, Saxony, etc.

Besides these there are many dialects of less importance, to wit : the *Bulgarian*, *Bosnian*, *Dalmatian*, *Silesian*, *Cassubian*, etc.

2 The *Lettic* group has lost one of its members, the *Prussian*, of which perhaps the only existing record is a catechism of the sixteenth century, and even this only a translation from German, with which its style is corrupted. As to the other dialects, namely, the *Litvanian* (wrongly written *Lithuanian*) and *Lettic proper*, their importance is of the highest order, as regards their great similarity to the Sanscrit on the one hand, and to the Latin on the other. The names *Curland*, *Livonia*, *Lituania*, *Lettic*, compared with *Cures* (*Quirites*), *Latin*, *Lavinium*, show more than an accidental agreement, and, connected as they are with other philological and ethnographical analogies, they indicate a great affinity of the respective nations.

Imbedded in the great strata of the European languages of the Sanscrit (Indian) family, the following of other families are found in various parts of Europe :

1. The *Euscara* (*Bascongada*, *Basque*) in the north of Spain, and in some Pyrenean districts of France. Its isolated position, its existence, since time immemorial, in the greatest southern peninsula of Europe, the coincidence of the name of the Iberians (whose language it must have been) with that of Iberia (or Georgia) in Asia, and its polysyntheticism, betray an analogy to the Tataric family of languages, and render it more worthy of scrutiny than any other language of Europe.

The *Magyar* (*Hungarian*), most probably connected with the language of the *Huns*, *Avares*; with the ancient language of the *Bulgarians* (which was distinct from the Slavonic of the present Bulgarians); and probably with that of the *Chazars*, is scarcely less important to philology than the former, which it resembles in several particulars. It shows, moreover, affinities to the following two.

3. The language of the *Suomo-laine* (or *Fins*, or *Tshudes*.) in the north of Europe and Asia, comprising the idioms of the *Esthes* and *Lappons*.

4. The *Osmanli* (or *Turkish*) which is collateral to the language of the *Ooigoors* and other Tataric nations.

5. The *Maltese*, which is an odd mixture of corrupt Arabic, Teutonic, Italian and Greek.

- It is sometimes asked, why, since all modern languages are in some sort corruptions of the ancient tongues, and since there are corruptions, at least of roots, even in ancient languages themselves, the English is selected for especial animadversion.

It is not captiousness nor caprice. The corruption of the ancient tongues, in which originated the modern languages of Europe, took place at a time of utter confusion and suspension of scientific cultivation; it took place unconsciously, instinctively, tumultuously, and necessarily, by the interfusion of the Teutonic tongues with the Latin, Greek, and Celtic.

The origin of the English tongue was as legitimate as that of the French, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Romain, &c., and the first English language bore a fair comparison with these. It is not the English of Shakspeare that is stigmatized, but the corruption of English since Shakspeare, and which is still going on, by reason of the apathy and groundless systems of the grammarians and lexicographers. The learned of other nations stemmed the tide of corruption, by remanding students to the principles of formation and change, which gave each language its peculiar genius. But the English have taken a false course for the last two hundred years. They do not inquire into nature, into the truth, but into custom alone; they are worshippers of the idol of fashion. The learned do not endeavor to lead or enlighten opinion, but to follow in its wake. They do not criticize. They succumb to the silly notion, that language is altogether arbitrary, or that it is inspired in some other way than reason, hearing, seeing are inspired. Because God makes men hear, is this any reason why the ear should not be cultivated on principles which shall enable it to analyse musical art? Because God makes men see, is it any reason why the eye should not be cultivated to the science and art of perspective? Because God makes men speak, is it any reason why we should not use our intellectual faculties to understand *language*, as a worthy exponent of the intelligence of man?

## NOTE C.

*Grammatical Terms.*

*Term-inus* (*τέρμα*) a natural word (that is, one which, by virtue of its root sound *t* signifies a *stop*, hence non-existence beyond certain points or limits) is appropriately used to designate such things as contain a kind of definition, boundary, limitation. Hence it follows that technical terms ought to be what their name purports, namely, true and exact virtual definitions of the object which they are used to betoken. If this be a condition *sine quâ non*, in all branches of human knowledge, it is evident that it is most so in logic, grammar, and mathematics; these being elementary disciplines of the mind. Very many terms of grammar will be found wanting, if weighed in these scales, and are, therefore, unworthy of preservation. Such is the term *declension* (*declinatio*), which is used to designate the alterations of the noun, in order to distinguish them from the alterations of the verbs. Does the term *declension* truly or exactly betoken the alterations of the noun, which often has more syllables in the oblique cases, than in the nominative? What happens to the noun in the so-called declension? A joining of the demonstrative pronoun upon the noun-root, which is as much a *conjugation* as the conjoining of the ancient personal pronouns on the verb-root. The term *declension* can be used with respect to those nouns which change their vowel, and corresponds to what the German grammarians call *umlaut*. But *declension*, in this more correct sense, takes place, not only in some nouns, but in the whole system of languages, in different parts of speech, thus: *man, men; drop, drip; hang, hinge; wild, wood; stand, stood; cado, cædidi; tango, tetigi; caballus, cheval; cænnabis, hemp; casa, house*. Dialects, parts of speech, grammatical forms, derivations, compositions, degrees of comparison, augmentatives, diminutives, and other accidents of words, are expressed by this *declining of tones*, which may be likened to the various scales of the gamut in music.

## NOTE D. on the letter X.

*Quinct* : Et nostrarum ultima *x*, qua tamen carere potuimus, si non quaesisset.

*Victorin.* ars gramm. : Latini voces quae in *x* incidunt, si in declinatione earum apparebat *g*, scribebant *gs*, ut *coniugs*, *legs*.

*Priscian* : *x* duplicem loco *c* et *s*, vel *g* et *s*, postea a Græcis inventam, assumpsimus, ut *dux*, *ducis*; *rex*, *regis*.

*Cicero de orat* : Verba sæpe contrahuntur, non usus causa, sed aurium : quomodo enim vester *Axilla*, *Ahala* factus est, nisi fuga literae vastioris ! quam literam etiam e *maxillis*, e *taxillis* et *vexillo* et *paxillo*, consuetudo elegans Latini sermonis evellit. Maluerunt scilicet dicere *malas*, *talos*, *velum* et *palum*. Ita et *sedecim* pro *sexdecim*, *sedigitus* pro *sexdigitus*.

*Isidor* : Ante Augustum *cs* vice *x*.

## NOTE E.

PARALLELS OF WORDS SHOWING THE GENUINE SOUND OF THE *c* AND *g* BEFORE *e* AND *i* IN LATIN.

Without speaking of syllables in the middle of words, of proper names, and of the host of those words in which *c*, *g*, *h*, are followed by *a*, *o*, *u*, *l*, *r*, *n*, and some other consonants, and which correspond, in their root-signification, with Latin words, wherein *c* and *g* are followed by *e* and *i*; the following list, containing the latter combinations, is given, as sufficient to prove the point in question, to every mind that is free from the tyranny of the prevailing cacœpy of Latin.

In the Celtic and the ancient Teutonic dialects, the *c* and *g* were every where, without exception, pronounced hard. This is undisputed and as notorious as the hard sound of the Greek  $\alpha$ ,  $\gamma$ .

Some of the words which are put parallel to the Latin words, are not translations of the words, but are words from the same root, which carry the same idea; though it may be differently modified by appropriation, and appear as different parts of speech. For instance, *clam* in Latin, *clam* in English, and

*clam*-atz in Slavonic, will not exactly translate each other, but all convey the idea of closing in a secretive manner: *clam*-atz means to *deceive*, a *clam* is an animal hidden in a shell, and *clam* in Latin signifies secretly.

The abbreviations designate: E. English, A. S. Anglo-Saxon, G. Gothic, Gr. German, I. Icelandic.

καί,-que.	κίλλω, cillo, cello.
κείρω (ξύρω, κορέω, Gr. keh-ren.) scheren.	κίναϊδος, cinaedus.
κέλης, E. race-horse; Aeol. κέληρ; whence Celeres, celsus (instead of eques) Fest.	κινάρα, cinara.
κέλλω, cello, percello.	κινέω, cieo; E. go, gone.
κεντέω κέντρον, centrum, &c.	κίρκος, circus, circulus, circinus.
κέραμος, carcer (in the Cyprian dialect.)	κίστη, cista.
κέρας, cornu; whence cervus, E. hart (horned.)	κίω, cio, cito.
κέρατος, lu-crum (carum dans.)	κύκλος, circulus.
κεστός, cestus.	κύλα, κούλα, cilia.
κεύθω, celo; κύω κύνω.	κυλλός, curvus, κούλος, ον, coelum.
κεφαλή, caput.	κέρμιος, herus.
κῆδος, cura.	Compare furthermore; κιννάβαρι; κιννάμωμον; κικαία; κικρέα; κικάθος; κινάριος; κίβος; κινδυνία; κίλινδρος; κίμβαιον; κίμβη; κίμιον; κινπάρισσος; κίπρος; κικρτός; κίων, &c.
κηλόω, (καίω,) candeo, incendo, &c.	
κῆσος, census.	Γέμω, gemo.
κῆρ, cor.	γένος, genus.
κηρός, cera.	γέφανος, grus.
κῆτος, cete.	γέτω, gusto.
κιβωτός, cista.	γηθέω, gaudeo.
κιγκλῆς, cancelli.	γίννος, hinnus.
κισάρα, cithara.	γύρος, gyrus.
κίθρατος, thorax (cista; E. chest.)	γυγνώσκω, γύψος, &c.
κικιννος, cincinnus.	
κικκος, ciccus.	<i>Latin.</i>
κικκίον, cilicium.	caedes, cado, κατα.
	caelamen.



- caementum, caedimentum.**  
**caerifolium, χαίρεφυλλον.**  
**caerimonia, cerimonia,**  
*καίρη.*  
**cedo, incedo, κω.**  
**celeber, analog. Engl. clever.**  
**centum, Germ. hund-ert,**  
*(Hand); 10 × 10 fingers*  
*=100 i. e. decies decem*  
*(dig.it. dig-it.) = cen-*  
*tum.)*  
**cerebrum, Gr. hirn.**  
**ceruo, certus, cretum ;**  
*κρηω.*  
**cernuus, forming a break,**  
*an angle.*  
**qerrus, quercus.**  
**cervix, analog. to cernuus**  
**ceu, ce+ve.**  
**ceva, Gr. kuh, E. cow.**  
**cibus, Gr. kauen, E. to**  
*chew.*  
**cicada, from crying ci-ci,-ci.**  
**cicatrix, ci-reduplication of**  
*cat, cut.*  
**cicer, Gr. kicher.**  
**cicindela, from candela.**  
**ciconia, in the dialect of**  
*Praeneste conia ; ci-re-*  
*dupl.*  
**cicur, redupl. ; from cura.**  
**cicuta, redupl. from caedo.**  
**cidaris, Hebr. keter.**  
**cilnius, Etrusc. cfelne.**  
**cimex, from κεντώ, cfr. ci-**  
*catrux.*  
**cingo, of the same root**  
*with circum.*  
**cinis, κόνις (καίω.)**  
**cinifes, σκνίπες.**
- cippus, analog. to columnā,**  
*cylinder, from cyclos.*  
**cirrus, analog. to circulus.**  
**cis, related to hic, here,**  
*ego, opposed to trans,*  
*t(h)ere, citer, hither, ci-*  
*tra.*  
**cito, E. to quote.**  
**civis, (κείμαι) cfr. symbol**  
*of here-ness.)*  
**coena, anciently coesna,**  
*from cum-edo.*  
**coenum, cunio, Gr. koth.**  
**coepio, co-apio.**  
**coero, curo, and many oth-**  
*ers.*  
**Gero, E. carry.**
- German.*
- Gähnen, χαίνω, χάω, hio.**  
**gällen, καλέω, I. kal. ; E.**  
*yell.*  
**geben, corresponds in a po-**  
*lar relation to capio.*  
**gehen, κω, cieo.**  
**geis, hoedus.**  
**gebb, AS. geolu ; Lat. gil-**  
*ves, helvus ; E. yellow.*  
**geltic, γαυλός.**  
**gemein, communis, κοινός.**  
**gemse, κεμάς.**  
**gergel, γήρος.**  
**gessen, get, G. gita, γάω, cio.**  
**gestern, G. gistra ; χθές ;**  
*hesternus.*  
**getzen, ergötzen, γέθτω,**  
*gaudeo.*  
**giebel, gipfel, G. gibla, cul-**  
*men, caput.*  
**giessen, geussen, G. giuta ;**  
*χέω, guito.*

ginnen, G. ginna, γένω.  
gürten, G. gairda, γυρῶω.  
gōri, I. a-gere, au-gere, fa-  
cere.

Hägen, hegen, ἔχω, habeo.  
heben, G. hafía, capio.  
hehlen, κλείω, celo.  
helm, κάλυμμα, galea.  
hengst, hinnus.  
herz, G. harto; cor.  
hin, hinc.  
hüllen, G. hulía; καλύπτω,  
celo.  
hürde, hört; κύριτη; carea,  
crates.  
hüten, E. to heed, to hide;  
κέύθω, celo.

Käfig, cavea; E. cave.  
kanker, γάγγραινα, cancer.  
käse, caseus.  
kasten, cista.  
kebe, corresp. to cubo.  
kehle, hohl; gula, κῶιλος,  
cavus; AS. ceol, celox,  
French, quille.  
kehren, γυρῶω.  
keichen, cough; κωκῶω.  
kelch, κάλυξ.  
keller, cellarium.  
kennen, G. kan, co-gnosco.  
kerben, to carve; κείρω,  
carpo.  
kerker, χάρακρον, carcer,  
kerl; churl; κοῦρος, κόρος,  
barbar. L. ceorlus.  
kern, G. kaurno; granum.  
kerze, cereus.

kessel, G. katils; κότυλος;  
catillus.  
kette, catena.  
keule, καυλός, clava.  
keusch, castus, ξυστόν.  
kibitz, gavia.  
kiel, κοίλος; calamus, E.  
quill.  
kies, cos.  
kiesen, G. kiusa; γέσω  
gusto.  
kind, γενητός, gnatus, geni-  
tus.  
kinn, γένυς, gena.  
kirren, queror.  
kirsche, cerasos.  
können, queo.  
küster, custos, &c.

#### Gaelic.

ce; quis, quæ, quod ?  
ceach, quisque.  
cead, cedo,  
cead, centum.  
ceal-aidh, celatio (barb)  
ceallada, custodia; celo  
cealt; vestes, E. clothes;  
claudo.  
ceanair, ceanntar; centum.  
ceann, cinn; caput,  
ceap, capio,  
cearb, carpo  
cearcabl, circulus,  
cearicur, sepulchrum (car-  
cer ?)  
cear, cædo,  
ceasnachadh, quæro.  
ceatharn, catorfa; caterva,  
ceil, celo.  
ceile, ae-qualis,

ceilear, κέλαδος, κελαρύζω,  
 clamo.  
 ceiltich, celte, sequestered  
 people, wood-landers.  
 ceir, ceich; cera.  
 ceis, corbis,  
 ceisd, καί, que.  
 cia, quis, quæ, quod.  
 ciarail, quarrel.  
 cib, manus. (a capio)  
 cigh, cerva.  
 cineal, cine, genus, gene-  
 ratio.  
 cinid, communis,  
 cinneach, gnatus. cinn-  
 seal, (ori) gin-is.  
 ciobhull, gula.  
 ciod? quis, quæ, quod?  
 cionag; granum, germen,  
 nucleus.  
 cir; clavis, crista.  
 cisd, cista.  
 ciumhas; margo circum.  
 ge, quisque.  
 geadd., cirrus.  
 gearan. questus, querela.  
 geimheal, catena.  
 gein, gnatus.  
 geinn, cuneus.  
 gin, gigno.  
 gineal, generatio.  
 gioradan; cochlea marina,  
 gyrus.  
 giort: cingulum, circum.

*Welsh.*

can-plyg, centuplum.  
 cant, E. century.  
 canol-bwynt, canol-bart;  
 centrum.  
 caer-wr, caer-ydd; civis.  
 cawr, gwiddon; gigas.  
 cefn-grwm, crivban, crwm;  
 gibbosus.  
 ceiso, E. get.  
 cengle, cenglu, gwreggyeu;  
 cingulum, cingo.  
 cenhedliad, generatio.  
 cer, ceriach; E. geer  
 (baubles.)  
 ceuladwy, gelu.  
 craith, cicatrix.  
 cuddig, cufigl, gell; cella.  
 cyffyr, E. gear.  
 cyflwyns, cyfarws, rhoddi;  
 E. give.  
 cylch, circulus.  
 cymrwd, caementum.  
 chwyldroad, γύρος.  
 cynhwynol, cynnedid; geni-  
 alis.  
 gefynnau, gevyn, E. gyves.  
 geneth, E. girl.  
 gweys, cingens.  
 gwyddau, E. goose; χήν.  
 gwawd, gwatwar, E. gibe.  
 o am-gylch, circum.  
 gwys, citatio.  
 gor-euro, gorthoi, E. gild.  
 etc.

## NOTE F.

*Diphthongs and Gutturals in Latin.*

*Diphthong* (or *double-vowel*), exactly and properly speaking, is a phonetic combination of *a*, *e*, *o*, with a subjoined *i*, or *u*, (both of which may become consonants.) The graphic combinations *ae*, *oe*, used in Latin, and *ao*, *eo*, used in some other languages, must naturally sound as if the former were written *ai*, *oi*, and the latter, *au*, *eu*; for *e* and *o*, being secondary vowels, cannot coalesce with the preceding vowels into one syllable, but are separated from them by a hiatus. Thus no genuine diphthong can be uttered. This view is borne out by the nature of the sounds themselves, as well as by the practical harmony of a great many languages. The graphic combinations of *ia*, *ie*, *io*, *iu*, of *ua*, *ue*, *ui*, *uo*, are spurious and only so-called diphthongs; their *i* and *u* being real consonants. As to the common division of diphthongs into *proper* and *improper*, which is met with in almost all English grammars, it is but one of the many infatuated assertions, with which most elementary books, published by the common book-mongers, are filled. It is tantamount to saying: there are two kinds of *two*, namely, the *proper two*, and the *improper two* which is *one*.

From a rigorous cross-examination of all kinds of witnesses and monuments, and from all legitimate analogies, it results: 1, that the diphthongs were double sounds originally, and while the language was in its normal condition; 2, that in later times, when the language was altering for the worse, one of the sounds was sunk, and finally quite lost, and that *ai*, *ae*, were sounded like the French *ai* in *j'aimais*, *au* like the French *au*. This total loss of one of the vowels is a symptom of the decay of the old harmonious language. The sounds in question are not wanting in any of the Indo-European languages. To sound, in Latin, the vowels *i*, *u*, as diphthongs, à l'Anglaise, is the acme of bad taste and self-conceited ignorance.

It is deemed superfluous, in this short treatise, to speak especially on the sounds of the simple vowels.

## Ae.

QUINCTIL. "Ai syllabam, cujus secundam nunc e litteram ponimus, varie per a et i efferebant; quidam semper ut Graeci, quidam singulariter tantum, cum in dativum, vel genitivum casum incidissent."

VELIUS LONGUS. "Ea quae nos per ae, antiqui per ai scriptitaverunt, *Juliai, Claudiai*. Et nihil obstat, quo minus hoc aut illo modo scribamus in utroque numero."

TERENTIANUS. "Alpha semper atque Iota, quem parant Graeci sonum, a et e nobis ministrant: sic nos scribimus."

SCAURUS. "Apud antiquos i littera pro e scribebatur, ut testantur metaplasmata in quibus est ejusmodi syllabarum deductio, ut *Pictai* vestis, et *Aulai in medio*, pro *pictae* et *aulae*; sed magis in illis e novissima sonat, et praeterea quoque antiqui Graecorum hanc syllabam per ae scripsisse traduntur."

## Au.

FESTUS. "Aulas antiqui dicebant, quas nos dicimus ollas, quia nullam litteram geminabant. *Auxilla*, olla parvula. *Ausculari* pro *osculari*, quod est os cum ore conferre. *Aurum* rustici *orum* dicebant, et *auriculas, oriculas*, atque ex hoc formavit Catullus *oricillam*."

PRISCIAN. "Au videtur quasi pati divisionem, cum o post u addita, transit eadem u in consonantis potestatem, ut *gaudeo, gavisus*; *nautes, ναύτης navita*; *ναῦς navis*. Contra fit a *lavor, lautus*; *faveo, fautor*; *avis, auceps, augurium, augustus*. Transit quoque au in o productam more antiquo, ut *lotus* pro *lautus, plostrum* pro *plaustrum*; *cotes* pro *cautes*; sicut etiam contra o, au, ut *austum* pro *ostrum, ausculum* pro *osculum* frequentissimeque hoc faciebant antiqui.

## Oe.

FESTUS. "Ab *oloes* dicebant antiqui pro ab *illis*; nam litteram non geminabant. *Pilumnoe, poploe* in carmine Saliari sunt Romani, velut pilis uti assueti."

SERVIVS. "*Moerorum* antiqui pro murorum; nam veteres

pleraque eorum, quae nos per *u* dicimus, per *oe* diphthongon pronunciabant: et contra punio, pro *poenio*, quod verbum a poena venit. Hinc est, "*Punica regna vides, cum Poenos ubique legerimus.*"

The alternation of *c*, *g*, *q*, occurring in ancient manuscripts, inscriptions of coins, buildings, etc., evinces what has been already stated in Note E.

## C.

FESTUS. "Prisci pro *acipenser* dicebant *aqipenser*, pro *sexdecim sexdequim*. Ex *κάρκερα* fecerunt *febrim querqueram* et *carcerem*, quia scilicet *κάρκερ* efferebant.

QUINCT. "Quidam *k* necessarium credunt quoties *a* sequatur, cum sit C litera, quae ad omnes vocales vim suam perferat."

JULIUS HYGINUS apud SERVIUM. "Cum Romani, euntes per Tusciam interrogarent Agyllinos, quae diceretur civitas, illi, ut pote Graeci, quid audirent ignorantes, et optimum ducentes, si eos prius salutarent, dixerunt *χῆιρς*; quam salutationem Romani nomen civitatis esse putaverunt et detracta adspiratione, eam *Caere* nominaverunt." Hence *caeremonia*, or *ceremonia*.

## G.

FESTUS. "Antiqui per *c* literae formam nihilominus *g* usurpabant. *Acetare* dicebant pro *agitare*; *prodigia* quod *prodicant* futura, permutatione *g* literae; nam quae nunc *g* appellatur, ab antiquis *c* vocabatur. *Quincentum* per *c* literam usurpabant antiqui; negotium, quod non sit otium; *negligens* dictus est non legens, neque delectum habens, quid facere debeat, omissa ratione officii sui."

VICTORIN. "Pro agro *Gabino* dicebant *Cabino*; pro lege, lece; *acna* pro agna. *Auctio* certe ab *augendo* dicta est; et numeri cum *c* habeant, ut *ducenti*, *sexcenti*, *g* reliqui habent, ut *quadringenti*, *nongenti*."

SCAURUS. "*Camelum* alii dicunt, alii *Gamelum*. *Negotium* dictum est quia *nec otium*."

## K.

PRISCIAN. “*K* et *Q* quamvis figura et nomine videantur aliquam habere differentiam, cum *c* tamen eandem tam in sono vocum, quam in metro continent potestatem. Et *k* quidem penitus supervacua est; nulla enim ratio videtur, cur *a* sequente *k* scribi debeat.”

SCAURUS. “Antiqui in connexionione syllabarum ibi tantum *k* utebantur, ubi *a* litera subjungenda erat: quoniam multis vocalibus instantibus, quoties id verbum scribendum erat, in quo retinere hae literae nomen suum possent, singulae pro syllaba scribebantur, tanquam satis eam ipso nomine expleret, ut puta decimus *d* per se, inde *cius*; item *cera*, *c* simplex et *ra*, et bene *bne*. Ita et quoties *kanus* et *karus* scribendum erat, quia singulis literis primae syllabae notabantur, *k* prima ponebatur, quae suo nomen *a* continebat; quia si *c* posuissent, *ce-nus* et *cerus* futurum erat, non canus et carus.”

## Q.

QUINCTIL. “Duras facit syllabas *q*, quae ad jungendas demum subjectas sibi vocales est utilis, alias supervacua, ut *equus* ac *equum* scribimus, cum ipsae etiam hae vocales duae efficiunt sonum, qualis apud Græcos nullus est, ideoque scribi illorum literis non potest.—“Cum is candidatus qui *coqui* filius habebatur, coram Cicerone suffragium ab alio peteret, *Ego quoque*, Cicero inquit, *tibi jure favebo*, pro *ego coque*.”

DONATUS. “Ciceronis dictum refertur in eum, qui *coqui* filius secum causas agebat. *Tu quoque aderas huic cause*; nam veteres, *coquus* non per *c* literam sed per *q* scribebant.”

VELIUS LONG. “Cocum nonnulli in utraque syllaba per *q*, scribunt nonnulli et inserta *u*. In verbo enim *coquere*, pro *quoquere*, Nisus censet ubique *c* literam ponendam, tam in nomine, quam in verbo.” “De *q* litera quæsitum est, et multi illam excluserunt, quoniam nihil aliud sit quam *c* et *u* et non minus possit scribi quis per *c* et *u*, et *i* et *s*. Ideoque non nulli *quis* et *quæ* et *quid*, scripserunt *qis*, *qæ*, *qid*; quoniam scilicet *q* esset *c* et *u*.”—“*Quor* est *cui rei*, quod significat *ob quam rem*. Ex hoc retinuit consuetudo hodierna, ut diceremus *quare*.”

Quor una syllaba castigatum fit *cur*, quod nos contenti sumus per *c* scribere.”

FESTUS. “*Quando et cuando* ab Ennio scriptum invenitur. *Quaxare* pro *coaxare* ranæ dicuntur, cum vocem mittunt. *Querquera* Græco *κάρκερα* certum est dici, unde et *carcer*. *Querquetum*, pro *quercetum*.

PRISCIAN. “Apud antiquos frequentissime loco *cu* syllabæ *qu* ponebatur, et e contrario, ut *arquus*, *coquus*, *oquulus*, *quum*, *quur*.”

DONATUS. “*Cui* per *q* veteres scripsere. Nimirum nihil inter qui et cui interest, nisi quod diphthongus aliter atque aliter efferatur, ut scilicet modo *u*, modo *i* integrum tempus consumat.”

SCAURUS. “*Quis* quidam per *cuis* scribunt, quoniam supervacuum esse *q* literam putant. Sed nos *c* in dativo ponemus, ut sit differentia *cui* et *qui*; quamquam secundum analogiam omnes partes orationis, quæ per casus declinantur, eandem literam in prima parte omnis casus servent, quam in nominativo habuerint. *Cum* quidam, nonnulli *quom* scribunt, quidam etiam esse differentiam putant, quod praepositio quidem per *c*, adverbium autem per *q* debeat scribi, ut *cum Claudia*, *quom legissem*: quoniam antiqui pro hoc adverbio *cume* dicebant, ut *Numa* in *Saliari carmine*.”

ANNAEUS CORNUTUS. *Quotidie* sunt qui per *co*, *cotidie* scribant, quibus peccare licet desinerent, si scirent inde tractum esse a *quot diebus*, hoc est, omnibus diebus.”

PAPYRIANUS. “*Reliquiae* et *reliqui* per *c* scribebantur, *cotidie* per *c* et *o* dicitur et scribitur, pro *q*; quia non *quotidie*, sed a *continente die* dictum est.”

VICTORIN. “*Licinius Calvus* *q* litera non est usus. *Anti*qui cum adverbium, scribebant quatuor literis *quom*, sed pronunciabant tamen perinde, ac si *cum* scriptum esset.”

---

These extracts might be very much enlarged. But a limit must be placed somewhere. Since I began to make these collections, a friend has shown me an English translation of *J. G.*



*Scheller's Latin Grammar*, made by G. Walker, A. M., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and head-master of the Grammar-School, Leeds; Second edition, published by Murray, in two volumes. In this work are collected some proofs with respect to all the letters, by extracts from Latin authors. The translator agrees to the reasonings and facts adduced by Scheller, and even adds some confirmatory considerations, and yet he has not the courage to insist upon this well proved pronunciation; because, he says, it is so difficult for the English to harden the gutturals before *e* and *i*, to read *j* as *i*, *v* as *w*, &c. ! It is absurd to speak of these difficulties, because the true pronunciation of Latin does not involve a single sound which is not common in English. But Mr. Walker does not look to the philological bearings of the letters, nor in any way view them as the ancients did, if we may credit their own sayings :

LIVIVS. "Miracula literarum."

QUINCT. "Hic enim usus est literarum, ut custodiant voces, et velut depositum reddant legentibus : itaque id exprimere debent, quod dicturi sumus."

Nor does he agree with a judicious English scholar, CLARKE, *praef. ad Iliad.* "Levia quidem haec, et parvi forte, si per se spectentur, momenti. Sed ex elementis constant, ex principis oriuntur omnia : et ex iudicii consuetudine, in rebus minutis adhibita, pendet saepissime etiam in maximis vera atque accurata scientia."

#### NOTE G.

##### *On the Appropriation of Words.*

It is certainly true, that nothing less than all the facts, which make up human experience, go to the formation of language; and all are necessary, in order to understand it thoroughly. We cannot indeed be present to all of these, with the feeble organization of our brain; but if we are fully alive to the desirableness of it, and if our energies are not blunted, our taste not destroyed, and our time not wasted by the obliqui-

