

ing they are pronounced. Let them rather be regarded as declarative of the great and fundamental fact of the gospel, that the grace of Christ abides with all his saints according to his promise, when about to lay down his life to bring in eternal redemption from sin and death.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### WEDGWOOD ON ENGLISH ETYMOLOGY.<sup>1</sup>

BY EUGENE SCHUYLER, PH D., NEW HAVEN, CONN.

PHILOLOGY, or the science of language, is almost wholly the growth of the last fifty years ; and in that time it has made rapid progress. Nearly all the known languages have been to some extent explored, and their sources and mutual relations pointed out. But philosophical research into the English language, by English scholars, has not kept pace with the advance in other directions. There has been produced no good and reliable work on English etymology, — not from lack of a rich field to work in, but from the incompetency of the laborers. Skinner and Junius lived before language was scientifically studied, and their works have been long out of date. Richardson and Webster, though still in use, are too inaccurate and incomplete to be of much service. They not only lacked the results worked out by investigators in other languages to aid their own researches, but they were both deficient in the genius and the capacities suitable for such studies. While Germany has become a nation of scholars, the age of English scholarship, even in the classics, seems to be past. The student of English has therefore

---

<sup>1</sup> A Dictionary of English Etymology. By Hensleigh Wedgwood, M. A., late Fellow of Chr. Coll. Cam. Vol. I. (A-D.) 8vo. pp. xiv. 507. London : Trübner & Co. 1859.

The same ; with Notes and Additions by George P. Marsh. 4to. pp. 247. New York : Sheldon & Co. 1862.

been forced to have recourse to the labors of foreign scholars in foreign languages, and draw what assistance he could from those sources. With regard to the Latin side of the language, Diez has covered most of the ground in his "Etymological Dictionary of the Romanic Languages;"<sup>1</sup> while Grimm<sup>2</sup> and Diefenbach<sup>3</sup> are authorities for the Teutonic and Celtic elements.

When, therefore, a new attempt in this line was announced by Mr. Wedgwood, under the auspices of the Philological Society of London, it was thought that the great want was about to be supplied. But on a careful examination of the work, we are obliged to say that the want is as great as ever, and that we must still wait, until some English scholar arises fully competent to perform the work.

A good etymological dictionary should be complete, scientific, and accurate. It should be complete in two respects. Not only should it contain all the words in the language, but all that is known about each word should be set forth. When a derivation is not certainly known, there should be a digest of the leading opinions on the word. All the cognate words, too, should be given, so that we may have before us all the steps necessary in ascending to its source.

A scientific treatment demands method; and a method based on true critical principles. No play should be allowed to mere fancy; but there should be a strict adherence to a fixed system in every part. About the word in question all the related words should be grouped, and arranged historically; going "upward through the ages," that we may clearly see its development, and know just when and how it came into our language. Thus, in treating a word of Latin origin, the forms in all the Romanic languages should be given, showing through which it came to us: that parent

<sup>1</sup> Friedrich Diez, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Romanischen Sprachen*. Bonn. 1853. 2d ed. 1861-62.

<sup>2</sup> *Deutsches Wörterbuch* von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm. Leipzig. 1852, ff. *Deutsche Grammatik* von Jacob Grimm. Göttingen, 1822-40.

<sup>3</sup> Lorenz Diefenbach, *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gothischen Sprache*. Frankfurt am Main. 1851.

*Celtica*. Stuttgart. 1839.

word should then be deduced from the Latin, and that compared with its cognates, perhaps in the Greek or Sanskrit, or its root compared with others in different classes of the same family. An unhistorical method is not really scientific; and, although it may sometimes be of advantage to compare resemblances of words in languages widely separated, yet, at the same time, the investigator is apt to be led away by mere similarities of external form, and to reach conclusions which the history of the word would at once overthrow. Every change which a word undergoes, in its growth from the root to the present form, may have an effect upon the meaning; and it is by presenting all these in their proper order that the exact signification is to be made out.

It is of course necessary to a scientific method that there be accuracy and exactness. Known facts and mere surmises must be kept distinct. The facts in the history and development of a word should be stated just as they are, and with no attempt either to draw inferences from them, or to make them square with any preconceived theory.

The science of language is now beyond the empirical stage to which ingenious hypotheses are appropriate. Facts are no longer to be explained by any arbitrary principle obtained independently of them. The object is now to obtain all the facts; when we have these, we may endeavor to see in what manner they can be explained. The theory must grow up from the facts. But it will not do to found a theory on insufficient data; for the temptation is great, of moulding, to suit our previous notions, what is subsequently discovered. Nor is a dictionary the place for theorizing. If a lexicon is of any use at all, it is solely for the facts which it contains, unburdened by extrinsic matter. Another work should contain the conclusions which might be drawn from the data there given. What would be said of the botanist who should interweave with the description of a genus, arguments about the "origin of species" or the beginning of vegetable life? Dr. Webster may be taken as a striking example of an author working in this way. Starting with the idea that all languages came ultimately

from the Hebrew, he endeavored to apply that theory to all words. Hence his work is full of the most absurd blunders, though mingled with occasional happy conjectures. Hence we see a word of Latin origin finding its source in the Welsh, or one of Greek in the Ethiopic.

Let us now examine more particularly the work of Mr. Wedgwood, and see how far it conforms to these requisitions. There has been issued only the first volume, from A to D inclusive, which ought to comprise about one fourth of the words in the language. But few words of Latin origin are given, the principal strength of the author being expended on those from the Teutonic and Celtic stocks. The author says: "I have as a rule omitted words of classical derivation, whether immediate or through the French, unless sufficiently disguised in form to require explanation, or in cases when the meaning of the word has been greatly modified during its residence in a foreign soil, or where it seemed desirable to point out relations not commonly recognized by our classical scholars." We do not perceive the expediency of such a rule; nor do we see that it has been well carried out and applied. Thus, many words have been omitted, the derivations of which are not at all obvious; and as many more find place, where the slightest familiarity with Latin would show us their origin. Even among the words from other sources there are singular omissions, some of them words in common use. Such are, among others, *amice*, *amma*, *among*, *anele*, *archil*, *arise*, *aroynt*, *arrack*, *bier*, *braid*, *bring*, *caboose*, *caddis*, *caltrop*, *capsize*, *caraway*, *crab*, *sour*, *derrick*, *die*, *donkey*, *drift*, etc. Again, of the words given, while many are treated at an unreasonable length, others are very incompletely noticed; as *arm*, *away*, *article*, *ass*;<sup>1</sup> while of some the etymologies are not attempted.

<sup>1</sup> In many cases, Mr. Wedgwood by a little more research would have brought out etymologies of great interest. He would have shown that *ask* was from the Skr. *ish*, to desire; that *bittern* was from the Lat. *taurus* or *bos taurus*, a bull, on account of its bellowing noise (cf. Pliny, 10, 42, 57); that *candy* was from the Skr. *khand*, *khud*, to break; and that *caper-sauce* comes from the Skr. *kaphari*, which there meant dried ginger, derived, on account of its dietetic qualities, from *kapha*, phlegm, and *ari*, an enemy.

as *dudgeon*, *art*, and *ape*. This last word is quite interesting in its origin. It may be traced through all the northern languages to the Greek *κῆπος*, *κεῖπος*, Sanskrit *kapi*, the root of which is *kamp*, to tremble, to move quickly. The *ape*, therefore, means the agile, quickly-moving animal.

Diez, in the preface to his "Etymological Dictionary," speaks as follows: "The problem of etymology is to trace back a given word to its source. The practical method for the solution of this problem is not always the same; we easily perceive two methods, a critical and an uncritical. The uncritical hits on its explanations, as a mere matter of luck, from some external resemblance of form, or extorts them, in cases of very slight similarity, or even complete difference, by a series of arbitrarily formed middle terms. A method of proceeding so faulty in principle, though through wit and genius it has made many lucky hits, has brought with many the whole science of etymology into discredit; while it has recommended itself to others through the ease of its application; for any one can practise it without call or preparation. The former err in their aversion, the latter in their inclination. In opposition to the uncritical method, the critical subjects itself to the well-settled principles and rules of phonology, without deviating a foot-breadth from them, except where clear actual exceptions compel. It strives to follow the very genius of the language, and to win from it its secrets. It weighs each letter, and seeks to ascertain its appropriate value in every position."

The critical method is finely illustrated in the work from which we have just quoted; Mr. Wedgwood's book is a most excellent example of the opposite. Instead of carefully following up each word, its author often seems merely to have turned over the leaves of various dictionaries, to have selected all the words of similar form, and to have placed them one after another without the slightest attempt at order. The arrangement is in some cases so defective, that we have been totally unable to perceive what he actually intended.<sup>1</sup> Frequently the same word is derived in

<sup>1</sup> See Mr. Wedgwood's treatment of the word *carat*.

Under the word *Artichoke*, Wedgwood cites Diez, but conveys a wrong im-

different ways in different places. The author often groups together words which, on a closer investigation, may be seen to come from different roots; while at the same time he overlooks most important relations, and separates words which are obviously connected. He is especially at fault in words of Latin derivation, where he sometimes ignores the Latin and endeavors to come to an origin this side of it. Besides all the confusion, mistakes, and oversights, with which he is fairly chargeable, we sometimes feel as if Mr. Wedgwood were misleading us for the purposes of his argument, so carefully does he often avoid real relations and bring out the onomatopoeic side of the word.

Under the word *class*, he says: "Lat. *classis*, a distribution of things into groups, originally *clasis*. Identical with Icel. *klasi*, Sw. Dan. *klase*, a bunch, assembly, cluster, Du. *klos*, *klot*, globus, sphaera." The Du. *klos*, *klot*, is also brought in under *clot*, *clod*, as formed from the sound of a heavy mass falling to the ground. It has always been supposed that the Lat *classis* was the Gr. *κλάσις* = *κλήσις*, from *καλέιν*, to call; the people as called together, a division of the people, a class. *Case*, *cash*, *cash*, *chest*, and *quash*, he compares with the It. *cassa*, Fr. *caisse*, Sp. *casco*, as well as with Icel. *kassi*, Du. *kasse*, Ger. *kiste*, and thus concludes: "The primary meaning seems something hollow or empty, from an imitation of the sound of a blow on an empty vessel by the syllable *kass!* *quash!* sometimes strengthened by a final *k* or *t*." The It. *cassa*, whence Eng. *case*, is plainly enough from the Lat. *capsa*, a box, from *capere*, to hold. So *cistern*, Lat. *cisterna*, formed from *cista*, Gr. *κίστη*, chest, he deduces from Bohem. *ciste*, clean, (= Lat. *castus*,) whence *cistiti*, to cleanse, and *cisterna*, a cleansing place.

Our author, besides his failings in comparative philology, has made great mistakes as an historian of words. Not unfrequently he reverses the order, and derives the earlier

---

pression of his meaning. He says, "Ven. *articioco*; Sp. *alcachofu*; Ar. *alcarschufu*; It. *carciofa*." Diez, however, deduces *artichoke*, Ger. *artischoke*, It. *articioco*, Fr. *artichaut*, directly from the Ar. *ar'di schauki*, i.e. earth-thorn, and only cites the other words by way of comparison.

word from the later. Oftentimes a little more attention to the history of a word would have brought out the very opposite of what he has given. The word *appall*, he asserts, is wholly unconnected with *pale*. He takes it from *pall*, to deaden, to lose or destroy the vital powers. He adduces some quotations from Richardson, but omits two which make against him, and which clearly show the origin of the word in *pale*, Fr. *pâle*, *pâlier*. To *deaden* is a secondary meaning easily arising from that of to be *pale*, *pallid*, like a corpse.

“ The answer that ye made to me, my dere,  
When I did sue for my poor hartes redresse,  
Hath so *appall'd* my countenance and my cheere,  
That in this case, I am all comfortlesse.”

*Wyatt, to his love on her refusal.*

The other passage is from *Shakespeare*: 1 *Part Hen. VI. Act i, sc. 2.*

“ Methinks your looks are sad, your cheere *appall'd*.”

Cheere is used here, as above, in the sense of face, cheek.

But Mr. Wedgwood's greatest fault is that he is carried away by his theory. This theory is that of Onomatopoeia, or the imitative character of language. According to this, man, in his primitive state, had at first no means of expressing his emotions except by gestures and inarticulate cries. He saw various animals; and though he could perceive their difference by his eye, he was unable to represent them, in their absence, either to himself or others. There was nothing to fix the conception. But at last he heard a voice, say the lowing of a cow. That cry was then the distinguishing feature of the object, and to bring before himself the idea of cow, all he had to do was to imitate its lowing. So with other animals, and so with the various objects above, around, or beneath him. He would be attracted by the perfume of a flower, would sniff up its fragrance, and after that would recall to himself the flower by a sound resembling *sniffing*. In process of time, derivatives would be formed, enough to express the different wants of his nature.

One of the objections to this view of the subject is that

it lowers too much the powers of man, in supposing that he was incapable himself of originating symbols of his ideas, and that he must learn his whole language, now so complex and various, from the cries of lower animals and the noises of nature; the whistling of the wind and the purling of the brook.

Thought and language are coincident. The child begins to talk as soon as it thinks. As soon as it perceives the separate existence of a mother, it calls her *num, num*, the first words which a child ever speaks. When man, then, commenced to think, and to think in reference to others, he began to speak. It is this in which man differs from beasts. They are incapable of expressing their thoughts by language, and use mere interjections of pain, joy, hunger, etc.: he thinks and speaks. Call it instinct if you will, it is a power peculiar to him; and it was as natural for him to speak as to move his arms. Dr. Steinthal well expresses the three principles which governed the production of language.<sup>1</sup> "I. At the origin of humanity the soul and the body were in such mutual dependence that all the emotions of the soul had their echo in the body, principally in the organs of respiration and the voice. This sympathy of soul and body, still found in the infant and the savage, was intimate and fruitful in the primitive man; each intuition awoke in him an accent or a sound. II. Another law, which played a no less essential part in the creation of language, was *the association of ideas*. In virtue of this law, the sound which accompanied an intuition associated itself in the soul with the intuition itself, so closely that the sound and intuition presented themselves to the consciousness as *inseparable*, and were equally inseparable in the recollection. III. Finally the sound became a *word* by forming a bond between the image obtained by perception, and the image present in the memory; in other words, *it acquired significance and became an element of language*. The image of the resemblance and the image of the perception are not

<sup>1</sup> H. Steinthal, *Der Ursprung der Sprache*; quoted from Farrar's *Origin of Language*, p. 45.



wholly identical; e. g. I see a horse; *no* other horse that I have ever seen resembles it absolutely in color, size, etc.; the general conception recalled by the word "horse" involves only the abstracted attributes common to all animals of the same genus. It is the collection of common attributes that constitutes the significance of the sound." It may be said that this does not exclude the theory that words were formed by imitation of sound. No; but it shows that it is not *necessary* for words to be so formed, and we think that the history of language and the facts of philology will show that few words have been actually formed in this manner.

Most etymologists are agreed in tracing language ultimately to a certain number of roots. As to what a root is, there are some differences of opinion, Mr. Wedgwood says, that "a root is merely a fiction of the grammarians to indicate the core of a group of related words having similar significations," having never had any independent existence. The root in this sense seems to be the consonantal sounds of a word; as *clb*, the root of *club*, modified to *clmp*, in *clump*. Max Müller,<sup>1</sup> however, says: we call *root* or *radical*, whatever, in the words of any language or family of languages, cannot be reduced to a simpler or more original form. Roots are either predicative or demonstrative. They are monosyllabic, and always contain a vowel. In this view the roots as such had a determinate meaning; and a word of new signification would be formed by the addition of one or more letters to the root, by a modification of one of the letters, or by a union of two or more roots. Inflections would be produced by the addition of a demonstrative to a predicative root. Now the Chinese vocabulary of from forty to fifty thousand words may be reduced to four hundred and fifty roots; the Hebrew to five hundred; and the Sanskrit does not require more.<sup>2</sup> It is also stated that two hundred and fifty roots are sufficient to supply the German with eighty thousand words. The demonstrative

<sup>1</sup> Science of Language, Am. ed., p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> Müller, p. 265.

roots are very few in number; and from their nature, being those which represent this, that, here, etc., cannot be imitative. The predicative roots, also, we would regard for the most part as original instinctive utterances. There was probably some reason, which, as yet, we have not reached, why one sound was better to express one idea than another. The explanation is probably to be gained, if gained at all, by a careful study of the modes of utterance, and by observation of the earliest attempts at speech in children. But there is this trouble, that we cannot ourselves remember our own experience, and it is very difficult to obtain anything with accuracy from watching others. This problem will, perhaps, always remain unsolved. It is these predicative roots which Mr. Wedgwood desires to prove are produced by imitation of sound. We will briefly state the different classes of words which he considers have their origin in this way.

1. Animal cries and sounds; as *chuck, croak, roar, neigh, low, purr*, etc. Hence come the names of animals.

2. Inarticulate human utterances, as *sob, sigh, moan, laugh, cough*, etc.

3. The collision and fracture of bodies of various degrees of hardness and resonance. Of hard bodies, represented by *p, t, k*, as *clap, tap, crack*: of softer bodies, by *b, d, g*, as *dab, thud, dag*: of resonance, by the liquids; as *clang, din, boom, knell*; sounds arising from the motion of the liquids and air, by sibilants; as *whirr, whizz, splash, dash*. "Modifications in the volume or pitch of the sound, depending on the size of the bodies in collision or vibration, are represented by a change of vowel; a sound of considerable volume being imitated by the vowels *a* or *o*, with a more open mouth and fuller voice, while notes of a high pitch are sounded with the thinner vowel *i*, into which the highest notes of the voice are necessarily moulded; e. g. *clank* and *clink*." Continuance is expressed either by reduplication of syllables, as in *murmur*, or by the addition of *r* or *l*, as in *grab, grapple, crack, crackle, clap, clatter*.

4. Words expressive of bodily and mental affections, as

of pain, terror, disgust; from various sounds used while experiencing those affections. Thus *ache*, from *ah*, the sound of pain. Words expressing silence are formed in a similar way, with the ellipsis of a negative, from the sounds *st*, *hush*, *mum*, etc.

Even if we allow all these words to be truly onomatopes, they are only words of occasional use, and not at all those which make up the strength and substance of the language. There are of course some words in all languages formed on this principle. But such words stand alone. They produce no derivatives, and are surrounded by no such numerous progeny as other roots are. To be sure, there are exceptions, but those only set the general fact in higher relief.<sup>1</sup> These are mostly words which mark nothing further than the mere sound imitated, its reality, or the means of producing it.<sup>2</sup> But the riches of a fully developed language are not seen in words of this sort. They are mere surface words. Such words are indeed desired in the vocabulary of poetry; but, as Heyse says,<sup>3</sup> "in this only so far as it has to do with a sensuous imitation of nature, which may be a concurring element in poetic representation, but in no wise its real object. For this is not imitation of nature, but representation of ideas. The original language may have been richer in them, just as the speech of children is; but as soon as the spirit looks deeper into the nature of things, it despises more and more this rough imitation of nature, and begins to name objects by deeper-lying, more significant marks.

<sup>1</sup> The word *mystery* is, perhaps, one of these exceptions. Gr. *μυστήριον*, a *mystery*, from *μύστης*, one initiated, from *μύειν*, to initiate, from *μύειν*, to shut the eyes or mouth. The root is *μύ*, *μῦ*, naturally pronounced by closing the lips.

<sup>2</sup> We do not believe that a person of ordinary intelligence, on hearing for the first time one of these words, could have any idea of the sound it was intended to express. With Mr. Wedgwood the case is different. He has been blessed with an exceedingly delicate ear, and is able to distinguish with the most seeming accuracy between the sound made by a sharp-pointed instrument on a soft body, and that made by a dull instrument on a hard body; between the sound made by the flat of the hand on a partition wall, and by the clenched hand against a yielding body; of a round, heavy body falling into the water, and of the fall of a mass of irregular shape.

<sup>3</sup> *System der Sprachwissenschaft*, p. 92.

Words of this sort bear a very small proportion to the number of words in a language. Mr. Wedgwood, however, could carry his principle of formation still further. He tries to prove that some of our commonest ideas are gained in this way. He says: "after thus tracing the expression of ideas like endurance or continuance, and even of silence itself, to an imitative root, we need not doubt the possibility of expressing any other idea on the same principle."

The word on which he relies, as showing the origin of continuance, is *abide*. "The effect of complete absorption in an object, whether from sudden astonishment or intent observation, is marked by involuntary opening of the mouth, arising from the relaxation of all the muscles of the face not exerted in a steady gaze. The interjection of wonder, then, is formed from a repetition of the syllable *ba! ba!* mechanically uttered through the parting lips; Gr. *βαβα!* Lat. *babae! papae!* The original force of this syllable is seen in the O. Fr. *baer, baier*, modern *béer*, to open the mouth, to gape, then to be intent upon anything. Hence the O. Eng. *abeyance*, expectation, *aby*, to expect, endure, remain. The insertion of a *d* to avoid the hiatus ('the *d* being in ancient Latin the regular stop-gap of the hiatus'),<sup>1</sup> gives us the Pr. *badar*, to gape, to open; It. *badare*, to be intent upon, to desire, wait. From It. *badare*, we are led through Goth. *beidan*, to expect, look out for, endure; O. Ger. *bitan, arbitan*; A. S. *bidan, abidan*, to Eng. *bide, abide*." The etymology proposed for the Romanic words is indeed possible; but it is scarcely credible that the Northern words came from them. We have the Goth. *beidan*, to wait; *baidjan*, to compel; O. H. Ger. *bitan*, to expect, endure, *beitōn*, to endure; *peitten*, to delay, force, urge; M. H. Ger. *biten*, to tarry; Icel. *bidha*, Sw. *vida*, Dan. *bie*, to wait, Eng. *bide, abide*. There is no idea of astonishment conveyed in any of these words; on the contrary, one of compulsion, so that, as Diefenbach suggests, they may be connected with Skr. *bādh*, to vex. It is noticeable, as Mr. Marsh remarks

<sup>1</sup> A labial would seem more likely to be a stop-gap than a lingual.

in a note, that the vowel in all of these words is not the *a* of involuntary utterance, but the closer *i*. The *d*, also, seems part of the root, and not a subsequent addition, for Dan. *bie* is plainly a later form. It is impossible to prove an historical development of the Italian into the Gothic,<sup>1</sup> while the Romanic words might have been formed from these, with the meaning, first, to wait, then to gape while waiting, etc., like *amuse*. Whether then our author has proved that the idea of continuance is from an imitative root, let the reader judge.

Many words are imitative only in appearance. Many seem to convey to imaginative minds a shadow of their sense, but only because we have got sound and sense so thoroughly identified, that any sound nearly like that of the word will call before our minds the idea represented. One acquainted with the poetry of Tennyson can easily see how words can be made to represent a sound with which they have not the slightest connection. From many words which seem to be onomatopoeic this appearance will wear off on a deeper inquiry into their origin. *Thunder* is often cited as an imitative word. But *thunder*, Ger. *donner*, O. H. Ger. *donar*, which seems to show a rolling, rumbling noise, is the Lat. *tonitru*, Skr. *tanyatu*, and derived from the root *tan*, Gr. *τελευν*, to stretch, whence come *τόνος*, *tone*, and also such words as Lat. *tenuis*, Eng. *thin* and *tender*.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Wedgwood says that the word *cat*, Ger. *katze*, is probably derived from the sound a cat makes in spitting. Yet in the Ger. *kater*, Eng. *cat* and *kitten*, there is no such sound, and in not a single language, from the Arabic to the Icelandic, except the Ger. *katze* (with perhaps the Finn. *kassi*, given by Mr. Wedgwood), does the sibilant occur.

The sum of the whole matter is happily expressed by Müller:<sup>3</sup> "Most of these onomatopoeias vanish as soon as

<sup>1</sup> We are a little surprised that Mr. Wedgwood did not try to derive the verb *drink* from the tinkling sound seen in Fr. *trinquier*, It. *trincare*, to touch glasses, to tittle, to drink. The analogy is just as obvious as in *bide*.

<sup>2</sup> Heyse, Sprachwissenschaft, p. 93. Müller, Science of Language, p. 364.

<sup>3</sup> Science of Language, p. 365.

we trace our own names back to Anglo-Saxon and Gothic, or compare them with their cognates in Greek, Latin, or Sanskrit. The number of names which are really formed by an imitation of sound, dwindle down to a very small quatum, if cross-examined by the comparative philologist; and we are left, in the end, with the conviction, that though a language might have been made out of the roaring, fizzing, hissing, gobbling, twittering, cracking, banging, slamming, and rattling sounds of nature, the tongues with which we are acquainted point to a different origin."

But, whatever may be the merits of this theory, it has been carried much too far in the volume before us. We will give here a few examples of evident errors into which Mr. Wedgwood has fallen while following the devious path of this ignis fatuus.

*Blind*, Mr. Wedgwood connects with *blink*. From *blink*, Ger. *blicken*, we have Ger. *blitz*, a flash, lightning; then by insertion of a nasal, *blinzen*, to twinkle, and by dropping the final syllable we get Scot. *blent*, a glance; Dan. *blende*, to dazzle; Du. *blindsele*, to be blind; Eng. *blind*. "The origin of *blind* would thus be the figure of blinking under a strong light." "Nor ought it," says he, "to startle us to find the simple form of a word derived from a frequentative. . . .

Words aiming at the direct representation of natural sounds are apt to appear in the first instance in the frequentative form." Strange reasoning this. As if it did not remain to be proved that the word does aim at the representation of a natural sound. He cites as another example of this the word *blend*. "This word represents," he says, "the sound made by the agitation of liquids. Swab. *blotzen*, to churn; *plotzen*, *plonsen*, to plunge; *blonssen*, to dabble in water; Eng. *bluther*, *bludder*, to make a noise with the mouth in taking any liquid; *blunder*, to stir up water. Hence Eng. *blend*, A. S. *blendian*, to mix." Now Grimm and Diefenbach show that both *blind* and *blend* come from a stronger form, Icel. Sw. *blanda*, Icel. Dan. *blende*, to mix; hence *blind*, mixed, muddy, dark, blind, which therefore has no connection with the Ger. *blicken*, to look. From the same come

also *blunder*, and *blunt*, which latter Mr. Wedgwood would have represent another sound, viz. that of a round heavy body falling into the water, connected with Eng. *plump*, Du. *plotzen*, *plonsen*, *plompen*.

*Brilliant* is classed by our author with *bright*, both of which he derives from one of his favorite roots *br*. This root, in which *b* interchanges with *g*, and *r* with *l*, represents a sudden noise; and then, by transfer from the ear to the eye, a flash of light. Now we have in French the verbs *grisser*, to creak, crackle, *gresiller*, *grister*, *griller*, to crackle as meat in broiling; also *brasiller*, *brusler*, *bruler*, It. *brasciare*, Eng. *broil*. "In the Fr. *breziller*, *briller*, the meaning is transferred from the domain of the ear to that of the eye, from the analogous effect produced on the sensitive frame by a crackling noise and a sparkling light." Let us see if we can find assistance elsewhere. Diez gives an It. *brillare*, Sp. Pr. *brillar*, Fr. *briller*, to shine, sparkle, which he deduces from the Lat. *beryllus*, beryl, It. *berillo* (in the dialect of Parma, *brill*). Compare also the Ger. *brill*, beryl, and *brille*, beryl, crystal, spectacles. *Beryllus*, Gr. *βήρυλλος*, is a stone of a sea-green color, used also as a general name for crystal. *Brilliant*, then, is shining, sparkling like a crystal, and we almost revert to the original signification when we speak of a diamond ring as a ring set with brilliants.

*Caprice* is another word falsely derived from an idea of signification in the sound. *Caprice*, Fr. *caprice*, It. *capriccio*, is usually and most probably derived from It. *capra*, Lat. *caper*, a goat; and like Eng. *caper* it meant originally a jump, leap, fantastic action, as of a goat. The former is generally used of mental, the latter of bodily action. Mr. Wedgwood looks for the origin of the word in an entirely different direction. He says: "The connection between the sound and the movement of the sonorous medium is so apparent, that the terms expressing modifications of the one are frequently transferred to the other subject. Thus we speak of sound *vibrating* in the ears; of a *tremulous* sound, for one in which there is a quick succession of vary-

ing impressions on the ear. The words by which we represent a sound of such a nature are then applied to signify trembling or shivering action." Various examples are adduced to prove this, — Gr. *φρίσσειν*, Fr. *frisser*, It. *brisciare*, Fr. *grisser*, etc. "We then find symptoms of shivering, chattering of the teeth, etc., employed to express a passionate longing for a thing, as in Sophocles' *ἐφριξ' ἐπαυ*, I have shivered with love." The whole argument is here built on the termination, as in *blind* on the so-called frequentative ending. The first syllable is entirely disregarded. He makes the same mistake in one of the examples which he cites in confirmation, viz. Lat. *ericius*, a hedgehog, It. *riccio*, hedgehog, prickly husk of a chestnut. *Ericius* is a diminutive of *er*, Gr. *χίρ*, related perhaps, to *χοῖρος*, a pig (though Curtius doubts it), and contains no idea of shivering.

The same is again exemplified in our author's treatment of *catch*. This he rightly identifies with *chase*, Fr. *chasser*, It. *cacciare*, but goes on thus: "The origin of this word is the imitation of the sound of a smart blow by the syllable *clatch!* passing on the one hand into *catch*, and on the other into *latch*, by the loss of the *l* and *c* respectively. Ger. *klatsch!* thwick-thwack! a word to imitate the sound made by striking with the hand against a partition wall; *klatsch*, such a sound or the stroke which produces it, a clap, flap; *klatsche*, a whip or lash. . . . . In the sense of seizing an object, the term *catch* is to be explained as clapping one's hand upon it, snatching it with a smack, in the same way that we speak of *catching* one a box on the ear." But how easily is this word traced to the Latin, where we lose sight of all similarity of sound. N. Fr. *chasser*, O. Fr. *cachier*, *cacher*, *chacher*, Pr. *cassar*, Sp. Pg. *cazar*, Lat. *captiare* for *captare*, to catch, chase, an intensive form of *capere*, to take.

We will give yet one more example to show how, led by his theory, Mr. Wedgwood has overlooked what was plain in sight, and wandered off into absurdities. Under the word *drill* he cites as an equivalent the Du. *drillen*, *trillen*,



to tremble, move quickly, whirl, turn about, bore. "The primary signification is to shake, to move to and fro; then, as vibration and revolution are characterized by the same rapid changes of direction, to move round and round, and thence to bore a hole. The Du. *drillen* was especially applied to the brandishing of weapons, . . . . hence *drillen*, as a factitive verb, to *drill* soldiers, to make them go through their exercise." But is not *drill* in this sense a tropical use, much as we say, to *bore* one, to put a thing *through*. For the source of the word, Mr. Wedgwood falls back on his old root, *br*, *gr*, this time modified into *dr* or *tr*. "The origin is seen in Fr. *dredré*, the chattering of the teeth; *dridriller*, *dridiller*, to jingle, as hawks' or mules' bells; Gael. *driethlich*, Fr. *driller*, to twinkle, glitter; the notion of chattering, quavering, trembling, shaking, glittering, being commonly expressed by modifications of the same root. . . . . The senses of shivering, turning round, piercing, are also found united in *thrill*, *thirl*, which must be classed with *drill* as mere differences of spelling. A *thrill* of emotion is a shiver or shudder of nervous excitement. Icel. *thirla*, circumagere; Eng. *thirlpool*, for whirlpool; A. S. *thyrlian*, to pierce; *thyrel*, O. Du. *drille*, a hole; Icel. *thirl*, a whirl for milling milk; Ger. *zwirl*, a tool for drilling holes; Du. *dwarlen*, to whirl; Eng. *twirl*." Now by reversing a part of the above process, we will come nearer the truth. Connected with *drill* we have the Du. Ger. *drillen*, Dan. *drille*, Sw. *drilla*; also A. S. *thyrlian*. This is plainly derived from *thyrl*, *thyrl*, bored or pierced through, a hole; O. H. Ger. *durhil*, *durihil*, bored through, from *durh*, *durah*, *durih*, N. H. Ger. *durch*, A. S. *thurh*, through. The original signification is then to pierce, bore; and, as in the act of boring, a rotary motion is usually given to the instrument, the various meanings of the Du. *drillen* have their rise. *Thrill* is the same as *drill*, to bore, to pierce, as with something sharp; hence to cause a tingling sensation, and to experience such a sensation.

We will now adduce some miscellaneous examples, taken almost at random, as specimens of the manner in which the work is written.

*Accoutre.* "From the Fr. *accoutrer*, formerly *accoustrer*, to equip with the habiliments of some special office or occupation,—an act, of which in catholic countries the frequent change of vestments at appointed periods of the church service, would afford a striking and familiar example. Now the person who had charge of the vestments in a catholic church, was the sacristan; in Lat. *custos sacrorum*, or *ecclesiae* (barbarously rendered *custring*, when the office was filled by a woman), in O. Fr. *cousteur* or *coustre*, *coutre*; Ger. *küster*, the sacristan or vestry-keeper. The original meaning of *accoutrer* would thus be to perform the office of sacristan to a priest, to invest him with the habiliments of his office; afterwards to invest with the proper habiliments of any other occupation." The Fr. *accoutrer*, O. Fr. *accoustrer*, comes much more easily and naturally from *ac* for Lat. *ad* and Fr. *cousture*, *couture*, It. *costura*, a seam, sewing. This is from Fr. *coudre*, part. *cousu*, Pr. *cóser*, *cusir*, Sp. *cosér*, *cusir*, It. *cucire*, to sew, Lat. *consuere*; *con*, together, and *suere*, to sew. *Accoutre* then, is to array a person by putting on him *sewed* things, or garments,—the real, primitive sense.

*Amerce.* Mr. Wedgwood follows Bailey in calling an *amercement* a pecuniary penalty imposed upon offenders at the *mercy* of the court, and cites in illustration the Law Latin *poni in misericordia*. *Amerce*, Fr. *amercier*, L. Lat. *amerciare*, is to impose a fine, require amends, from Lat. *merces*, *mercedis*, hire, wages, reward, penalty. Indeed, this is the source of *mercy* also, as seen in O. Fr. *mercit*, Sp. *merced*, It. *mercè*. The Lat. *merces* came, in the Middle Ages, to be equivalent to *misericordia*, pity, our *mercy*<sup>1</sup>; and the phrase to be amerced or be in mercy, was translated into the Latin of the courts as *poni in misericordia*.

*Arrant.* "Connected," says Wedgwood, "with Ger. *arg*, bad of its kind, great, exaggerated; *ein arger Schelm*, an arch rogue. A. S. *earg*, timid, evil, wretched; O. Eng. *arwe*, arrant. The termination *ant* is probably from the Low Ger. inflection *en*." The common derivation of this

<sup>1</sup> See Blackstone's Comm., Book III. App. p. xxv.

word, from Lat. *errare*, to err, to wander, is undoubtedly the true one. The word was first applied to vagabonds, and then to rascals of any description. Accordingly we find the spelling in Old English to be *erraunt*, *errant*, *errand*.

“An outlawe, or else a thefe erraunt.”

Chaucer, *The Manciples Tale*, v. 17173.

“That errand traitor, Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, upon the scaffold.” — *Bp. Gardner, True Obedience. Translator to the reader.*

“And made Edward, from an errant rake, become a fine gentleman.” — *Tatler*, No. 9.

*Bastard*, according to this work, is “apparently of Celtic origin, from Gael. *baos*, lust, fornication. O. Fr. *filz de bast*, *filz de bas*.” We have also Fr. *bâtard*, Pr. *bastart*, It. Sp. Pg. *bastardo*. The best explanation of the word is that furnished by Mahn,<sup>1</sup> and approved by Diez. He derives it from O. Fr. and Pr. *bast*. N. Fr. *bât*, Sp. It. *basto*, a pack-saddle, with the termination *ard* or *art*. The muleteers of Provence and Spain used their saddles for beds in the inns; and hence the O. Fr. *filz de bast*, son of a pack-saddle, and the O. Eng. *born in bast*, were used in distinction from legitimate children born in the marriage bed. See an example in *Don Quixote*, c. 16. The etymology is similar to that of *bantling*, Ger. *bänkling*, *bankert*, from *bank*, bench.

*Bilboes*, an instrument of punishment among sailors, is from *Bilboa* in Spain, where they were largely made. Great quantities of them are said to have been found on board the Spanish Armada. It is not, as the author states, from Du. *boeye*, Lat. *boja*, a fetter, shackle.

*Black*, — *Bleak*. “The original meaning of the word *black* seems to be pale. Then as a pale complexion takes a bluish tint, the designation has passed on to mark the darker colors of the spectrum, and finally, in Eng. *black*, a total absence of color.” These two words do indeed come from the same root, but not at all in the way supposed by Mr. Wedgwood. Under the same letters, the A. S. *blac* contains two words, which should be accented in different

<sup>1</sup> Dr. C. A. F. Mahn, *Etymologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Romanischen Sprachen*, p. 17.

ways ; *blác*, black, ink, and *blác*, pale. *Bleak*, A. S. *blác*, is the O. Sax. *bléc*, Icel. *bleikr*, Sw. *blek*, Dan. *bleg*, Du. *bleck*, O. H. Ger. *pleih*, N. H. Ger. *bleich*, pale. The O. H. Ger. *pleih* is formed directly from *plíchan*, to shine, Icel. *blika* ; whence N. H. Ger. *blicken*, to shine, *bleichen*, to be pale, A. S. *blican*, to shine, *blaecan*, *blaecean*, to whiten, *bleach*. From Ger. *blicken*, by the insertion of a nasal, we have *blínken*, to twinkle, to blink, and *blank*, Eng. *blank* : also, from the same root *blech*, tin, and *blitz*, lightning. The O. H. Ger. *plíchan* is further connected with the Lat. *fulgere*, to shine, *flagrare* to burn, Gr. *φλέγειν*, *φέγγειν*, Skr. *bhrádsch* (*bhrág'*). *Black*, on the other hand, comes from A. S. *blác*, Icel. *blakkr*, Dan. *blak*, Sw. *black* ; also, A. S. *black*, ink, Icel. *blek*, Dan. *blák*, Sw. *bläck*, O. H. Ger. *plah*, L. Ger. *black*. With these words is connected the L. Ger. and Dan. *blaken*, to burn with a black smoke, which also, in its turn, is connected with the Gr. *φλέγειν*. *Black*, then, would signify the blackening, charring effect of a blaze on the thing burned ; *black*, *bleak*, and *blink*, the dazzling, shining appearance of the blaze itself.

Our author connects, singularly enough, the words *cable*, *calibre*, *caliver*, *capstan*, and *carbine*. He deduces them all from It. Sp. *cabre*, *capra*, Lat. *caper*, a goat. The name *goat* was applied, he says, to battering rams, and thence to other warlike machines, especially those for throwing heavy stones. From this we have the O. Fr. *calabre*, a military engine. This name, on the invention of fire-arms, was transferred to a kind of cannon ; hence come *carbine*, and *caliver*, from which last *calibre*, the bore or diameter of a piece, is derived. From the sense of a projectile engine, the designation was early transferred to the strong rope by which the strain of such an engine was exerted. Hence we have *cable*, Fr. *cáble*. So also the name of the projectile engine was applied to a machine for raising heavy weights or exerting a heavy pull. This is seen in Sp. *cabestrante*, Eng. *capstan*. The only fault in these etymologies is that they are all historically incorrect. *Carbine* comes, it is true, from the O. Fr. *calabre*, but that, as seen in the contracted form

*caable*, is for *cadable*, Lat. *cadabulum*, evidently from Gr. *καταβολή*, a throwing down. *Calibre* is either from *qua libra*, referring to the size of the bullet, or from the Ar. *qalib*, mould or model. *Caliver*, as Marsh shows in his note, was taken from *calibre*, and not the reverse. *Cable*, Fr. *câble*, Sp. Pg. *cable*, It. *cappio*, is from the Low Lat. *capulum*, a rope, seen in Isidore, from *capere*, to take, hold, and finally, *capstan* comes from the same verb, through the Sp. *cabestrante*, capstan, *cabestrare*, to bind, especially with a halter, *cabestro*, a halter, chain, Lat. *capistrum*, a halter, band.

*Cinder*. A. S. *sinder*, is not connected with Fr. *endre*, Lat. *cinis*, ashes, although its spelling was influenced by it. The A. S. *sinder* is dross, scoria, from *sinder*, *synder*, separate, asunder; referring especially to the scales struck off from red-hot iron by the blacksmith.

*Crab* Mr. Wedgwood connects with *grab*, as the pinching animal. He considers it one of a series of words — such as *cramp*, *grab*, *clamp*, *club*, etc. — of which the radical idea was a lump or thick mass, from whence the notion of sticking together, contracting, compressing, was derived. Now *Crab*, A. S. *crabbe*, Ger. *krebs*, L. Ger. Dan. *krabbe*, is the same as the Lat. *carabus*, Gr. *κάραβος*, a crab, and a beetle, Lat. *scarabaeus*, Skr. *ṣarabha*, a locust. This is from the root *ṣar*, *char*, *kal*, to go; and *crab* is simply a walking animal.

*Cress*, A. S. *cerse*, *cürse*, Du. *kers*, Ger. *kresse*, is not from “the crunching sound of eating the crisp green herb,” but from O. H. Ger. *kresan*, to creep.

The word *divan*, Mr. Wedgwood has evidently not examined. He merely says: “The raised bench or cushion at the upper end of a Turkish room on which the principal persons sit; hence, as a council or court of justice.” The signification of a seat is the last one in the historical development of the word. The origin is the Persian *divân*, a book containing many leaves, a collection of writings, especially poems (compare Goethe’s “West-östlicher Divan”), an account-book, a register; then, a council, senate, board of accounts, custom-house (in Fr. *douane*, It. *dogana*); next,

a council-chamber ; and finally, the seats round the wall of such a room — any raised seat.

*Dock*, a basin for ships, he explains “through the notion of stopping up, hemming in, confining. The Ger. *docke*, signifying primarily a bunch, is applied to the tap by which the water of a fish-pond is kept in or let off. Hence the name seems to have been transferred to a naval dock, the essential provision of which is, the power of keeping in or shutting out the water by an analogous contrivance, though on a greatly magnified scale.” It can hardly be doubted that the Northern words corresponding to *dock* (Du. *dok*, Dan. *docke*, Sw. *docka*, Ger. *dock*, *docke*) are of comparatively modern origin, for they are not found in the older languages, not even the Middle High German ; and they are probably identical with L. Lat. *doga*, *doha*, *dova*, a ditch, It. Pr. *doga*, O. Fr. *douhe*, N. Fr. *douve*. All these come from the Lat. *doga*, a sort of vessel, Gr. *δοχή*, *δοχείον*, a receptacle, from *δέχεσθαι*, to receive.

In looking through this volume, we have found history distorted, and all rules of sound criticism violated ; and in closing it, we must express our regret that the Philological Society, in whose Journal much of it was originally published, should have so far committed itself as to entrust to Mr. Wedgwood the supervision of the etymological part of their New Dictionary ; for, to judge from the present specimen, it will neither be a credit to English scholarship,<sup>1</sup> nor an aid to English students.

The American edition is enlarged by Notes by Mr. George P. Marsh ; which, in our opinion, do not add materially to the value of the work. It is probable that the republishers merely wished for the name of this distinguished scholar to assist the sale. Mr. Marsh must have seen that to comment adequately upon the work would be, in fact, to rewrite it. A few of his notes are interesting and valuable, and to some of these we have previously referred. We wish that we had space left us to insert his able refuta-

---

<sup>1</sup> The Greek throughout is printed without accents.

tion of the author's ridiculous derivation of the words *better*, *boot*, *bait*, and *abet*, from *bet!* *bet!* a huntsman's cry to the dogs. But often the notes are too long and too wandering; as those on *amber* and *anneal*, and that on *main*, under the word *cablish*, which should have waited for the second volume. The disquisition on *at* would be much more in place in an English grammar, or in Mr. Marsh's own "Lectures." Although the annotator does not thoroughly espouse Mr. Wedgwood's theory, he is occasionally led into similar mistakes. He does not hold to the derivation of *brick*, from the Lat. *imbrex*, a gutter tile, which he propounded in his "Lectures"; but we see that he still thinks that *commodore* comes from the Pg. *capitão mór*, chief captain. Now it is possible that *commodore* might be corrupted from Fr. *commandeur*, Pg. *commendador*, It. *commendatore*; but in *capitão mór* the similarity consists only in the first and the last letters. We are almost tempted to exclaim with Cotta: "In enodandis autem nominibus quod miserandum sit laboratis? . . . quamquam, quoniam Neptunum a nando appellatum putas, nullum erit nomen, quod non possis una littera explicare unde dictum sit."

Sometimes, too, Mr. Marsh forgets his own rule about historical derivations, and tells us that *admiral* came into the language of Europe through the Byzantine Greek *ἀμυραῖος*, which occurs in Theophanes Isaurus, who lived from 758 A. D. to 815 A. D. Du Cange asserts that it came directly from the Moors, through the Sicilians and Genoese; and he cites *amiratus*, from the Vita Carol. Mag. A. D. 801.

With regard to *apricot*, Mr. Marsh says: "The apricot, as we know from Pliny, N. H. l. xv. c. 12, was introduced into Italy in the time of that writer, and there is no doubt that it came to Rome from Armenia. It is now called *bar-kuk* in Persian, and the same name is given to a species of plum by the Arabs. These nations would not have borrowed the name of a native fruit from the Romans, and *apricot*, supposed to be from the Latin *præcox*, because the fruit ripened earlier than the common peach, with which it

was confounded, is probably a case of accommodation from the Oriental *barkuk*." Now it is true that our *apricot*, O. Eng. and Fr. *abricot*, comes from the Arabic *al-birquq*, through the Sp. *albaricoque*, Pg. *albricoque*, It. *albercocco*. But the Arabic, in its turn, is derived from the Lat. *praecox*, *praecocia*, through the Greek of Dioscorides, who says, 1. 165, τὰ μῆλα ἀρμηνιακά, Ῥωμαῖστί δὲ πραικόκκια. Dioscorides's treatise on *Materia Medica* was, as is well known, translated into Arabic, and was the chief authority in their schools. Through this the Arabians gained many words, and among them this.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

#### THE STATE AND SLAVERY.

BY PROF. E. P. BARROWS, ANDOVER, MASS.

THE treatment received by the man who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among robbers, too truly represents the fate that has overtaken the question of American slavery. It has fallen into the hands of partisan politicians, and been made by them a powerful engine for the advancement of sectional interests, while the true welfare of the nation as a whole, and of the slaveholding states in particular, has been forgotten. This was not always so. It is well known that the patriots of the revolution, both North and South, regarded slavery as a great evil, and earnestly desired its extinction.

"Slavery has been opposed by eminent men in America from the beginning. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Franklin, Jay, Hamilton, and many more of those who took a conspicuous part in laying the foundations of the government, regarded slavery as a great evil, inconsistent with the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the spirit of Christianity. They confidently expected that it would gradually pass away before the advancing power of civilization and freedom; and, shrinking