

In concurrence with, and in the phrase of, the ablest of modern essayists, "We wish the greatest genius on earth, whoever he may be, might write an inscription for this great statesman's monument to express in the most strenuous of all possible modes of thought and utterance, the truth and the warning that no person will ever be accepted to serve mankind in the highest departments of utility, without an eminence of virtue which can sustain him in the noble defiance, 'Which of you convicts me of sin.'"

ARTICLE IV.

THE DERIVATION OF UNQUAM, USQUAM, AND USQUE.

BY PROF. LEMUEL S. POTWIN, WESTERN RESERVE COLLEGE, HUDSON, OHIO.

THE derivation of *Unquam* from *unus* and *quam*, given in Andrews' Latin Dictionary, and even in White and Riddle's, is probably satisfactory to no one. Such a use of *unus* is without example, and if admitted would only explain the form *unquam*, leaving the other form *umquam* inexplicable; while, as to the *meaning* of the word, neither *unus* nor *quam* contains the idea of *time*, which is fundamental to *unquam*.

In seeking for the origin of *unquam*, or *umquam* (from which the former comes by euphony), the first suggestion from its *form* would be that it comes from some interrogative or relative word, by the addition of *quam*. This suggestion, which, indeed, at the outset, amounts to evidence from analogy, arises from such familiar words as these: *quis-quam*, *uti-quam*, *uti-que*, *ubi-que*, *undi-que*. It is to be specially noted that in several words of this class the initial *k* sound has been lost, as is proved by the forms, *ali-cubi*, *ali-cunde*, *unde-cunde*. There can be no doubt, also, that *uti* arises from *cuti*. In the light of these examples then, *um-quam* appears to be a changed form of *cum-quam*, or *quum-quam*.

Let us turn now to the *meaning* of *umquam*. *Quis-quam*

means *any one at all*. How it comes to mean this is not essential to our present inquiry; but we may observe, in passing, how often an interrogative, by being closely connected with an enclitic or a prefix, becomes an indefinite, as in *siquis, nequis, numquis, ecquis, aliquis, quispiam, quisque*, and that *quam* passes readily from the idea of *manner* to that of amount and degree, as in *quam multi, quamdiu*. Thus *quisquam* would mean *any-as-much-as*, or *just any*, and in implied negative connection *any at all*. But whatever be the process, the result is that *quisquam* means *any one at all*, and is used in negative and exclusive sentences. Let us try this as our guide in interpreting *umquam*. *Cum-quam* would mean *at any time at all*, and would be used in negative and exclusive sentences. Such, precisely, is the meaning, and such is the use of *umquam*.

But, if this derivation is correct, why do we not find the form *um*? The answer is easy. First, we could not expect to have both *cum* and *um*, meaning the same thing, any more than *cubi* and *ubi*. Secondly, if two forms of *cum* were required, for a distribution of meaning, and either consonant should give way, it would be the weaker. Now every reader of Latin verse knows that *m* final is weak. Mr. Roby says, without special reference to poetry, "At the end of words it appears to have been scarcely audible" (Gram. p. 27), *cum*, then, if it were to be reduced to one consonant would be, not *um*, but *que*. In fact, we can see that the weakness of *m* has preserved the initial *c*—the *um* being too weak to stand alone—for as soon as *cum* is strengthened by *quam*, its *c* falls away, and it follows in the path of *ut, ubi, and unde*.

But why, then, do we not have *umque* instead of *cumque*? Because *cumque*, by itself, is little used, and thus the *c* is rarely initial, although it is often preceded by a vowel, as in *quicumque, ubicumque, undecumque, quocumque*. In similar circumstances we find the *c* in *alicubi, alicunde, necubi, necunde*.

Every consideration, then, of both form and meaning

points to *quum-quam*, and the root of *quis*, as the origin of *unquam*.

The derivation of *Usquam* is not so obvious, but the method employed in investigating *unquam* can hardly fail to guide us aright. Assuming that *usquam* comes from some interrogative, its meaning at once directs us to *ubi*; for *usquam* means *at any place at all*, and is used in the same kind of sentences as *quis quam* and *unquam*. This presumption is strengthened by the fact that we never meet with the form *ubiquam*, while we have in *usquam* precisely the notion that *ubiquam* would regularly express. The case at this point seems so strong that one is inclined to say that somehow the word *must* come from *ubi*, even if the form is without analogy. But analogies are not lacking. Notice the forms in composition, of the three Latin prepositions that end in *b*—*ab*, *ob*, *sub*—when they come before *c*, *q*, *p*, *t*. From *ab* we have *abs-que*, and, with the *b* dropped, *as-pello*, *as-porto*. From *ob*, *obs-trudo*, *os-tendo*. From *sub*, *subs-cus*, *sus-cipio*, *sus-que*. Nothing is wanting to complete the analogy, unless one makes a point of the final vowel of *ubi*. But all these prepositions have in Sanskrit and Greek, final vowels; and the two forms *uti* and *ut* at once suggest the form *ub* as possible. But it is not necessary to suppose the existence of this separate form. The final vowel of *ubi* is variable in quantity. Long in *ubique*, it is short in *ubivis*. If we suppose it to be short in *ubiquam*, we see that the unaccented *i* would easily drop out and *ub-quam* become *ubs-quam* and *us-quam*. We find an almost exact parallel in the different forms of the name of the Oscan people, *Opici*, *Opsci*, *Obsci*, *Osci*.¹

¹ This fatal fondness of *b* for *s* may possibly explain some other words, whose etymology is as yet unsettled, e.g. *Luscinia*. Its form would be reasonably satisfied by coming from *lub-et* and *cano*, and the meaning would then be the *pleasure-singer*, or *passionate-singer*. But can it not be harmonized with the words *luscus* and *luscitiosus*? Perhaps the key to these last two is found in *nuscitiosus*. This means *night-seeing*, and implies two other words *nuscitia* and *nuscus*. But *luscitiosus* also means the same, and through *luscitio* comes from *luscus*. This gives the suggestion of two forms of the same word, *nuscus* and *luscus*. Some plausibility is given to this by the words *λύμφη*, and *λύμφη*. If

We conclude, then, that both the form and meaning of *usquam* indicate its derivation from *ubi* (*cu-bi, quo-bi*), and ultimately from the root of *quis*.

Passing to *Usque* we can apply to it all that has just been said on the first syllable of *usquam*. Indeed, we are shut up to a derivation from *ubi*, for we have the weighty example of *usquam* itself, in addition to all the others; and we have no examples pointing to a different origin.

Let us pass, then, to the meaning of *usque*. Taking *quis-que* for our guide, as before we took *quis-quam*, we should expect to find that *u(b)s-que* means *in each, or every, place*; and its use should not be confined to negative or exclusive sentences. That this approaches the meaning of *usque* is apparent, but it is *exactly* the meaning of *ubique*. Now it is not difficult to see that the actual meanings of *usque* have arisen from a *distribution* of senses which might all have remained under *ubique*. In the first place, it would be natural that *ubique*, as *ubi*, should have a secondary meaning of *time*, but it does not, this meaning being wholly transferred to *usque*. In the next place, the local and primary meaning of *ubique* would naturally, in connection with prepositions of motion, as *ad* and *in*, pass from simply *everywhere* to *all the way*; and this meaning also is transferred to *usque*. *Ubique*, therefore, and *usque* are complementary derivatives. They together fulfil all the requisitions of a derivative from *ubi* by an appended *que*. Moreover, as to the double form, we find the key in the variable quantity of the *i* of *ubi*. Remaining long it acquires the accent and keeps the form in full, *ubique*. Losing both length and accent it leaves the form to drift to *usque*.

this is so, *luscus*, *l* being weaker than *n*, must come from *nuscus*, and we are led to *nub-ere* as containing the root. *Lus-cus* would mean the *covered* or *veiled* one, then as a secondary meaning, *one-eyed*, and *lus- (nus-) cinia* would mean the *veiled singer*, or one that, as Milton has it, "Sings *darkling*, and in shadiest covert hid Tunes her nocturnal note." This would not make *luscinia* come from *luscus*, but from the root *nub*, common to both, and *cano*, the ambiguous form in *-inus*, *luscinus*, being responsible for some confusion as to the origin of the words.

In discussing these three words almost no reference has been made to other languages, because the changes have obviously gone on within the Latin itself. They are strictly *res domesticæ*. In such subordinate branches of etymology each language should be allowed to mind its own business.

ARTICLE V.

COTTON MATHER AND THE WITCHCRAFT DELUSION.

BY PROF. R. D. C. ROBBINS, NEWTON HIGHLANDS, MASS.

The Views of Cotton Mather and his Age concerning Unseen and Spiritual Agency.

BEFORE proceeding to the direct investigation of Cotton Mather's connection with witchcraft, for which he has been so severely censured, and his name been made a synonyme for all that is harsh and unloving, it seems appropriate to examine briefly his views of the influence of unseen agents in moulding the destiny of human beings. And in doing this, it may not be amiss to bear in mind now what we shall have occasion more than once to refer to, that his belief was substantially that of the best and most intelligent men of his age in this country, and to a great extent that of the most religiously inclined in England.

In the education of his children he dwelt much upon the presence and influence of good angels, "who love them, help them, guard them from evil, and do many good offices for them; who likewise take a very diligent notice of them, and ought not in any way to be disobliged." In reference to evil angels, his kindness of nature took precedence of his theology, for he did not say much about them, his son says, lest his children should be haunted by "frightful fancies" and "apparitions of devils." Still, "he would not have them ignorant that there are devils who tempt them to wickedness, who are glad when they do wickedly, and who may get leave of God to kill them for it."