

INTRODUCTION.

aining the real origin or true orthography which cannot be ascertained by analysis. But doubtless many changes have taken place of which the evidence is uncertain: the chain which might conduct us to the original orthography being broken, and no means now remaining of repairing the loss.

In no language, has the rejection or change of consonants served so effectually to obscure the original words as in the French. So extensive have been the changes of orthography in that language, that had not the early lexicographers indicated the loss of letters by a mark, it would be impossible now to discover the original orthography, or to trace the connection of words with other languages, in a large portion of them. And it is with regret we observe the influence of the French practice of suppressing consonants, extending itself to other countries. It is owing to the most servile obsequiousness of nations, that *Basil* or *Basilea*, the elegant name of a town in Switzerland, has been corrupted to *Basle*, and pronounced most barbarously *bale*. The Germans are pursuing a like course in suppressing the palatal letters: a most unfortunate circumstance for the strength of the language.

The Italians also have a disposition to reject letters when they interfere with their habits of pronunciation, and hence we see, in their language, *plano* written for *plano* *flor* for *flor*, *fucio* for *fucio*; a change that has removed a radical consonant, and thus obscured or rather destroyed the affinity between the Italian and the Latin words.

Another difference of writing and pronouncing, has been produced by the change of a sibilant letter into an aspirate: or *e* converso, by the change of an aspirate into a sibilant. No person doubts whether the Latin *super* is the Greek *ὑπέρ*, or *ὑπέρ* is *super*; or *sal* is *sal*, salt. The latter in Welsh is *halen*, hal. So *helyg*, a willow, in Welsh, is in Latin *salix*. The Greek *ἑπτά* is the Latin *septem*, English *seven*. This in Persic is *هفت* *heft* or *haft*, which approaches the Greek *ἑπτά*. It has been commonly supposed, that in this case, the aspirate in Greek has been converted into an *s*. There are however strong reasons for believing that the change has been the reverse, and that *s* has been dropped, and its place supplied by an aspirate. The word *seven* is, beyond a question, the Shemite *שבע* *shab*, whence *שבת* *Eng. sabbath*; and the Gaelic *sean*, old, whence Latin *senex*, in Welsh *hen*, seems clearly to be the Ar. *سنا* *sunna*, to be old. It is then clear that in these words *s* is radical. It is probable however that the aspirate, in some cases, has been changed into *s*.

It deserves to be noticed that the radix of a word is sometimes obscured, in Greek and Latin, by the loss or change of a radical letter in the nominative case. We find in Latin *repes*, in the nominative, is *neptis* in the genitive; *homo*, *homois*, &c. In these changes, I suppose the letter *re* is dropped in the oblique case to be the true radical letter. Thus *adamant* has been deduced by our etymologists from the Greek *α* negative and *δαναι*, to subdue, on the supposition that the stone was named from its hardness. This is a good example of a great part of all etymological deductions; *they are mere conjectures*. It did not occur to the inquirer that *adamas*, in the nominative, becomes in the genitive *adamantis*; that *n* is radical, and that this word cannot be regularly deduced from the Greek verb. Any person, by looking into a Welsh dictionary, may see the original word.

In some words it is not easy to determine whether *n* before *d* is casual or radical. In such words as the Latin *fundo*, to pour, and *tundo*, to beat, there is reason to think the *n* is casual, for the preterit is formed without it, *fudi*, *tudi*. But in other words *n* before *d* seems to be radical, and the *d* casual; as in *fundo*, *fundare*, to found. For in this word coincides with the Irish *bun*, foundation, and with the Shemite *בנה* *banah*, to build. So the English *fund* is in Swedish *fanna*, and in Danish *find*.

Another fact of considerable consequence, is, the casual sound of *g* given to *n* before *p*, and the effect of doubling the *γ* in Greek, and of occasioning the insertion of *n* before *g* in the Latin, as also in the Teutonic and Gothic languages. Thus we see the *γ* is doubled in the Greek *εργαστος*, and we know, in this case, how the change originated; for the original word is in the Gaelic and Irish, *agolla*. So *γ* is prefixed to another palatal or guttural letter in *אגלה* *agla*, to remove.

A similar nasal sound of *g* probably introduced the *n* before *g* in *lingo*, to *ling*; *linguo*, to leave.

We may be confident, in all cases, that *n* is not radical, when it is dropped in the supine and participle, as in *litum*, *litus*, from *linguo*. When *n* is retained in the supine and participle, there may be more reason for doubt; but in this case, the question may often be determined by the corresponding word in another language, or by some other word evidently of the same family. Thus we can have little doubt that *lingo* and the English *lick* are the same word, or that the Lat. *lingua* and *figula* are of one family.

The casual insertion of *n* in words of this class must be carefully noticed by the etymologist, or he will overlook the affinity of words, which are evidently the same. We have many words in English which are written with *n* before *g* or *k*, when the ancient word in the Gothic and Teutonic languages, and some of them in the modern Danish and Swedish, are written without *n*. Thus *sink*, in Gothic is *sigcwan*; to think, is *thagþyan*. It is not improbable that the Gothic word was pronounced with the sound of *n*

or *ng* as in English. So also in *sigcwan*, to sing; *luggs*, long. In a few instances, we find the Swedes and Danes have the *n* written in both ways, as *lång*, *langer* and *lycka*, *lykker*, to think. But in general the Germans, Danes, Swedes and Dutch write words of this sort with *ng*.

To show how important it is to know the true original orthography, I will mention one instance. In our mother tongue, the word *to dye*, or *color*, is written *deagan*; the elements or radical letters are *dg*. To determine whether this and the Latin *tingo* are the same words, we must first know whether *g* in *tingo* is radical or casual. This we cannot know with certainty, by the form of the word, as the *n* is carried through all the tenses and forms of the verb. But by looking into the Greek, we find the word written with *γ*, *τιγγω*; and this clearly proves the alliance of the word with *deagan*. See *Dye* in the Dictionary.

We have many English words, in which a *d* has been inserted before *g*, as in *budge*, *budge*, *lodge*, *pledge*, *wedge*. In all words, I believe, of this class, the *d* is casual, and the *g* following is the radical letter, as *pledge* from the French *pleige*; *wedge* from the Saxon *weeg*. The practice of inserting *d* in words of this sort seems to have originated in the necessity of some mode of preserving the English sound of *g*, which might otherwise be sounded as the French *g* before *e*. And it is for this reason we still retain, and ought to retain *d* in *alledge*, *abridge*. In like manner the Teutonic *c* has been changed into the sound of *ch*, as Sax. *vacian*, *vacian*, to wake, to watch; Sax. *thac*, thatch.

There are some nations which, in many words, pronounce and write *g* before *u* or *v*; as in the French *guerre*, for *war*; *guede*, for *ward*; *guelter*, for *twist*; in Welsh, *gwael*, for *wall*; *gwair*, for *woman*; *gwared*, for *guard*, which in English is *ward*; *Sp. guarda*. In some instances the *v* or *u* is dropped in modern writing, as in the French *garconne*, a *warren*; *garde*, for *guard*. This difference of orthography makes it difficult, in some cases, to ascertain the true radical letters.

CHANGE OF SIGNIFICATION.

Another cause of obscurity in the affinity of languages, and one that seems to have been mostly overlooked, is, the change of the primary sense of the radical verb. In most cases, this change consists in a slight deflection, or difference of application, which has obtained among different families of the same stock. In some cases, the literal sense is lost or obscured, and the figurative only is retained. The first object, in such cases, is to find the primary or literal sense, from which the various particular applications may be easily deduced. Thus, we find in Latin, *libeo*, *libet*, or *libeo*, *libet*, is rendered, to please, to like; *libens*, willing, glad, cheerful, pleased; *libenter*, *libenter*, willingly, gladly, readily. What is the primary sense, the visible or physical action, from which the idea of *willing* is taken? I find, either by knowing the radical sense of *willing*, ready, in other cases, or by the predominant sense of the elements *lib*, as in Lat. *labor*, to slide, *liber*, free, &c. that the primary sense is to move, incline or advance towards an object, and hence the sense of willing, ready, prompt. Now this Latin word is the English *love*, German *lieben*, *liebe*. "I love, to love." I am inclined to go; I go with cheerfulness. But the affinity between *love* and *libeo* has been obscured by a slight difference of application, among the Romans and the Teutonic nations.

Perhaps no person has suspected that the English words *heat*, *hate*, and *hest*, in *behest*, are all radically the same word. But this is the fact. Sax. *hatian*, to heat, or be hot, and to hate; *hatan*, to heat and to call; *hatan*, to call, to order, to command; *ge-hatan* or *gehatan*, to grow warm, to promise, to vote; Gothic *gahaitan*, to call, to promise; Dutch, *herten*, to heat, to name, to call, bid or command; German, *heizen*, to heat; *heissen*, to call; *hitzen*, to heat, to hoist; Swedish, *hetta*, to heat, to please; Danish, *heder*, to heat, to be called. *Behest*, we have from the German; Swedish dialect. *Heat* coincides with the Latin *astus* for *hestus*, which is written with *s*, like the German. *Hate* coincides with the Latin *odi*, *osus*, so written for *hodi*, *hosus*, and as the Teutonic *h* often represents the Latin *c*, as in *horn*, *cornu*, the Danish orthography *heder*, coincides with the Latin *cito*, to call. Now what is the radical sense? Most obviously to stir, agitate, move, raise, implying a driving or impulse; and hence in Latin *excito*, to be hot, and to rage or storm; *hence to excite*, and hence the sense of the Latin *cito*, quickly, from stirring, rousing to action. In this case *hated*, as well as *heat*, is violent excitement. We find also in the Saxon and Gothic the sense of vowing, that is, of driving out the voice, uttering, declaring, a sense allied to calling and commanding, and to this is allied the sense of the Latin *recite*, to recite.

In English, *befall* signifies to fall on, to happen to; in German the same word, *befallen*, has the same significant sense. But in Saxon *gefeallen* signifies to fall, to rush on, while in German *gefallen* signifies to please. That is, to suit, to come to one's mind, to be agreeable. The Danish *gefælde* has the same signification as the German.

We find by the Saxon, that the English *reck*, to care, and *reckon*, and the Latin *rego*, to rule, are all the same word, varied in orthography and application. To find the primary sense of *reck*, to care, we are then to examine the various derivative senses. And we need go no farther than to the Latin *rectus* and English *right*, the sense of which is straight, for this sense is derived from *straining*, *stretching*. Care then is a straining of the mind,