ment would have the sound it has in *balance;* it is therefore expedient to retain both letters in all words of this class.

15. It is an established rule, in the English language, that monosyllabic verbs, ending in a single consonant, not preceded by a long vowel, and other verbs ending in a single accented consonant, and of course not preceded by a long vowel, double the final consonant, in all the derivatives, which are formed by a termination beginning with a vowel. Thus, *fit, blot, bar*, when they take the terminations, *ed, eth, ing*, are written *fitted, fitteth, fitting ; blotted, blotteth, blotting ; barred, barreth, barring. Abet, compel*, form the like derivatives; *abetted, abetteth, abetting ; compelled, compelleth, compelling*. The reason of this rule is, that without this duplication of the last consonant, the vowel of the primitive word would, in the derivative, be naturally pronounced wrong, that is, with its long sound ; *fited, blating, bured, compeled*. Hence we see the reason why verbs, having the long sound of a vowel, do not double the last consonant, as *feared, repealed, repeated*.

The converse of this rule is, that verbs, ending in a single consonant, but having the accent on the first syllable, or on a syllable preceding the last, ought *not* to double the final consonant in the derivatives. Thus *limit, labor, charter, clatter, pardon, deliver, hinder*, have for their derivatives, *limited, laboreth, chartered, pardoning, delivering, hinderest*. But strange as it may seem, the rule is wholly neglected and violated, in most of the words of this class in the language. Thus we observe, in all authors, *balloting, bestowing, levelled, travelled, cancelled, revelling, rivalling, worshipped, worshipper, apparelled, embowelled, libelling*, and many others, in which the last consonant is doubled, in opposition to one of the oldest and best established rules in the language. Perry, in his Dictionary, lays down the rule for guidance, but has not been careful, in all cases, to observe it. I have endeavored to reduce these classes of words to a regular and uniform orthography. In like manner, nouns formed from such verbs are written with a single consonant, as *jeweler, traveler, worshiper*, for the purpose of establishing a general rule, to which there may be no exception. What should we say to a man who should write *audittor, alterrer, barterrer, banterrer, gardenner, laborrer ?* Yet no good reason can be assigned why the final consonant should not be doubled in these words as well as in *jeweller, traveller, enameller*. The truth is, the syllable to be added is the usual termination *er* or *or*, and nothing more.

Next to a syllable is the practice of doubling the last consonant in *equalled, equalling*, but not in the verb *equalize*. And to add to the inconsistency, the last consonant is sometimes doubled in *tranquillize*, a word in exact analogy with *equalize*.

With regard to words which recent discoveries have introduced into the sciences, there may be some apology for differences of orthography, as writers have not established usage for a guide. Hence we find *oxyd* is written also *oxide* and *oxyde ; oxygen* and *hydrogen*, are written also *oxigene, oxygene* and *hydrogene*. *Sulphate, nitrate*, &c., are written also *sulphat, nitrat*.

In this case, what course is the Lexicographer to pursue ? Shall he adopt the method by which Walker attempts to settle pronunciation, and cite authorities in favor of each mode of spelling ? Then the result is, so many names appear on one side, and so many on the other. But who, it may be asked, will undertake to graduate the scale by which the weight of authority shall be determined ? Numbers will not always decide questions of this sort to the satisfaction of the public.

In this case, I have determined to conform the orthography to established English analogies ; the only authority from which there can be no legitimate appeal. Now, no rule in orthography is better established, than that which we have adopted from the Latin language, of representing the Greek *upsilon* by the letter *y*. In the orthography of *oxygen* and *hydrogen*, from οξυς and ὑδωρ, this rule has been observed ; and why should *oxyd* be an exception ?

With regard to *sulphate, nitrate*, and other names of that class of compounds, I consider the final *e* as essential to the words, to prevent a false pronunciation ; the vowel *a* having its first sound as in *fate*, though slightly pronounced.

The word *chimistry* has undergone two or three changes, according to fancy or to conjectural etymology. Men have blundered about the plainest thing imaginable ; for to determine its true orthography, nothing was necessary but to open an Arabic Lexicon. The inhabitants of the South of Europe, who introduced the word, doubtless knew its origin, and wrote it correctly with *i*, not with *y* or *e* ; and had the English been contented to take it as they found it, the orthography would have been correct and uniform.

In introducing words from other languages, it is desirable that the orthography should be conformed, as nearly as may be, to established English analogies. For this reason I must approve of the practice of Darwin who drops the Latin termination of *pyrites*, writing *pyrite*, with the accent on the first syllable. *Botanic Garden, Canto* 2. 350.

Stalactite has in like manner, been anglicized; and *barytes*, it is hoped, may suffer the like change. In this manner, the words, in the English form, become susceptible of a regular plural ; *barytes* and *pyrites* in two syllables, and *stalactites* in three : and further they admit of regularly formed adjectives, *pyritic, barytic, stalactitic*, which cannot be regularly formed from the Greek terminations.

The word *talc* is also ill-formed. The original word on the continent of Europe is *talk* or *talg* ; and the change of *k* into *c* is not merely needless, but worse, for it precludes the use of the regular adjective, *talcy*. Hence we see the adjective used is *talcose*, an awkward compound of a Teutonic word with a Latin termination. This word should be written *talk* or *talck*, which would admit regular derivatives, *talcky, talckiness*. In like manner, *zinc*, if written *zink*, would admit the regular adjective *zinky*, as written by Kirwan.

In botany, as the sexual system of the celebrated Swedish naturalist is now generally received, it seems proper to make the new terms, by which the classes and orders of plants are designated, a part of our language. Hitherto these names have not been anglicized ; but from the technical terms, English and American writers have begun to form adjectives which are at variance with the analogies of our language. We see in books such words as *hexandrous, monogamous, polygamous*, and *syngenesious*. The writers who use these words, seem not to be aware of the importance of pursuing settled rules in the coining of words, as uniformity aids both in learning and in recollecting new names. The regular mode of forming adjectives from nouns ending in *a* or *ia*, is to add *n* to the noun, not *ous*. So we form *Italian* from *Italia ; American* from *America*. In some cases, the termination *ic* is used, but rarely or never *ous ;* or if it is, it is an anomaly.

To arrest, if possible, the progress of these irregularities, and at the same time, to make the more important botanical terms really English, by giving them appropriate English terminations, and further to abridge the language of description, I have ventured to anglicize the names of all the classes and orders, and insert them in this work.

Thus from *monandria*, the name of the class containing plants with flowers having one stamen, I form *monander*, the name of an individual plant of that character. From *monogynia*, the name of the order containing plants with flowers which have one pistil, I form *monogyn*, [pronounced *monojin*] to express an individual plant of that order. The adjectives are formed from the nouns with regular English terminations ; *monandrian, monogynian, syngenesian, diecian, monecian*, &c.

In describing a plant technically, according to this nomenclature, instead of saying, it is of the class monondria and order monogynia, the botanist will call it a *monogynian monander*, a *digynian pentander*, a *trigynian octander*, a *pentandrian diadelph*. These terms designate the class and order, as precisely as the use of the Latin technical names : and in this manner we unite, in our botanical language, technical precision, with brevity, correctness and elegance.

It is with no small regret, that I see new terms formed, without a due regard to regular English analogies. New terms are often necessary, or at least very useful ; but they ought to be coined according to the settled principles of the language. A neglect of these principles is observable in the word *systematize*, which, not being borrowed from the Greek, ought to follow the known rule of English formation, in agreement with *legalize, modernize, civilize, animalize*, and others, and be written *systemize*. This is the more important, as the derivatives *systemizing, systemization*, are of more easy utterance, than those of *systematize*, and particularly the noun *systematization*.

I observe in modern works on Natural History, the words *crustaceology*, and *testaceology ;* terms that are intended to designate the science of different kinds of shells, from *crustacea, testacea*. But what can countenance the use of such words ? Where do we find another instance of similar terms formed from adjectives ? Why should we violate an established principle in coining words of this family ? Besides, who can endure the derivatives, *crustaceological, testaceological*, and much less the adverbs, if they should ever be wanted ? I have not admitted these anomalous words into this vocabulary ; but have inserted the proper words, *crustalogy, testalogy*, which are regularly formed, like *mineralogy*.

Under this head I would subjoin a remark or two on the mode of writing Indian names of rivers, mountains and places in America, which we have adopted.

The French were the first Europeans who explored the country between the great lakes and the gulf of Mexico, and of course, the first to commit to writing the Indian names which occurred to them in their travels. In doing this, they attempted to express the sounds in letters, according to the French manner of pronunciation. Hence it happened that they wrote *ch*, where we should have written *sh*, had we first reduced those names to writing. Thus we have *Chenango, Michigan* and *Michillimackinac*,* in the French orthography. And as the French have no *w* in their language, they could not express the proper sound of the first syllable of *Wabash, Wisconsin, Wachita*, otherwise than by writing them *Ouabache, Ouisconsin, Ouachita*, and *Missouri* in French is *Missouri*. All this is very proper for Frenchmen, for the letters used express the true sounds of the words. But in English, the letters used lead to a false pronunciation, and for this reason, should not be used in English compositions. It is to be deeply regretted that our language is thus doomed to be a heterogeneous medley of English and foreign languages ; as the same letters representing

* This word is, I believe, customarily pronounced *Mackinaw*, and the original may well be suffered to fall into disuse.