

vitality from the 'Commedia.' The mediæval hell was not invented by Dante, but was accepted by him as it was, and, as was the religion of his time, as a mélange of paganism and a doctrine of a hopeful and progressive immortality. If Dante had invented his Inferno, no one in his time would have believed in him or it. To say, therefore, that painters were influenced by Dante because they painted the Inferno, is a most insufficient reasoning; and our author's dictum is one which could not occur to an art critic pure and simple—it borrows reasons from literature, which are always fallacious.

It is a refinement of critical acumen which makes Ghiberti's work so superior to that of other sculptors in his vein. As decorative ensemble, no doubt they are the most remarkable of their kind in existence, and Michael Angelo's hyperbolic commendation has done as much for them as their real merits; but as sculptor and in statuary he may easily be overrated, and, in fact, it seems to us that the very limitations of his genius were the cause of his remarkable success in what must, after all, be accepted as a secondary work of sculpture.

It seems to us unfortunate that Mr. Perkins had not (if he has not) written his work in English, because his French does not compensate for his native language: it reads heavily. But, to cease fault-finding, which is the reviewer's chief business, we must render complete homage to the thoroughness of the work done by Mr. Perkins in the collation and weaving into one of the most interesting of art biographies the materials for Ghiberti's life. The publisher's part is ill done—the illustrations are in the worst vein of process work, and most unworthy the book or any illustrated book in this day of perfected processes. An American publisher of good standing would be ashamed to furnish so important a book with a so poor artistic outfit.

#### SOME RECENT WORKS ON ETYMOLOGY.

*Précis de Grammaire historique de la langue française.* Par Ferdinand Brunot. Paris: G. Masson; New York: F. W. Christern. 1887. Pp. 692.

*Dictionnaire étymologique.* Par L. Pourret. Paris: A. Fourant; New York: F. W. Christern. 1886. Pp. 520.

*An Etymological Dictionary of the French Language.* By A. Brachet, translated by G. W. Kitchin. 3d edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan & Co. 1882. Pp. 407.

*The Life of Words as the Symbols of Ideas.* By Arsène Darmesteter. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co. 1886. Pp. 173.

M. BRUNOT'S 'Grammaire historique' is much more ambitious than the analogous work published by M. Brachet twenty years ago. As the latter and his able translator, Mr. Kitchin, have not kept the older publication up to the requirements of modern science, it is natural that it should be superseded and surpassed. It may be doubted, however, whether the time has even now come when a complete French historical grammar can be written. There is as yet too little unanimity among the specialists of this branch of learning. The simplest forms give rise to too many contradictory statements. A single example may serve to show how much uncertainty yet exists in regard to the derivation of the commonest words. It is not necessary to look in very old French grammars to find the word *oui*, yes, explained as being the past participle of the verb *ouïr*, to hear. Then came the more logical and historical explanation, which accounts for the old form of the word, *oïl*, deriving it from *hoc illud*. This is probably accepted now by 90

per cent. of those who, without being specially etymologists, have generally correct ideas on French derivations. But of very late years the learned in phonetic changes have proved by analogy that the words *hoc illud* could never have given *oïl*, but only *oël*, so that one of them proposes as a solution the words *hoc illic* as the original of *oïl*. This etymology, for reasons which it would be pedantic to develop here, satisfies all the laws of letter changes from Latin to French. M. Clédât, in his 'Grammaire élémentaire de la vieille langue française,' already noticed in the *Nation*, rather shirks the question, although lately, in his edition of the 'Song of Roland,' he proposes *o* (Lat. *hoc*) and the personal pronoun *il*. In this M. Brunot follows him; so that, according to him, the answers to the questions, "Do you go?" "Does he go?" would have been *o je* and *o il*, as the answer to "Do we go?" would have been *o nous*; *o il* taking later the place of all the other forms. Hence, in view of all these newly discovered "belle choses," the professional etymologist must feel like exclaiming with Molière's *Madelon*: "Si Pon ignore ces choses, je ne donnerais pas un clou de tout l'esprit qu'on peut avoir."

M. Brunot is familiar with the latest researches, though in this elementary book he wisely gives only the results. After a very clear chapter on the general history of the French language, he devotes ninety pages to the now all-important branch, phonetics. But the main portion of the work is occupied with the forms and the syntax of the language. As to the syntax, scarcely anything good is to be found in former elementary historical grammars. M. Brunot has tried to do more than his predecessors, and in many cases has succeeded. The comparatively full treatment of the moods and tenses is especially to be noted. The book has a very complete table of contents, which, however, does not quite make up for the absence of an index.

The long sub-title of M. L. Pourret's work will do more than any analysis to give an idea of the author's intentions: "Vocabulaire des racines et des dérivés de la langue française, précédé de notions générales sur l'étymologie et la dérivation, à l'usage de tous les établissements d'instruction." This promises much, but the execution is not equal to the promise. The etymologies given are often more confusing than instructive, since they are seldom explained. The book is a typographical curiosity, being printed in two colors, red and black. The black is for the French words and the etymologies attributed to them; the red for the primitives, which are given mixed in with the French words, just as they come, in alphabetical order. Thus, after *fêtu*, in black, we have in red "*Fetwa*, ARABE: *fetfa*," which might be puzzling even to pupils who had gone beyond the *établissements d'éducation*. Thus, again, in one column, besides the French words, we find: *hedera*, Latin; *hedjra*, Arabic; *hedra*, Greek; *heester*, Flemish; *hei*, Dutch; *heigero*, Old-High German; *heis*, Greek; etc. The author has evidently taken great pains to obtain a very meagre result.

The 'Etymological Dictionary' of M. Brachet, translated by Mr. Kitchin, received a long notice in the *Nation* when the first edition appeared in 1873. The second edition, in 1878, was a very great improvement on the first. The third edition does not differ materially from the second. It is but fair, in a notice of works on French etymologies, to recall this excellent book, one of the best printed by the Oxford Clarendon Press (New York: Macmillan). The 'Etymological Dictionary,' as improved by the translator, is far superior to the original work of M. Brachet, of which a very large number of editions have been issued with no material changes, though many are needed.

There has long been a promise of a French dictionary by MM. Darmesteter and Hatzfeld. In this we may expect, judging from the previous works of the authors, not only a careful presentation of the derivations, but also a logical classification of the meanings in the order of their development. The Dictionary is announced as in the press in the last work of M. Darmesteter, 'The Life of Words as the Symbols of Ideas.' The author delivered in London last year a short course of lectures which have been translated from the manuscript, as they have not yet been published in French. He says modestly in his preface that his book deals "almost exclusively" with that language. This is true as to the selection of examples only, for, while not addressing specialists, he touches with a light and graceful hand upon the very deepest general questions. His little book is very suggestive. Linguistic points thus treated, thus artistically presented and classed, may excite interest in the daintiest of readers. There are scattered throughout the work pages of exquisite beauty. Where all is so logically connected, it is difficult to quote, but a passage like the following may serve to indicate the general tone, where examples and diagrams are not made to teach the necessary lesson:

"A whole world of vague impressions, of indistinct sensations, live in the unconscious depths of our own thoughts, a sort of obscure dream which each of us carries in him. But words, rough interpreters of these inner worlds, allow only an infinitely small part of them to appear externally, those which are the most apparent and the most easily seized, and these are received by the listener, who in his turn gives to them the various fugitive and shifting aspects with which the basis of his own imagination furnishes him.

Thus each of us bears about with him a world of ideas and thoughts which remain in the subjective state, and which he is almost powerless to convey to others."

It would be misleading not to state that a great portion of the book is made up of examples often repeated. It deals less with general assertions than with a few (never exhaustive) details. The translation reads well, though fault might be found with the renderings of a few idioms. Thus: *Triste comme un bonnet de nuit sans coiffe* is rendered, "As melancholy as a nightcap without a tassel." Now, *coiffe* never meant *tassel*, and as *sans coiffe* (now always omitted) is what explains the queer expression *triste comme un bonnet de nuit*, the translator's version is misleading. The phrase may be found explained in Littré under *coiffe*. In conclusion it may be said that the impression left by M. Darmesteter's 'Life of Words' is that language is eminently a living organism, subject to the same laws as all organic life. If those who are trying to fetter thought in *Volapuk* or other conventional strait-jackets would but understand this, they might see the futility of their efforts.

'Le Démonstratif ILLE et le Relatif QUI en roman' (Paris, Vieweg) is a short essay by M. Darmesteter, in which he clearly and learnedly establishes the fact that the hitherto unsatisfactorily explained French *lui* was formed by analogy under the influence of the relative *cui*.

#### THE LATEST YEAR BOOKS.

*Year Books of the Reign of King Edward the Third.* Years 13 and 14. Edited and translated by Luke Owen Pike, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law, author of 'A History of Crime in England.' London: Longmans & Co. 1886.

A YEAR and a half ago we gave some account of the translated new Year Books of the twelfth and thirteenth of Edward III., then lately published under the editorship of Mr. L. O. Pike. The gap in the old black-letter volumes, between the tenth and seventeenth years, is now still further re-

duced. Another volume has appeared, containing the reports of the thirteenth and fourteenth years of the same king, beginning with the Michaelmas (October–November) term of 1339, and ending with the next or Hilary term (January–February), 1339–1340. Edward's regnal year began with January 25. This volume is marked by the same excellent qualities that characterized the last one—the same comparison of various texts (more than seven in the case of this volume), the same occasional reproduction of a second report, and especially by the same careful collation with the original records. "Not only," says the editor, "are the references to the records in the present volume more numerous [than in the last one], but they must very nearly exhaust the possibilities of identification." No one who has not inspected the great and almost unsearchable bulk of these records can justly tell what labor this has involved on the part of the editor; it is very great. One fact we are glad to learn—that the Year Books have reported nearly all of the most important cases: "The Year Books are, in fact, to those who know how to use them, the most perfect guides to almost all that is most important in the rolls."

The editor confirms, by all he says and does, the opinion, which is growing in this country, no less than in England, that the old printed Year Books should be reëdited. It is gratifying to learn, from various sources, that this important task is likely to be undertaken before long. The idle and shallow opinion that the Year Books are obsolete and useless, is fast passing away. To legal students who would be thoroughly grounded, they are invaluable; and it is certain that a new, translated, and thoroughly edited set of the old Year Books, with all gaps supplied and the text brought into relation with the records and with the newly printed volumes, will be heartily welcomed by many persons on this side of the water, no less than on the other. There can be no doubt that in such scholars as Mr. Pike and Mr. Maitland, England has men that are fit for the task.

In this volume, as in the last, there is interesting matter touching the early infiltration of equitable principles into the common-law courts; especially in the case of Staunton vs. Staunton and wife (pp. 16–37), and Uppecote's case (pp. 33–98), and in the editor's comments on these cases at pp. xxxvi–xlii. He remarks upon the uniformity given to the administration of justice by the constant supervision of the King in Council; and by the fact that a case brought in a common-law court might be carried into the Chancery at almost any stage. The system was

"that of proceeding by established forms so long as they sufficed, and of assistance from the authority to which they originally owed their existence where they sufficed no longer. . . . The unity of principle which is thus discernible may perhaps afford some assistance towards the comprehension of a very remarkable observation made by Stonore [C. J. of the Com. Pleas] in Uppecote's case. He said . . . : 'We see, on the one hand, that, according to good conscience and the law of God, it would be contrary to what is right (or reasonable); if the plaintiff speaks the truth, that by such a fine which is void he should be disinherited; and on the other hand, it is a strong measure, having regard to the law of the land, to take an averment which may annul the fine; wherefore we wish well to consider it.' The point in dispute was, like that in Staunton's case, the admissibility or otherwise of an averment relating to a fine, and one which presented an unforeseen difficulty. It is not impossible that Stonore's hesitation may have been caused in part by the decision of the Council in Staunton's case. In both cases he was clearly of opinion (though in Staunton's case the Council decided otherwise) that the averment was inadmissible in law; but in Uppecote's case he thought that in conscience or equity it should be admitted. It is not certain that he had any intention of applying the principles of conscience or equity in the Court of Common Pleas, but he may have

thought that if this point were taken before the Council which listened to appeals for justice 'pur dieu' (made as for God's sake), the decision might be the same as in Staunton's case, and he may have taken time to consider whether he would follow that decision as one which did substantial justice, or act on his own opinion as to the strict law."

The learned reader will recall other cases in the Year Books that illustrate the same topic, e. g., a case in Y. B. 39 Ed. 3. 35. A, where in strictness the plaintiff was entitled to judgment, but the court suspected some practice on the plaintiff's part and made an examination of the defendants, which tended to confirm their suspicions. The plaintiff insisted upon his right to judgment, but the Chief Justice refused, saying:

"The manner in which it is done is suspicious and 'vicious,' and in a like case of Giles Blaket it was spoken of (*parle*) in Parliament, and we were directed that when any such case came before us and we could see any *viciosite*, we were not to proceed to judgment without good advisement; *car il soit matveis ensample*. Wherefore sue to the Council; and as they wish that we should do we will do; and otherwise we will do nothing in this case."

Mr. Pike has interesting remarks and suggestions on the puzzling topics of the *secta* and the early jury, and the way in which witnesses may have been used with the jury. "Upon the whole," he says, "it seems a reasonable inference that at the period of the reports in the present volumes there had not come into existence any trial by jury in the modern sense, any hearing by the jury of oral evidence given in court upon oath as a preliminary to their verdict." In the note on p. liii there is an error in the citation of the important case of Y. B. 17 Ed. 3. 48. pl. 14: both year and page are wrongly given. The editor's interesting speculations as to the custom of inserting in counts and declarations the names of witnesses who were never examined, might perhaps be illustrated by the practice, of which there are traces in the Year Books, of mentioning in the counsel's address to the jury the names of witnesses who were not examined.

In these Year Books, as in others, there are matters of a more general interest. The editor remarks upon the replication, in a certain action of Waste, that whitethorn is a tree upon which a graft can be made: "There is not, from a modern point of view, anything very remarkable in the statement, as it is well known that the whitethorn is used for grafting purposes. But it is not by any means so well known that fruit was cultivated with so much skill in the first half of the fourteenth century." The early history of surnames is another subject which is illustrated here. In the case of the Abbot of Glastonbury vs. Sir Richard Pyke, it is said: "Idem Ricardus et Thomas Richardsheyward Pyke attachiati fuerunt ad respondendum." The editor adds: "It is hardly necessary to say that 'Thomas Richardsheyward Pyke' is not an instance in which two baptismal names stand before a surname. . . . It may not, perhaps, be equally apparent that this Thomas had no surname at all. Thomas Richardsheyward Pyke is, however, in all probability, only an idiomatic expression which might be rendered in modern English, Thomas, the hayward of Richard Pyke. This is not a mere conjecture, but an inference founded on many similar instances. . . . The custom prevailed throughout the length and breadth of the land." Another instance is given from the record of a case in this volume, and two more from certain Durham records:—Edward, servant of Joan de Chiltern; William, servant of William Litster of Gateshead; and Nicholas, servant of Robert of the Woghes, as Nicholas Robertservant of the

Woghes. "The only reasonable explanation of the formula seems to be that at a time when family names were not very definitely fixed, even throughout the whole of the higher ranks, persons in the lowest ranks had no family names and no surnames of their own at all."

Mr. Pike announces in his preface, dated in August last, that the material "is in a forward state of preparation as far as the end of the sixteenth year of the reign." We may hope, therefore, to see before long another volume of his scholarly and thoroughly good work.

#### THAYER'S GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament; being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti, Translated, Revised, and Enlarged by Joseph Henry Thayer, D.D., Professor in the Divinity School of Harvard University. Harper & Bros.*

THE long-expected appearance of this book is matter of special rejoicing, not only to theological students and all ministers who use the Greek Testament as they ought, but to any other persons who have a fair general knowledge of the language, and would like to make careful reading of the New Testament in the original. Dr. Robinson's Lexicon was a useful book, but never satisfactory. Edward Robinson was the creator of modern Biblical geography, and in that department a great honor to American scholarship. But he had no special talent for philological work, and his lexicon is unscientific. Moreover, the German works on which his was based were far inferior to that of Grimm, now translated and greatly improved by Dr. Thayer. From the first appearance of Grimm's book (completed in 1863, with a second edition in 1879), its great superiority was recognized by scholars in all countries. We know of an American theological teacher who at once made his students throw away Robinson and use Grimm in the Latin, though the average American student does not do that with delightful facility, and will no doubt distinctly prefer the English.

Robinson (whose second edition appeared in 1850) gave only the words and forms found in the Greek Testament of Hahn, a now-forgotten follower of Griesbach. We are still far from having any single standard for the Greek text. Grimm wisely gave whatever was in the so-called Textus Receptus, with all the additional words and forms found in Griesbach, in Lachmann, or in Tischendorf; Thayer has now added every word or form found in Tregelles or in Westcott and Hort, even the marginal readings; so that whatever Greek Testament is read, this Lexicon will meet the reader's wants. We were at first inclined to regret that Dr. Thayer did not follow the example of Robinson and of Grimm in constructing an independent work on the basis of a predecessor. This would have been more convenient and agreeable to beginners and to the majority of general readers. But Grimm's book has attained such generally recognized preëminence that scholars would have been constantly desirous of knowing whether his view was precisely the same as that given in the American work. Upon the whole, therefore, we are satisfied that Dr. Thayer has pursued the wisest course. He translates Grimm throughout, putting in square brackets his own additions and intimations of dissent. We think these additions are of such extent and value as to warrant its being called Thayer's Lexicon. The translation itself is remarkably good. A German writer's Latin is apt to retain in some measure the Teutonic lack of lucidity, and a translation of it into idiomatic, clear, and agreeable English is really not a very easy task; but