

consider and criticize a concrete case, employs the casuistic method, which is based upon the harmonising apperception. Upon this, too, rests criticism, the last and psychological form of interpretation.

Coming now to a definition of linguistic or glottology we find it to be 'the science of the evolution of the expression of human thought and human feeling'.

When studied apart from its expression human thought forms the subject-matter of logic and psychology; in so far, however, as it is expressible, as accommodating itself to expression, it belongs to ideology, to apperceptology, or, as Dr. de La Grasserie prefers to call it, psychic, which partly corresponds to what has improperly been called syntax. 'Psychic consists in the observation of the manner in which one conceives ideas, which differs greatly amongst different tribes alike in the mode of classification and of co-ordination'. That is to say, it consists of the four or five modes of apperception with which the Herbartians are wont to deal. In the concrete language of the Abipones, for instance, we are told by Martin Dobrizhoffer that the pronoun of the third person varies according to the situation of the person of whom we speak. If that person is present and is a man, he is called Eneha; if a woman, she is called Anaha; if he be sitting we must say Hiñiha, if she be sitting it is Hañiha; if he be walking and seen it is Ehaha, if she be walking and seen it is Ahaha. Does a language denote gender, and, if so, how many? Do we distinguish between things animate and inanimate? When speaking to each other do heterogeneous persons use different expressions from those they use when speaking to persons of their own sex? In using the plural do we include or exclude ourselves? Is the difference between elder and younger consanguinity marked by special terms for each and the difference of sex by adding either the words male and female or by modulation of sound? As regards the verb, too, do we denote but one gender in the singular and two