NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS.

GLOSSOLOGY: Being a treatise on the Nature of Language and on the Language of Nature, by CHARLES KRAITSIR, M. D. New York, Geo. P. Putnam. 1852.

Méthode pour Apprendre à Lire, par le Système Phonétique. Seconde Partie. Passage de l'Ecriture Phonétique à l'Ecriture Usuelle; par Ad. Féline. Paris, 1854.

We learn from Sacred History that there was a time when "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. But it came to pass, as men journeyed from the East, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. And they said, go to, let us build us a city, and a tower whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." The issue of the grand enterprise needs not to be stated. The Babel-builders were but victims of that

Vaulting ambition which o'erleaps itself
And falls on the other side;

the early heroes of what in after-times has become an old and trite story. There are those who assure us that the old Jewish legend is nothing but a myth, a scrap of Rabbinical lore only fit to impose on old women and very small Sunday-school children. We have but little taste for polemical theology, nor are we very strong in Hebrew hermeneutics, but we find it quite as easy to believe in the authenticity of the story as in the super-eminent sagacity of the profound pundits who have ventured to impugn it. In a word, we find it easier to believe in a miracle of power which purports to have the Omnipotent for its author than in such miracles of sapience as a Strauss or a De Wette affect to be when they pronounce so dogmatically upon what *is* genuine and what *is not* in the Sacred Writings.

Great results have often sprung from very trivial and insignificant causes. The curious in such inquiries have amused themselves by recounting how an apple lost us Paradise and taught the great mind of Newton the principle of gravitation; how a faithless baggage like Helen caused the "woes unnumbered" which thinned the chivalry of Greece and made "the tale of Troy divine;" how a faithful spouse like Lucretia expelled the Tarquins from the Eternal City; how Cava brought the Moors to Spain; how a jibe at the virtuous Madame de Pompadour led to the battle of Rosbach; and how a basin of water spilt on Mrs. Masham's gown called back the great Marlborough from his victorious career on the Continent and led to the disgraceful peace of Utrecht. And so, too, if it had not been for the ease with which bricks were made from the soil of Shinar and the abundance of bitumen which it produces, we might never have heard of the tower of Babel, and the confusion of tongues, if not avoided, might at least have been postponed in its rise and restricted in the degree of its prevalence; while Mr. Kraitsir would never have written his "Glossology," nor Monsieur Féline have indited a French phonography, nor newspaper scribblers, *uti nos*, have played the critic over either.

Dr. Kraitsir, as our readers all know, though a Hungarian by birth, is a "learned Theban" by scholarship. If the Doctor had been present at Babel when the confusion of tongues unhappily arose, we are sure he would have forthwith offered his services as interpreter to the blunder-heads engaged in that ambitious undertaking, though we greatly fear he would have soon lost his temper in discharging the duties of his office; for the Doctor seems to be one of those whom "much learning" has made "mad." Samuel Johnson, who loved a "good hater," would have pronounced Dr. Kraitsir a man after his own kidney; and if any one of our readers has a taste for the language of objurgation we can safely commend the "Glossology" to his attentive perusal; for, though the book is written in *English* jargon, it is plain that the *jargon* is the only vernacular part of the work. Still we are inclined to be considerate towards Dr. K., though his irascible proclivity is any thing but what Mr. Weller would call an "amiable weakness." There is something admirable in all deep emotions and something respectable in all honest convictions. It is evident to our mind that Dr. Kraitsir, like the Hebrew prophet on a notable occasion, thinks that he "does well to be angry;" and we are ourselves not so sure that he greatly "sins" in venting somewhat of his stomachful indignation on the "purveyors, market-men, hucksters, butlers, grocers, chiffoniers, curiosity-shop-keepers," and such like, who infest the walks of our modern scholastic literature.

The two things which seem most to vex the soul of Dr. Kraitsir are, firstly, the miscalled spelling of English words, and, secondly, the barbarous pronunciation of the Latin language as taught by English and American pedagogues. His present work, accordingly, is addressed to all those "on whose mind there remains a spot undyed by the manufacturing process of common schools, and whose intellect has not been blunted, besquinted, and tattoed" by the *barbarian* methods which tend to reduce all American school-boys into pedantic, bigoted, canting, timid, hypocritic, spelling, parsing, ciphering simulacres of men," fit only to make "*good subjects* for an autocrat or *money-making citizens* for a republic." The causes which have brought about this sad state of things are illustrated and defined in the following lucid paragraph:

"We may liken this abnormous condition of things with the cholera, with the potato-disease, and with similar animal and vegetal epidemics. In all, the first cause consists in a distemper of the elements of the atmosphere or soil, the next consequence being a subtle dyscracy of the animal or vegetal organ which has been affected by the former, while the dreadful effects—which are but the last rings of the chain of all disproportions between the atoms of matter, and of all concomitant dysharmonies between the energies of the dynamic momentum—are manifest; those disproportions and dysharmonies, escaping the scalpel of the anatomist, the tests of the chemist, the diagnostic acumen of the leech, withdraw themselves from the possible correction by means that are at hand, though not at brain."

This extract will suffice to give our readers a good idea of Dr. Kraitsir's style, which must be admitted to be original, if not elegant. It will certainly not be the author's fault if his book does not succeed in stirring up "the sleepy waters of the schools" and in "displacing the unconscious, cacochymic, half vegetal and half animal matters of equivocal generation that are infecting the pure souls of the young under the pompous titles of orthoëpy, orthography, prosody, and the like;" and it surely will be a great reproach to the American people if it shrink from this "feeler of the capacity of public *taste*," this "poker into the Alps of school-dust and broom which may help to sweep out some of it," as Dr. K. metaphorically entitles his work.

To speak sincerely, if the Doctor had written his book in a little better English and in a little better temper it would have proved none the less interesting and a good deal more valuable. We have already avowed our conviction that he is more than half right in his denunciations; but, as was once said of a certain pulpit Bombastes, we could wish that he had thundered less and lightened more. We admire his *fortiter in re*, but cannot say much in praise of his *suaviter in modo*. Neither can we very clearly see the necessity or pertinency of much that Dr. Kraitsir has favored us with in his very dry and yet very spicy volume. Because the ignoramuses of the "nursery, primary-school, academy, lyceum, college, institute, university, boarding-school, seminary," &c. are guilty of mispronouncing English letters and Latin words we cannot understand why an erudite author should snap and snarl so fiercely at all "the rest of mankind." It may be quite right and proper for the Doctor to rap the knuckles and thwack the wooden sconces of the pedagogues; but why should he travel so far out of his way to fetch a sly thrust with his "poker" on such as Louis Napoleon, Herod of Galilee, Shylock, Barnum, Jenny Lind, and Kossuth? It is fair game perhaps to make a mock of such "pretenders" in linguistics as Ollendorf, Mezzofanti, and our own "learned blacksmith;" we may even forgive the crabbed Doctor for his scurvy witticisms on our mathematical friend of New York, because he would fain "insult public opinion by representing *sausages* as *lines* and *mattresses* as *surfaces*;" but why was it necessary to disturb the rest and evoke the spirit of Smithson to haunt the "*Regents blasés*" of the institution which bears his name? As Dr. Kraitsir says of that "flying Frenchman," Chavée, so we venture to say of himself, that he has furnished us "a mere glossologic fata-morgana, a mirage produced by refracted rays of truth on a Sahara of scholarship."

We have placed the work of Monsieur Adrien Féline by the side of Dr. Kraitsir's, not because they teach the same cure for the "corruption of human speech," but because they alike acknowledge and deplore the *kakoëpy* of English and French *orthography*. As the learned Hungarian complains that by the "present miscalled spelling of English one single word only can be correctly spelt"—the interjection O! and this only when it is not written *oh!*—so our ingenious Frenchman deplores the complications and anomalies of his own mother tongue, in which, for example, the letter *a* can be pronounced in ten different ways, while there are thirty-seven combinations which produce the sound of *an*. But whatever may be the difficulties thus presented, to the young pupil especially, M. Féline believes they can be surmounted by means of a phonetic alphabet, such as he has applied to the French language. His method consists in first teaching the learner to read by an alphabet in which there is one sign, and one only, for each sound; so that he can promptly read words and phrases without being constantly arrested by the anomalies of an irregular and inconsistent orthography. Then, when the pupil has acquired a facility in reading and correctly pronouncing French words as written by the phonetic alphabet, he is gradually taught to drop the phonetic spelling and to slide imperceptibly into what is called *orthography* according to common usage and the French academy. Thus the young student is made to pass through three successive stages in learning to read. He first reads French in the phonetic characters; he next reads it in a modification of the phonetic spelling, which approaches more and more nearly the established orthography; until, lastly, he reads French as spelled by the dictionaries.

This system of Monsieur Féline, we must confess, seems to us more ingenious than useful, in so far as it is sought to apply it in teaching the young mind the art of reading. The method is too cumbrous, and we greatly question if it would not prove in the end more embarrassing to the tyro thus to learn a phonetic alphabet, which he must also learn to unlearn as he passes from the phonetic to the established spelling, than to grapple at the start with all the difficulties of the established French orthography. Nothing, we know, is more arbitrary and unreasonable than the pronunciation of both the French and English tongues as they are currently spelled, but such anomalies cannot, we fear, be rectified by any invention like that proposed by M. Féline; though we are glad to observe that he does not seek to supersede the French orthography in order to make it conform to the French orthoëpy, as we are counselled to do, with respect to English, by M. Pitman and the phonographers of his ilk.

The remedy proposed by Dr. Kraitsir is different, of course, from that of M. Féline and of every body else. His prescription is that we shall return to the correct pronunciation of Latin, and make it "the *canon* for the right analysis of the English and of other languages, *without destroying their peculiarities*." Or, as he elsewhere expresses himself, the Latin, when correctly pronounced, can be made to serve as the flying-wheel, so to say, the balance, the escapement of the Europæo-American languages, by which they can be guarded, on one side, against barbarification, and, on the other, against running themselves down and thus endangering the wholeness of their limbs and the soundness of their genius by empiric would-be improvements. Without, therefore, adopting the "life-endangering" recommendations of the phonographers for such languages as the English and French, he advises to avail ourselves of all that is good in their suggestions, but recommends, "on the whole, to keep the present *graphy* (or mode of writing) of English and French, but to abandon altogether, and as soon as possible, what we are accustomed to call and believe to be *spelling*." Spelling, in its true sense and signification, consists, according to our author, "in the analysis of words in two ways, viz: 1, into the sounds they consist of, as now pronounced; and, 2, into the letters with which the words are written."

If, now, any given word be spelled in the proper way these two analysis of its sounds and letters *should* coincide. The word *hat*, for instance, is not *spelled* when we "say off" its letters thus: *aitch-a-tea;* for the letters pronounced *aitch-a-tea* do not when combined produce the sound represented by the word *hat*; whereas a *word* in its true sense should be nothing more than a compound of the sounds which are perfectly represented by its component parts—that is, its letters and syllables.

And the importance of a return to the correct pronunciation of Latin, in connexion with this proposed reform in English spelling, is argued by Dr. Kraitsir on the following grounds: because the Latin forms fully two-thirds of the English tongue, and because it is not true that we mispronounce the Latin only by pronouncing it like so much English. We have no right, therefore, to pervert the original pronunciation of the Latin element in our language, and the excuse for so doing (that we apply to Latin words an English sound) is not tenable, because, were we to pronounce Latin as we do the bone and marrow and nerve of our vernacular, we would do justice to the Latin itself while following the genius of our own tongue, and at the same time would be laying bare the roots of the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Provençal, Valacchic, and even the French, German, Dutch, Russian, Icelandic, Danish, Swedish, and other affiliated languages; for such is the similarity among the *etyma* or roots of all these tongues that by *rightly* analyzing and pronouncing those of our own we can more readily master those of all cognate languages.

A reform in English spelling like that advocated by Dr. Kraitsir must of course be preceded by a reform in the pronunciation of the English alphabet, and the extent of the change required is stated in the following paragraphs:

"Pronounce the vowels *a, e, i, o, u,* and *y* as they respectively sound in the words *Alabama, Bethlehem, Mississippi, Ontario, full, Ypsilanty;* and all the consonants by *exploding* them from the mouth with a vowel sound just sufficient to articulate them, as is done in the case of *b, c, d, g, j, k, p, q, t, v, z,* and *not* as is now done with *f, h, l, m, n, r, s, x,* which last are articulated by *prefixing* an *e* or *ai* sound to the consonant, whereas they *should* be sounded with this vowel *suffixed*, as in the case of the other consonants; and pronounce *c* as *k; g* as *g* is sounded in all genuine Anglo-Saxon words; for instance, in *get, give, girdle, bigger,* &c.; *j* as *y* in *yes*. Please to shake the tongue in making the sound marked by *r*, that is, rattle it thus, *r-r-r*—. Pronounce *w* as if it were written uv.; both *j* and *y* as if they were marked *i j*, with one single quick emission of the voice; x as if it were written *ks*.—[We have slightly altered, for the sake of perspicuity, the arrangement of Dr. K.]

"Do not be afraid," adds Dr. K., "of either losing your English or of being in the wrong. People may laugh at you. They ought to weep at their being so many locomotive towers of Babel, *felones de sua ipsorum ratione;* as if they had committed all the sins of the Danaïds, of Sisyphus, Ixion, and of all backsliders from the path of truth and justice."

With such a corrected pronunciation of the English alphabet our sanguine author is prepared to *spell* English words, that is, to analyse their sounds and constituent symbols. Let the *sounds* of the spoken language, he argues, be analyzed by children before they are taught the *letters;* let the letters then be taught as they ought to be; apply the sounds represented by the letters to that mass of English words and parts of words which are really written phonetically; and, after the children have thus learned what is true, and not before, introduce them to those words and parts of words in which the *writing* disagrees from the *speaking*. The very oddity of this discrepancy will strike the children, as Dr. K. thinks, and be only the better remembered without impairing their sense of truthfulness. On an average it is calculated that the natural and organic sounds of all the letters, as pronounced above, stand, even in the present corrupted state of English orthoëpy, in the ratio of about eight to one as compared with the false, arbitrary, and anorganic names of the English letters as commonly taught. To change the names of our letters, as advised by Dr. K., would therefore be to conform them more accurately to the great body of our English lexicography; but whether such mighty benefits would result from it as are predicted by our author may, we think, be greatly questioned, without questioning at all the propriety of such a reform in the alphabet as that which he indicates.

On a future occasion we hope to resume our consideration of Dr. Kraitsir's curious and instructive volume; for in our notice of to-day we have merely glanced at a single feature of the work. On the origin and *nature* of language the reader will find much ingenious and, as we think, profound speculation in this remarkable book. To those familiar with the philological writings of William von Humboldt, Dr. Kraitsir will afford little that is wholly new; but the views of that most acute linguist and erudite scholar have found in the Hungarian polyglot a zealous defender, if not always a very lucid interpreter.

THE CHECK REIN.

When Stewpyd harnesses his horse for dragging brick up a grade, the horse's head is pulled back towards his tail and anchored there by the senseless and merciless check rein. The arrangement is unnatural; the animal is constrained by it. He must inevitably lose strength by it, for it disturbs the vital force and induces an unnatural action in the muscles of the neck, head, shoulders, and mouth. There are actually less energy and vigor left for the limbs and chest than there would be if the stupid contrivance were jerked off and thrown over the nearest fence. If reason cannot teach this promptly to any man, just let him try the experiment by putting a martingale upon himself and go to wrestling, or putting a check in the jaws of a boxer that shall extend down his back to his belt.

Who beside the British use the check rein, saving their free trade slaves and general imitators, the Americans? The French do not use it; the Germans do not; the Indians and Spaniards of South America, who literally live on horseback and are perfect horsemen, do not; the Spaniards of Europe do not, nor do the Turks. The most observant and most natural people in the world are free from this mischievous error. It is strange to us that the English and ourselves did not, years and years ago, reason upon the constantly-witnessed fact that when a check rein was loosed at a tavern stoop or in a stable the poor horse *always* stretched out his neck and hung down his head. That was his language for saying that the strap hurt him and wearied him, and that he was heartily glad to be relieved from it.

The genius that first proposed the mechanical feat of lifting himself up by the seat of his breeches must have been the author of the theory that the check rein held the horse up and kept him from falling. The mechanical action in the two cases must be precisely the same. If the reader will reflect for a moment he will see that no suspending power can be derived except from without the animal. A post, tree, or beam is just as indispensable to the support of a horse as to the support of a man intent on suicide. A horse can't hang himself up in the air by the terrets on his back any more than a man can by pulling upwards at his neck handkerchief.

The check rein should be abolished. It wastes motive power. Its use is unhealthy, for it disturbs the otherwise naturally and equally distributed vital forces. It shortens the life of the horse. It diminishes his speed and lessens the free and quick action so essential to the animal's safety and that of his driver. It is of no use, and cannot confer dignity or grace to an animal that was made by the Lord. Had man got up the horse, check reins and all sorts of contrivances would have been allowable not only, but perhaps necessary; but the work of the Great Artist cannot be improved upon.

Brethren of the press, let us emancipate the horse from the British check rein.—*Buffalo Democrat.*

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE.

Just before and following the recent execution of *Francis Dick* (at Dayton, Ohio) there was a deep, and to some extent a legitimate, public curiosity to know the circumstances, in detail, which attended the killing by him of Catharine and James Young. Of his guilt no one, after his second conviction, entertained a shadow of doubt; but no one saw him commit the deed, and he alone could disclose the manner of its commission. He was convicted on proof satisfactory to the jury that a coat of his, which was found hanging in the stable where he slept the night before the murder, was stained with blood; that one of the boots worn by him on the morning of the murder, but taken off and put away in Steffin's garret before the murder was discovered, had a small "clot of blood" in one of the wrinkles above the heel; and that a certain spade, supposed to have been used in committing the murder, had rust-spots upon it which were produced by blood. The fact whether the appearances on these articles resembling blood were really blood was the material issue in the case. Forming an opinion from mere inspection, witnesses came to different conclusions. The weight of evidence, however, was decidedly in favor of the conclusion that the stains were blood. As to the boots, the persons who first saw them were positive that the red deposite in the wrinkle was blood. A scum was formed on it, and, breaking this with the finger, the blood was fresh and liquid. As to the coat and spade there was less certainty. The blotch on the coat, which was blue jeans, had a dirty brown appearance. When moistened it communicated a dark red stain to white paper. The coloring matter, however, whatever it was, appeared dim on the surface, considering the amount of it in the fabric. This induced the belief, universally expressed by the witnesses, that the stained section of the garment had been washed. There was still greater doubt about the rust-spots on the spade. Whether they were produced by blood, or by tomato juice, or by rain could not be determined with certainty from simple inspection, and the witnesses generally so qualified their opinions.

For the purpose, if possible, of resolving the doubt, the prosecution employed Dr. H. G. Carey, previous to the last trial, to make a chemical analysis. Accordingly, by a process which we need not describe, he procured a quantity of the supposed blood and tested it, making his experiments first upon that taken from the coat and afterwards upon that taken from the spade. The tests which he employed were those regarded as most reliable by medical jurists, and the results attained were entirely satisfactory to his mind that the substance in both cases was blood. He believed, and so testified, that there was scarcely less room for error in regard to this conclusion and the process of reaching it than there would be in a mathematical demonstration. Other scientific men testified; some of them confirming the reliability of Dr. Carey's analysis, and others treating it as of no value whatever.

In this position of the evidence it was important to know from Dick himself whether he used the spade in committing the murder, and whether, while committing it, he wore the coat and boots. The information was important, not because it might gratify a very natural public curiosity, but because it would tend to show the reliability or unreliability of such testimony and tests as were satisfactory to the jury in his case; and important, therefore, as a commentary upon the law of criminal evidence.

Having very little confidence in the reported confessions of Dick, many of them contradictory, we requested his priestly adviser, who had his entire confidence, to ascertain for us for publication such facts as would show whether the proof of blood on the spade and other articles in question was true or otherwise. This he consented to do, provided the information was used only for the proper and legitimate object for which we desired him to procure it. The statement thus furnished is, that the spade, and no other implement or weapon of any kind, was used in killing both the old woman and the boy. The spade was not washed afterward, but it was rained on before it was found, subsequent to the murder. This probably removed the grosser particles of blood, leaving only the sprinkles, which were fixed upon the iron by rusting. As to the coat, Dick's declaration was that he did not wash it, for if there was blood upon it the circumstance escaped his notice. Neither did he wash his boots, except as they were washed by walking through the wet grass; just as the witnesses, Scott and McReynolds, who first saw them, supposed the fact to be.

This statement of facts by Dick may be relied on as true, if there was any truth at all in him; and we may say for him, as a reason for confidence in his last declarations, that they correspond with his uniform denials and admissions to his counsel before and during his trial, so far as those denials and admissions went. There is no reason to question the honesty and truthfulness of his dying words; and, admitting their truth, they assure us not only that every circumstance which was allowed to tell against him told the truth, but that the existence of those circumstances, even the least potent of them, the blood upon the coat and spade, was ascertained by methods entirely reliable.—*Dayton (Ohio) Gazette.*

RAILROAD ACCIDENT.—On Tuesday night, the 12th instant, the downward train on the Chicago and Mississippi railroad met the upward train near Joliet, to which place it was necessary that the former should return to enable the latter to pass. In doing so, while crossing the bridge over the River Des Plains, one of the freight cars was thrown from the track. This caused the bridge to give way, by which eight cars filled with merchandise were precipitated into the river. The upward train, which was following closely, ran into and smashed the other locomotive and tender. Passengers were badly frightened, but no one hurt.

COLONIAL FAST.—The authorities of Nova Scotia have set apart the 21st instant as a day of public thanksgiving to Almighty God for his mercy in exempting that portion of British North America from the recent ravages of the cholera.

INCREASED PAY TO SOLDIERS.

GENERAL ORDERS, No. 16.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, September 14, 1854.

Inquiries having been made by several commanding officers in regard to the construction of various points of the act approved August 4, 1854, "to increase the pay of the rank and file of the army and to encourage enlistments," the following instructions are published for the information and guidance of all concerned:

1. The act takes effect from its date, and increases the pay of the non-commissioned officers, musicians, and privates of the army of the United States (a description which includes all enlisted men except those of the Ordnance Department) four dollars per month over the rates to which they were entitled by previous laws. One dollar per month of the pay of the private soldier is, however, still to be retained till the expiration of his term of service, in conformity with the fifth clause of the supplementary act of July 7, 1838.

2. Every enlisted soldier in service at the passage of the act, and subsequently receiving an honorable discharge on the completion of his term of enlistment, who shall, within one month thereafter, re-enlist in the army, shall be entitled to two dollars per month, in addition to the ordinary pay of his grade, for the first period of five years after the expiration of his previous enlistment, and a further sum of one dollar per month for each successive period of five years, so long as he shall remain *continuously* in the army.

3. Soldiers honorably discharged before the passage of the act, but who re-entered service within one month after their discharge and the date of the act, are entitled, from the date of such re-entry, to two dollars per month in addition to the ordinary pay of their grade.

4. Soldiers in the army at the date of the act, who have served one or more enlistments and been honorably discharged, are entitled to the two dollars per month, in addition to the ordinary pay of their grade, from the date of the passage of the act.

5. Every non-commissioned officer, musician, or private soldier who may re-enlist into his *company* or *regiment* under the conditions expressed in the 29th section of the act of July 5, 1838, viz. "within two months before or one month after the expiration of his term of service," is still entitled to the three months' extra pay provided by said act. The "three months' extra pay" (bounty) thus allowed is the ordinary pay of the grade in which the soldier was serving when discharged.

6. The serving out of each enlistment entered into under the 29th section of the act of July 5, 1838, above cited, is to be counted as five years' service within the meaning of the 2d section of the act of August 4, 1854.

7. If an enlistment or re-establishment be made at or in the vicinity of the remote military posts under the conditions of the 3d section of the act of June 17, 1850, the soldier is also entitled to the bounty provided by that act—the amount to be paid to him in equal instalments at the end of each year's service, and in the proportions fixed by the regulation of June 22, 1850.

8. Soldiers who received a certificate of merit for distinguished services in the war with Mexico, as well those now in the army as those who may hereafter enlist, are allowed the two dollars per month to which that certificate would have entitled them had they remained continuously in the service. Where the service has been continuous the pay commences from the date of the engagement in which the certificate was won; where the soldier has been out of service, but was in the army at the passage of the law, he is entitled to the extra pay from August 4, 1854, the date of the act. In all other cases the pay will commence from the date of enlistment.

9. The rule recited in the foregoing paragraph is applicable also to those non-commissioned officers who, under the authority of the 17th section of the act of March 3, 1847, were recommended for promotion by brevet to the lowest grades of commissioned officers, but did not receive the benefit of that provision. A list of the non-commissioned officers embraced in this description will be published hereafter.

10. The sixth section of the act of August 4, 1854, increasing the allowance to soldiers employed at work on fortifications, in surveys, in cutting roads, and other constant labor of not less than ten days, is a substitute for the act of March 2, 1819, on the same subject, which it entirely supersedes. Accordingly, the "extra gill of whiskey or spirits" heretofore allowed to the army when employed on fatigue duty is discontinued. Enlisted men employed as laborers and teamsters at posts east of the Rocky Mountains are now entitled to an extra-compensation of twenty-five cents per day, and when employed as mechanics to forty cents. At all posts west of those mountains the corresponding rates are thirty-five cents and fifty cents per day, respectively.

11. It is particularly enjoined on all commanding officers to see that the muster-rolls embrace all the data necessary to insure justice to the soldier and to guide the paymaster in making his payments. Thus, when men are entitled to the benefits of the second section of the act of August 4, 1854, the following remarks should be placed opposite their names: "$2 pr. mo. for former services;" the expression "former services" being used to designate the whole period of the soldier's service prior to the date of the act. If he be entitled to $1 additional for re-enlisting subsequent to its date, the remark will then be, "$2 pr. mo. for former services and $1 for re-enlisting;" for a second re-enlistment, "$2 pr. mo. for former services and $2 for second re-enlistment," &c. For soldiers coming under the provisions of the 3d and 4th sections of the act, note as follows: "$2 pr. mo. for cert. merit;" $2 pr. mo. for previous services, $2 for cert. merit, and $1 for re-enlisting," &c., according to the facts of the case. The bounty of "three months' extra pay," allowed for re-enlistments under the 29th section of the act of July 5, 1838, is not to be entered on the muster-roll, as this bounty is paid by the recruiting officer, and not by the paymaster; but instalments of bounty due for enlistments made under the provisions of the 3d section of the act of June 17, 1850, will be noted as follows: "One-tenth (or one-eighth, one-sixth, or one-fourth, according to its being the instalment due for the first, second, third, or fourth year's service) ret'd bounty ($——) due;" the regulation amount of the bounty to be specified. The instalment for the fifth year's service will be thus noted: "$—— ret'd bounty ($——) due."

The pay certificate given to soldiers at the time of their discharge must also clearly set forth the extra allowances to which they are entitled.

By order of the SECRETARY OF WAR:

S. COOPER, Adjutant General.

THE POWER OF THE PENCE.

A TRUE MANCHESTER STORY.

The Rev. J. B. Owen, M.A., of Bilston, in the course of a lecture delivered in the Liverpool Concert Hall, in connexion with the Church of England institution upon "Popular Insurance," related an anecdote strikingly illustrative of the power which lies in the hand of the working men to promote their own social comfort and independence if they would only exert it. A Manchester calico-printer was, on his wedding-day, persuaded by his wife to allow her two half-pints of ale a day as her share. He rather winced under the bargain; for, though a drinker himself, he would have preferred a perfectly sober wife. They both worked hard, and he, poor man, was seldom out of the public-house as soon as the factory closed. The wife and husband saw little of each other except at breakfast; but, as she kept things tidy about her and made her stinted and even selfish allowance for housekeeping meet the demands upon her, he never complained. She had her daily pint, and he perhaps had his two or three quarts; and neither interfered with the other except when at odd times she succeeded, by dint of one little gentle artifice or another, to win him home an hour or two earlier at night, and now and then to spend an entire evening in his own house. But these were rare occasions. They had been married a year; and, on the morning of their wedding anniversary, the husband looked askance at her neat and comely person with some shade of remorse as he observed—

"Mary, we'n had no holyday sin' we were wed; and, only that I haven't a penny i' th' world, we'd take a jaunt to th' village to see thee mother."

"Would'st like to go, John?" asked she softly, between a smile and a tear, to hear him speak kindly as in old times. "If thee'd like to go, John, I'll stand treat."

"Thou stand treat!" said he, with half a sneer; "has got a fortune, wench?"

"Nay," said she, "but I'n gotten the pint o' ale."

"Gotten what?" said he.

"The pint o' ale!" was the reply.

John still did not understand her, till the faithful creature reached down a loose stocking from under a loose brick up the chimney, and, counting out her daily pint of ale in the shape of three hundred and sixty-five threepences, (i. e., £4 11s. 3d.,) put it into his hand, exclaiming—

"Thee shall have the holyday, John."

John was ashamed, astonished, conscience-smitten, charmed. He would'nt touch it.

"Hasn't thee had thy share? Then I'll ha' no more," said he.

They kept their wedding-day with the old dame, and the wife's little capital was the nucleus of a series of investments that ultimately swelled into shop, factory, warehouse, country-seat, a carriage; and, for aught Mr. Owen knew, John was mayor of his naive borough at last.

A SAD ACCIDENT.—A young man named Edwin R. Keyes, late of Princeton, (Mass.) was strangled to death in a car-shop at Cleveland, Ohio, on the 4th instant. He was adjusting something near the shaft of the planing machine, when his neckerchief became entangled around the shaft and he was almost immediately choked.

TO THE EDITORS.

WASHINGTON, SEPTEMBER 15, 1854.

GENTLEMEN: With the consent of the author for the publication of the letter herewith communicated, and with the recommendation of persons deeply interested in the discovery which it treats of, I respectfully solicit a place in your columns, knowing that the information it contains will be highly valuable to all who love knowledge and labor to advance her truths. By these the letter will receive the attention and interest it merits, and when I say that more than sixteen years of toil have been spent to produce a theory which would benefit mankind, the value of which, after a year's publication nearly, is just being realized, although incomplete in its details, cannot fail to elicit, when more generally known, an entire acknowledgment of indebtedness from the sailor and the merchant for the security it gives to life and property on the ocean. The Government has paid out large sums to have this phenomenon investigated, yet they have not been able to have its mysteries explained. As far as that goes, then, we are still in darkness. But in the author's "*Mechanical Theory of Storms*" the navigator is supplied with all that he needs. This I am able to say from having carefully determined the predictions of the theory; and from a comparison of the results deduced from the theory with the physical features of many storms which I have investigated, the most remarkable harmony exists; so that by the observance of the attendant phenomena on the approach of a vortex the sailor can determine its bearing as well as if he had made the calculation, and by the action of the wind on a descending or ascending vortex he knows how to shape his course. To the author of such a discovery this is no praise, and is not intended for any. There are men in high positions, in every way eminent, who are thoroughly convinced of the truth of these doctrines, and to them belong the honor of bestowing praise.

P.

OTTAWA, SEPTEMBER 5, 1854.

DEAR SIR: In answer to your queries concerning certain predictions of mine which appeared in the National Intelligencer of August 14th, I would refer you to a communication since sent to that paper explaining their object. You will perceive they were neither intended for publication nor regarded as predictions of a *storm*, but simply as an example of a vortex passing from north to south, and were made dependant on certain contingencies to be observed in deciding on the attendant phenomena, such as the magnitude of the barometrical fluctuations about that time and the general character of the weather. But these qualifications were omitted. In order to enable you to form a correct opinion of the theory, I will now give you a more detailed explanation of the difficulties standing in the way of precise predictions. There are six vortices in each hemisphere—one central and five lateral; further distinguished as three inner and three outer. This of course gives twelve passages over any middle latitude in one siderial revolution of the moon, more or less; but the apparent number is diminished by the frequent occurrence of a vortex passing descending at the same time and place as another passing ascending. At such times the observations do not assist in determining the orbit elements. Now, the first important element is the obliquity of the vortex, and the next the right ascension of the node at a given time. But these cannot be determined independently of the rest, for the passages are the only visible indications to serve as data. We must therefore find, at the same time, an approximate mean radius for each orbit and a mean position angle. Then comes the question, how many of these vortices are there? This difficulty is increased by the fact that two consecutive passages of the same vortex, differing sometimes nearly ten degrees in latitude, are both invisible to the observer. Again, a central passage even may be made without great derangement, owing to the non-impressibility of the atmosphere. And, again, an ascending vortex, when great derangement is apparent, often clears off with the wind at northwest, as if it were a descending vortex, although the dim hazy bank to the northward is sufficiently significant to one familiar with the theory. But suppose the number determined; the question arises, do the radii of these orbits increase with the moon's distance in a direct or inverse ratio? Are no some inverse and some direct? Are not the mean position angles affected by change of the moon's distance, and in what ratio? All these things have to be determined at the same time, and years of approximation have been required. But there are other inequalities, independent of the moon, directly springing from the *principles* of the theory, of such an enormous value as to reverse the apogees of the several orbits. As an instance of this I will mention that the particular vortex of the predictions (the first inner descending) passed latitude 44° on the 12th of March, when the moon's right ascension was nine hours forty-eight minutes, and was still further advanced on the 2d of May in latitude 40° and in the same longitude, when the moon's right ascension was only seven hours fifteen minutes; the former passage being probably connected with the "City of Glasgow." Now, I ask you, in view of these facts, is it reasonable, is it liberal, to exact precise predictions as the test of a theory whose chief characteristic is an ability to divest *all* meteorological phenomena of mystery, and to refer them to simple mechanical principles, on which the whole of Nature is shown to be dependant? That there are such thus disposed is evident from the character of a report of the weather which appeared in the paper before mentioned on August 28th, in which it is said "the whole north was uninterruptedly dry, calm, and very warm, from August 20th to 23d." The Baltimore Sun of the 24th says: "Yesterday was quite an agreeable day, being about eighteen degrees cooler than Tuesday, whilst a cooling breeze from the north blew the whole day. During the previous night a perfect hurricane of wind was experienced, and a heavy storm was expected." I see, also, by the shipping reports of New York, that many ships report bad weather at that time, the British brig Woodlark, from Cardiff, losing both her topmasts off Block Island, about latitude 41°. (See Tribune of August 29th.)

The theory gives the prediction as an average of the direction of the winds along a belt of land, including the line of passage. This belt is often one, two, or three hundred miles wide, according to the time of the year and the impressibility of the atmosphere; and this belt is again subdivided into spaces and veins of greatest and least action, and having a general progression eastward in middle latitude; and from these inequalities and their immense extent, and the comparatively limited field of vision, it requires at least a willingness to look at the evidence of the theory being true in order to be convinced. A person may be very expert at reading barometers and analyzing past records, but it requires the eye of the sailor and the enlarged views of the astronomer to recognise this phenomenon; yet, once familiar with it, it will be looked for as regularly as the rising of the sun, and never disappoint the observer. It may be readily understood why the scientific are loth to admit the necessity of joining the doctrines of Des Cartes with the system of Newton, as this theory requires. Nevertheless it must be done if we would avail ourselves of the knowledge Nature has placed within our reach. And those who advocate *permanence* as the grand key of physical science will no doubt oppose a theory which insists on the necessity of entirely remodelling the whole system of meteorological observations. Do this, and in ten or twenty years we may reasonably anticipate that every storm and every wind will be predicted years beforehand for the mariner and the time of drouth and rain in a general way for the agriculturist; and, if this be true, no time should be lost in view of the annual destruction of life and property due to a want of such knowledge. Having thus placed the theory and nature of these predictions in their true light, the real philosopher will look only for the general verification of a prediction, and not regard discrepancies in minutia as important. His first question will be, Do these vortices really exist? Do their numbers correspond with the theory? Do they follow a mathematical law connecting them with the motions of the moon? These answered satisfactorily, he will be willing to put his shoulder to the wheel and ignore such theories as hold out no hope to mankind of making any future advance towards remedying the physical evils referred to. *How* these vortices produce the derangement I have explained elsewhere, sufficient that the *modus agendi* is rational and mechanical, and does not outrage a single principle of science.

You ask me: "Are these vortices connected with the equinoctial gales, and can you predict one?" Of course they are caused by the vortices acting on an atmosphere more easily disturbed than at other times. Their influence is therefore more extensive. In the predictions prepared for the committee you will find such a prediction; but this I would remark, the theory has been determined from my own observations, confined to one latitude and longitude, and the present elements give results closely corresponding with the facts. If the "obliquity" be in error, the error will not vitiate the calculation for this latitude much, (supposing the other elements correct.) In another latitude, differing considerably, there will be discrepancies, if such be the fact; and, in view of this, I earnestly protested against the requirements of the committee, especially against stepping out of my own latitude. An equinoctial gale also is less satisfactory as evidence of a passage, for the reason that every one expects a gale about the equinox, and the result might be attributed to chance. Now, as the reality of a passage of a disturbing cause on the 22d of August has been disputed, and as a vortex returns at average intervals of the moon's siderial period, it would seem more appropriate to let the same predictions still apply to the next passage, subject to the state of the atmosphere at the time. The same vortex is now passing ascending over this latitude; at least the *effects* are palpable, as a yellow bank of heavy cumuli, wind blowing a strong gale from the south, and the sky looks squally, (September 5th, 3 P. M.) Well, sir, this same vortex will pass descending in latitude 40° on the evening of the 18th of September, although its effects will probably not be developed until the following night, as a squall of wind from the northward. It is as sure to come as the sun is to rise, and squalls will no doubt be observed along and near the central line of passage; but the force in a given locality is yet uncertain. It will first appear as a cloudy space in the northern sky, and if watched will spread over to the southward. I have before stated that one reason why I selected this vortex (first inner descending) was on account of its comparative isolation when on latitude 40°. The same peculiarity makes it at its approach at the ascending passage, near latitude 40°, equally distinct. The first outer descending, however, frequently passes the next day, and its departure is less readily observed. Its next ascending passage will be early in the morning of the 2d October, and will plainly come from the south, as it is usually preceded by two or three days of fine weather. It will be nearly central at Washington. On the morning of the 29th a belt of clouds may be visible in the north, passing south. After passing south the clouds will chiefly affect the southern sky. This will be due to the second inner vortex descending, which passes on the morning of the 29th, *though not very near*. On the 29th September, on the 30th, and on October 1st there will be no evidence of the presence of a vort