

and child has suddenly started up an *individual*. This again is an example how language is corrupted by a silly dread of plain speaking. Our ancestors were *men* and *women*. The former word, too, was often used generally, as it is still, like the Latin *homo*, for every human being. Unluckily, however, we have no form answering to the German *mensch*—and hence, in seeking for a word which should convey no intimation of sex, we had recourse to a variety of substitutes, for, no one being strictly appropriate, each after a time has been deemed vulgar, and none has been lasting." After noticing these various substitutes, such as '*wight*,' '*folk*,' '*a body*,' '*a soul*,' '*a creature*,' '*a fellow*,' '*a person*,' the writer goes on to say, "Nowadays, however, all these words are grown stale. Such grand people are we, for whom the world is too narrow, our dignity will not condescend to enter into any thing short of a quadrisyllable. No! give us a fine big long word, no matter what it means; only it must not have been degraded by being applied to any former generation. * * The attempt to check the progress of a word which has already acquired such currency, may perhaps be very idle. Still it is well, if one can but lead some of the less thoughtless to call to mind that words have a meaning and a history, and that, if used according to their historical meaning, they have also life and power. The word in question, too, is a good and valuable word, and worth reclaiming for its own appropriate signification. We want it; we have frequent occasion for it, and have no substitute to fill its place. It should hardly be used, except where some distinction or contrast is either exprest or implied. A man is an *individual*, as regarded in his special particular unity, not in his public capacity, not as a member of a body; he is an *individual*, so far as he is an integral whole, different and distinct from other men; and that which makes him what he is, that in which he differs and is distinguished from other men, is his *individuality*, and *individualizes* him."—P. 134.

A like example is the very common disuse, nowadays, of the good old words, '*begin*' and '*beginning*,' which seem in a fair way of being thrust out of our speech by the newer French-English words '*commence*' and '*commencement*.' The former are in our Bible—in the very first verse, and elsewhere, in the Liturgy, and in the best writers of all the times of English Literature, and it would indeed be a pity that such simple, native words, should be sacrificed to the love of fine writing and fine talking, and thus lost to the language. Instead of parting with such words that are still left to us, it is better to find an author excellent in style, like Southey, strenuously restoring a word, which, though it has