

ish language, legitimately expressing "to use as a loan." The very frequent use, therefore, which we observe, of the word "hire" in the form of a verb or a participle, is wholly corrupt and inadmissible.

At least barbarism borrowed from our neighbours, which I will now notice, is one so abundant and self-evident, that it is astonishing how many, having the means of consulting a grammar or a dictionary, could persist in using it. The term "*tri-weekly*" is habitually employed by a considerable portion of the American press, and their example has been thoughtfully followed by our provincial editors, to express an exact opposite to its correct meaning.

The prefix "*tri*" is from the Latin "*tres*, *trium*," ("three,") but not *three times*, which is "*thrice*," a term expressed in Latin by the word "*ter*."—" *Tri-weekly*," therefore, means *three-weekly*, *every third week*, or "*once in three weeks*;" and it neither does, nor can it mean anything else. So, "*annual*" is once a year or every year; *bi-annual*, is every second year, or once in two years; *tri-ennial*, once in three years; *quadrennial*, once in four years, (from which our new election law is called the *quadrennial act*;) and so on; and in the same mode of composition, we have the "*tri-weekly*," or *three-weekly*, &c. The English language is settled and determinate, and ought not to be altered by the whims of editors, however they may manage to distort their native tongue: *tria* or *tres*, therefore, meaning only *three*, cannot be substituted for *ter*, meaning *thrice*; and hence, to use "*tri-weekly*" as denoting "*three times, or thrice-a-week*," is fundamentally wrong. No compound term expressing this meaning has yet been adopted; and such a phrase is absolutely necessary, it should be "*ter-weekly*," and not "*tri-weekly*."

The examples which I have now elucidated appear to spring from an American origin; there are, however, equally numerous errors, common among us, and resulting only from personal carelessness or ignorance. To enumerate all these would require more time and attention than we can possibly devote to the subject; we must content ourselves, therefore, with the consideration of a few specimens, which may guide the way to a discovery of the remainder. They may be classified as I. "*Etymological errors*," or using words in a wrong sense,"—II. "*Errors of grammatical construction*,"—III. "*Errors of pronunciation*," and (IV.) mere "*Vulgarisms*."

In the first class I will briefly instance the

words "*Beautiful*," "*Humoursome*," "*Hire*," "*Learn*," and one or two others.

The substantive "*Beauty*" is defined by Lexicographers as "*that assemblage of graces which pleases the eye*;" and its cognate adjective "*Beautiful*" is expounded as "*fair, elegant, lovely*." The term, indeed, legitimately applies to qualities, which are objects of perception by one only of the senses, viz., that of sight. Whatever the eye can judge of, and deem fair and lovely, that alone can be rightly termed "*beautiful*." It is true, that by analogy we say, "*a beautiful idea, a beautiful thought, a beautiful expression*;" but ideas, thoughts and expressions are things comprehended only by intellectual judgment, and not by any corporeal sense; they are objects of mental perception, as much as outward matters are of ocular vision; and hence, for such purposes, the perception of the mind, and the sight of the body are so far synonymous terms. "*The mind's eye*" is indeed an established figurative phrase. It is, therefore, extremely erroneous, to apply the word "*beautiful*" to things affecting other senses than that of sight; as we often do hear persons speaking of beautiful sounds, or beautiful tastes and flavours.—*Taste is feeling*, and the organ of hearing has no relation to that of sight; which last is the only corporeal sense that can judge of beauty. With regard to the gratification afforded by any object to other senses, the words "*Delightful, delicious, sweet, good, excellent, harmonious, pleasant*," &c. afford a sufficient variety of definitions; but the term "*beautiful*" cannot apply.

We sometimes hear, in common parlance and sometimes perceive in the public prints, the term "*humoursome*" improperly substituted for "*humorous*." The words may appear, to superficial observers, very much alike; but their meanings widely differ. "*Humoursome*" is "peevish, petulant, addicted to cross and wayward humours;" while "*humorous*" is "jocular, whimsical, pleasant." This distinction should be carefully remembered.

The verb "*to Hire*" is often erroneously used. To hire is to engage for pay, to obtain the temporary use of a thing for a consideration; and hence, the term can only be rightly used, by the person obtaining or borrowing the thing; and not by him who lets it out for hire. When, therefore, we hear persons speaking of hiring out an article, when lending it for hire, we hear an unwarrantable expression, diametrically opposite to its legitimate mean-