

neither of these forms of speech comes among the cases in which the colony has kept on the elder usage of the Mother Country. This hardly needs proof in the case of "corn." But the narrower use of that word is exactly analogous to the narrower use of the word "beast" among English graziers, and of the word "bird" among English sportsmen. In the case of "shop," the word is perfectly good English both in the wider and in the narrower sense, as it is in a good many other senses besides. But I cannot find that "store" was ever used in England in the American sense, till it came in quite lately in the case of "Co-operative stores." But I have not the slightest doubt that a perfectly good reason for the difference of usage could be found in some circumstance of early colonial life. I can fancy that in one of the first New England settlements a shop would really be a "store," in a sense in which it hardly is now on either side of the ocean. And the "co-operative store" may be so called for some reason of the same kind, or it may be because the name is thought to be finer, or it may be a mere transplantation of the American name. The "shop" or the "store" suggests its contents; and I dare say that there is some good reason, though I do not see it, why the contents of one particular kind of "store" should be specially called "dry goods." The contents of some other kinds of store seem to the untechnical mind to be equally dry. But the phrase, however it arose, is just like our phrase "hardware," which does not take in all things that are in themselves hard. Then again, I have known some foolish Britishers mock at such phrases as "town lot," "city lot;" but these are perfectly good and natural names for things to which we have nothing exactly answering in modern England. The constant use of the phrase "block," in showing a

man his way about a town, struck me at first as odd. But it is a perfectly good use. American towns are built in blocks, in a way in which the elder English towns at least are not. The "city lot" suggests the "city" itself, of which we certainly hear much more in America than in England. The use of the word "city" in England is rather strange. At some time later than Domesday and earlier than Henry the Eighth, it came to be confined on one hand and extended on the other, so as to take in all places that were bishops' sees, and no places that were not. In America a "city" means what we should call a corporate town or municipal borough. But in England the word "city" is seldom used, except either in rather formal speech or else to distinguish the real city of London from the other parts of the "province covered with houses" which in common speech bears its name. In America the word "city" is in constant use, where we should use the word "town," even though the place spoken of bears the formal rank of a city. I remember getting into strange cross-purposes with an American gentleman who, in speaking of a visit to London, went on speaking of "the city," while he meant parts of the province covered with houses far away from what I understood by that name. "Town," in New England at least, has another meaning. A "town" or "township" may contain a "city," or it may not. On the other hand, one often hears the phrase "down town," even in New York itself. New York, by the way, calls itself a "metropolis:" in what sense of the word it is not easy to guess, as it can hardly be because it is the seat of a Roman Catholic archbishopric. And I have even known a New York paper speak of the rest of the United States as "the provinces." That insulting name is bad enough when it is applied to an Eng-