

ugly person, is obnoxious to the condemnation already pronounced on similar corruptions; ugliness and beauty being qualities to be judged of (with the exception, as regards beauty, to be noticed hereafter,) only by the eye.

The next in this class of examples is the adjective "*Grand*," the correct definition of which is "*great, illustrious, high in power*." Corresponding with these characteristic elucidations of the term, the adjective itself is never appropriately employed, but to denote things, persons or occurrences of a high and exalted order: the word is always associated with the idea of illustrious and pre-eminent qualities; and its adaptation to inferior objects is therefore puerile and absurd. Hence, the very common use of this word, in reference to the most trifling and subordinate actions in ordinary life, is a species of grandiloquence, peculiarly childish and silly: whatever style of speech is essentially contrary to established usages, and in violation of correct colloquial principles, is the result either of affectation or ignorance, or both; and is consequently inelegant and vulgar; and under this condemnation comes the familiar and depreciating use of the word "*Grand*."

My next instance of verbal corruption is of so gross a nature, as scarcely to require more than to point it out for your candid consideration, to ensure your instant admission of its inelegance and impropriety. The employment of the compound and senseless phrase "*Right-away*" to express "*immediately, instantly, directly*," or "*at once*," is to the last degree so atrociously low, vulgar and unjustifiable; at the same time, that with so excellent a choice of expressive and simple, legitimate terms, it is so entirely needless, that no further argument can be necessary, to induce every individual, desirous of cultivating correct phraseology, to discard for ever so ridiculous a corruption.

Congenious with the abuses already alluded to, of the terms "*clever, smart, ugly*," &c., is that of the adjective "*Handsome*." The primary and almost exclusive meaning of this word is "*beautiful, graceful, elegant*," and its adaptation is to the visible appearance of persons and things; for although we metaphorically apply it also to the moral qualities of generosity and liberality, and thus denominate a liberal action as "*handsome conduct*," yet this is but the exception to the rule; and therefore the vernacular application of this adjective to a great variety of *other* actions and qualities than those now alluded to, is innately

incorrect, and betrays a carelessness and ignorance which cannot characterise well-educated men. Similar remarks may be applied to common abuse of the adjective "*elegant*," which is as much, or even more improperly employed than the term "*handsome*."

Another American vulgarity is the misapplication of the word "*some*," independently, instead of joining it to a substantive, to give it its proper effect, or using the term "*a little*." These people sometimes hear such queries and replies, "Did you frighten him at all?" "I guess I did, *some*." "Are you acquainted with the country?"—"I should think I am, *some*." The adjective "*some*," in these cases, should either be placed between the preposition and the noun "*measure*," or "*degree*," as "*in some degree*," or "*in some measure*," to give it its legitimate effect, or it should be wholly dispensed with, by the substitution of the term, "*a little*." The independent use of the adjective "*some*," is extremely abrupt and ungrammatical.

So the verb "*keep*" is similarly perverted and constrained to imply what can only be fully expressed by its conjunction with a following noun or pronoun. The remarks already made, with respect to the word "*dictate*," equally apply to this verb. "*To keep*" is to "*retain, preserve or maintain*;" and its definition intrinsically shews, that the expression requires some *person or thing* to be retained, preserved or kept." The verb alone is incomplete; it has no object to act upon, and consequently is meaningless. How absurd, then, are such phrases as, "Does John *keep* here?"—"Who *keeps* in that house?"—"That is where Mr. B. *keeps*."—"What do you *keep*?"—These are extremely common but very erroneous expressions: they are definite and imperfect; the verb refers to no object. The persons spoken of may *keep themselves*, or *others*; they may *keep* a horse, an ox, a cow or a sheep; they may *keep* an inn, a private house, a shop or an office; they may *keep* their money, or *keep* their bed; they may *keep* an exhibition or a prison; but inasmuch as none of these various objects is specified, the sense is indeterminate, and the phrase ungrammatical and improper.

I now briefly notice a corruption, in the forming a substantive into a verb. The word "*Loan*," in the English language, is a noun and a noun only. The language acknowledges no such verb. "*A loan*" is a thing lent; the act of delivering a thing as a loan, is "*lending*;" and "*to lend*" is the only verb in