

says that to *loan* is rarely used in England, and I may say that I never heard it there. What advantage then does it possess over the more familiar form of the verb that it should supersede it here? Surely the phrase "money to lend," is sufficiently intelligible. To talk of *loaning* money, would suggest to an unsophisticated Englishman, the idea of some unknown process at the mint.

Again, let a clergyman study his sermon, a professor his lecture, a member of Parliament his speech, or a merchant the state of the markets and the rate of exchange: an educated or uneducated Englishman would probably say, "*the man is master of his subject*," and than this, more need not and cannot be said. In the States and Canada, however, a new phrase is current. A member of our Assembly makes a luminous speech, say about that great institution of modern civilization, the gallows,—and writers forthwith remark, that "he is *posted-up* on it." A Professor of Anatomy gives a lecture on some abstruse branch of his department of medical education, and his admiring pupils exclaim that "he is well *posted-up* on his subject." A metaphysician once more grapples with the old problem how many angels can stand on the point of a needle, and he, too is *posted-up* on it." A clergyman is *posted-up* in theology, a black-smith in iron, a milliner in crinoline, a mother in nursery government, and an undertaker in the art of "performing" funerals, and coffinng his customers. But, while ledgers may and should be "posted," it has not hitherto been the English practice to treat men so, unless they be black-legs.

A man in England possesses notable capacity, and people style him *capable*, or *able*, or *great*. In Canada he is designated *first-class* carriage, or a *first-class* prize, or even a *first-class* prize ox. may be right enough, but why apply phrases with such poor associations to men of splendid intellect? Is it not enough that a man be *great*? Will he seem any greater when indissolubly associated with a railway van? The originators of such expressions no doubt thought so, but if the victim of such a nick name be what it is supposed to imply, he will not thank his admirers for the compliment.

A man in Britain buys a house, or farm, and it is said to be *in*, or more precisely, *situated* in such a street, or district, or county. Here, nobody or thing is *situated* anywhere; all are *located*. Our farms, our houses, our congregations, our constituencies, all are *located*. We admire a mansion occupying a healthy, or commanding site, and we are told that "the *location* is good;" a clergyman is congratulated on his incumbency, which is styled a comfortable *location*; and so on *ad infinitum*. To *locate* is a purely technical term, belonging to land-surveyors and their profession, and it is difficult to perceive any gain to the language by its application being extended beyond its original technical significance.

Ask an Englishman how much he has accomplished of a given work, and he will reply if getting on well, "a good deal." Ask the same question in our own colony, and if in a like position, the answer will be, "*considerable*." Now, *considerable* means, "worthy of consideration." Thus: "a man has a *considerable* fortune." We can understand when, in answer to the question, "how are you getting on with your mathematics?" the student replies *considerable*, or, still more elegantly, "*considerable much*." He means to say, "very well" and it is to be regretted that he should not say so. Or to give another specimen of the novel mode of applying this word *considerable*; a newspaper editor recently illustrating by comparison the telegraph-cable designed to unite Canada with the States, by being laid in the bed of the River St. Clair, from Detroit to the Canadian shore, says of it: "it is larger by *considerable* than the Atlantic submarine cable."

A man *concludes* a bargain, and he *resolves* on a certain course of action. A man also comes to a *conclusion* after having considered a matter. But there is a difference between coming to a conclusion and resolving. To do the former, merely implies that he has formed an opinion, to do the latter implies that he has determined on a course of action. So we understand it, and so the words are used in English literature. But it is becoming common in Canada to confound *conclude* and *resolve*, and to speak of conclusions when resolutions are intended. Thus:—"I *conclude* to go," is put for, "I have *resolved* or made up my mind to go;" surely a very needless confusion of ideas or vocables.

A *territory* is defined by Webster to be "a tract of land belonging to, or under the dominion of a prince or state, lying at a distance from the parent country, or from the seat of government." It is also used for the *whole lands* belonging to any kingdom or state. On this continent, it is often applied in its first signification, thus:—"the *territory* of Wisconsin," and indicates then, either all the lands of a state or nation, or certain distant or outlying possessions.

*Region* and *district* again indicate a portion only of a kingdom, province, or territory. But a *district* may indicate a very minute portion of a state, county, or even of a city; whereas a *region* describes so wide an extent of country, as almost to be synonymous with that word. Beginning, then, with the latter, we say *district* means the smallest measure, *territory* a large measure, and *region* the largest of all. But in the States and Canada, the three words are often confounded; *territory* is put for *region*, and *region* for *district*, until neither word has any exact or specific meaning left. It is inevitable, indeed, in a new country, settled under peculiar circumstances, so different from those of the mother country, that new terms should be devised. Hence our Gores, Townships, Concessions, broken-fronts, water-lots, &c. But all of these are definite, universally understood with the same significance, and so contribute to the precision of language, instead of detracting from it, and as such, some of them at least, will be permanently incorporated into the English language.

People who speak English, say of a jury when it returns to court, and expresses its judgment, that "it *renders* its verdict," and this act is called "the *rendering* of a verdict," or technically "its *finding*." All this appears intelligible, and we are slow to imagine anything plainer. But people who, whatever their shortcomings, try to speak the language of Swift and Addison, are little aware of the progress of the age. With many among us, juries never *render* verdicts, but make *rendition* of them; and such, in lieu of speaking of a *finding* or *rendering*, refer to what they style a *rendition*, a mode of expression which, whatever it may be, is not English in such a connection. There is such a word as *rendition*, but it means *surrender* or *yielding possession*, it is a diplomatic, or law term, more than anything else. Let us apply the true meaning of the word to the action of a jury. Thus:—"the jury returned to court in the course of half-an-hour, and surrendered or yielded possession of their verdict." I submit that such bodies of men give, or express, but do not *surrender* opinions. Indeed, one would like to know how any man could surrender an opinion? A man may make *rendition* of his property, but he only *expresses* his sentiments. As the men of Derry said, so say I, "no surrender." But the most absurd use of this abused word may be illustrated by its mode of introduction in a newspaper notice of a concert recently given in Toronto. The writer seems to have been pleased with some tune, and he accordingly speaks of "the beauty of its *rendition*." Musical people do speak in a certain sense of "*rendering* tunes," but the author of this critique has the honor of originating the idea of a tune being capable of *rendition*. The unsophisticated reader would be sorely tempted to ask how in all the world could a man *surrender* a tune? Doing so implies a measure of coercion. But can a singer be forced to sing, or even, having done so, does he thereby surrender the tune? By force you may take the notes out of his hand, but how can you take them out of his throat?

In England it occasionally happens that great offenders are *hanged*, but in the States and Canada, criminals are never *hanged*; they are all *hung*. In England, beef is *hung*, gates are *hung*, and curtains are *hung*, but felons are *hanged*; in Canada, felons, beef, gates, and curtains, are all treated in the same way.

But our English is not only wayward and independent, it is also so exceedingly modest, that we are in danger, not only of altering our vernacular, but of forgetting how our bodies are constructed. If we know anything of English conversation or letters, we speedily find out, even if stone-blind, that British men and women have both arms and legs. But in Canada, a stranger who could not see, would find it difficult to discover much about our conformation. He would learn that both sexes had *limbs* of some sort, but from any information which our language would give, he could not tell whether their *limbs* were used to stand on or hold by.

Among British domestic fowls there are many styled *gallinaceous*; and among these are cocks and hens, male and female. But a blind naturalist could never fancy that we have the same distinctions in Canada. He would, indeed learn that we have hens; but he would wonder in vain what had become of their mates. That there existed an unknown creature called a *rooster*, he would early discover, but unless he made particular enquiry, he might return after a year's residence among us, thoroughly convinced that the hero of the barn-yard does not exist in the province. In Canada, such a garment as trowsers is unknown. What do we wear? Pantaloon is the reply; or more familiarly *pants*, with the feminine elegance *pantalets*! But is this the fact? Certainly it is not. At least it has never been my fortune to meet with one in this country who wore them. Pantaloon is an article of dress, out of fashion for fifty years. In more familiar vernacular they were wont to be