

during the debate, to cover with ridicule the clique of which Mr. Lowe was the head, he bethought him of David's escape from Achish, King of Gath, and the character of the people who subsequently foregathered with him in the Cave of Adullam, and a new name was added to the political vocabulary.

When, pending a general election, he had occasion to complain of the determined dissatisfaction of the Conservatives, he again turned to the classical book of the people, and on the morrow all England was laughing at the party who, *"if they had been in the wilderness, would have complained of the Ten Commandments as a harassing piece of legislation."*

Here is plain sailing; but we get into the fog again when we come to some other of the terms now quite familiar to us as indicating parties—not political parties—unknown to our forefathers.

Why, for instance, are the followers of John Wesley called "Methodists? It is said that the term was suggested by the Latin appellation *"Methodista"*, given to a College of Physicians in ancient Rome in consequence of the strict regimen under which they placed their patients; but this is going a long way off to account for something, the origin of which probably lies much nearer home.

So again with Teetotallers. Did it originally imply persons who drank nothing stronger than tea, or *Tea-totalers*? or is there any truth in the story of the stammering man who tried to say that he was a *"Te-te-total abstainer,"* and was so laughed at, that the wits applied the term to the party.

Why, it may be asked, should this subject engage our attention? Partly because it is interesting in itself—partly from the fact that one or two new terms have sprung into use of late in connection with politics, the origin of which is likely to exercise the ingenuity of posterity. Only the close student of English parliamentary history will be able