

do not *prepare*, and carefully *prepare*." and "Which are all *items*, and important *items*." The *Standard* offends in the same manner, "Everything obliges us to *assume*, and to *assume with much confidence*;" and "We say it, and say it advisedly." So also the *Morning Advertiser* of November 1, 1882, has, "They *think*, and *rightly think*, the question of procedure one which especially concerns the dignity of the House of Commons." The *Daily Telegraph*, November 6, 1882, in expatiating on the beauties and amenities of Hampstead Heath as a recreation ground for London, says that the neighbouring inhabitants "*thought*, and very *properly thought*, that cricket ought not to be forbidden."

Exaggeration, or attempted intensification of language, especially in the use of epithets, is one of the colloquial or literary vices of the age, and is by no means peculiar to the newspapers. If a thing is very good, or exceedingly good, it is not sufficient to say so in simple terms. *Very*, is but a weak word in the requirements of modern times, which insist on the stronger epithets of awfully, or dreadfully, to express a becoming sense of the charms either of beauty, health, wealth, or mirth. Awfully handsome, awfully well, awfully rich, or awfully funny, are common colloquialisms. Then "awfully" is varied *ad libitum* by dreadfully, or even by excruciatingly. A very funny farce would be but a poor thing in the parlance of to-day, and must be described as "*screamingly funny*," if it were expected to be acceptable to the jaded frequenters of any modern theatre. To burst into tears is no longer a permissible phrase in the language of novelists, nothing less than a flood or a deluge of tears will suffice for their exigencies; while to be applauded, signifies nothing unless the recipient of the public favour be applauded "to the skies."

The introduction of new words into the language, or the formation of new words upon the old Greek and Latin basis, is no difficult process. The difficulty lies in procuring their acceptance. It is almost impossible to force them into favour or into general use if prematurely or unnecessarily compounded. In the "New World of Words," 1678, by Edward Phillips, which borrowed its title from a previous work by Florio, "The World of Words," there is inserted by way of appendix a list of two hundred and forty words, which he declared "to be formed of such affected words from the Latin and Greek as are either to be used warily, and upon occasion only, or totally to be rejected as barbarous, or illegally compounded and derived." Of these prohibited or partially prohibited words, only eleven have made good their footing in the language during more than two centuries. These eleven, which in our day could not well be dispensed with, and to which it seems strange that any one could ever have objected, are "autograph, aurist, bibliograph, circumstantiate, evangelize, ferocious, holograph, inimical, misanthropist, misogynist, and syllogize." Possibly, during the next two centuries, a few more of the strange words collected by Phillips may force their way into colloquial or literary favour; but there seems to be little chance of the adoption of the greater part of them, such as *fallaciloquent*, speaking deceitfully or fallaciously; *flocification*, setting at nought; *homodox*, of the same opinion; *lubidinity*, obscenity; *mauricide*, a mouse-killer; *nugipolyloquous*, speaking much about trifles; *spurcical*, obscene; *vulpinarity*, fox-like cunning; and *alpicide*, a mole-catcher, and others equally egregious. It is to be remarked that very many of the words which met with his approval, and found a place in his "World of Words," have died out, and are wholly unintelligible to the present genera-