

*Standard*, December 14, 1880, speaking of several Parisian journals of the same shade of politics, says: "The *Défense*, the *Univers*, and their competitors of the same ilk, are loud in their appeals to the president to throw the Chamber and the Republicans overboard." In the *Pall Mall Gazette*, January 24, 1869, occurs, "Many barbarians of this ilk, and even of later times;" and in the *Daily Telegraph*, February 8, 1870, a writer informed his readers that "Matilda lived in St. John's villas, Twickenham, and Mr. Passmore in King street of the same ilk."

Among the many corruptions which have long been creeping into the newspapers are the present tenses of the verbs to *bid* and to *dare*, which hasty writers persistently use for the preterite and past participle *bade* and *bidden*, *dared* and *durst*. The fact is that *bade* and *durst*, and even *dares*, have become all but obsolete in our day, without any possible reason either in grammar or in euphony. Why, for instance, should not *bade* or *bidden* be used in the following instances from the *Times* and the *Quarterly Review*? "Mr. Charles Dickens finally *bid* farewell to Philadelphia."—*Times*. "Uncertain even at that epoch (1864) of Austria's fidelity, Prussia *bid* high for German leadership."—*Times*. "He called his servants and *bid* them procure firearms."—*Times*. "The competition is so sharp and general that the leader of to-day can never be sure that he will not be *outbid* to-morrow."—*Quarterly Review*. And why not *durst* in the following extract from the Rev. Charles Kingsley? "Neither her maidens nor the priest *dare* speak to her for half an hour."—"Hereward the Wake."

It is scarcely possible to take up any newspaper—daily or weekly—metropolitan or provincial, or any magazine or periodical whatever, with-

out finding the matter of fact word "factor" employed on every variety of occasion. No doubt the word is sometimes convenient, and if only used sparingly might be accepted as a welcome substitute for many an awkward periphrasis; but its constant iteration, without reason or relevancy, is a nuisance. Take for instance the following examples of its misuse, selected at random from recent newspapers. Writing of the desire of the Americans to possess a monolith or obelisk, such as that conveyed from Egypt to London by the liberality and public spirit of Sir Erasmus Wilson, the *Daily Telegraph* remarks, October 12, 1880: "If Americans really travel abroad, as the *New York World* seems to think, because they have no obelisks at home, defeated Europe will not grudge them the most superior monolith. It seems that a man of wealth and leisure finds no interest to keep him in New York compared to what allures him to foreign capitals.' If obelisks make a *factor* of the sum of foreign allurements, by all means let New York have one or more all to herself." The weather has also its "factor," according to the *Globe*, May 28, 1877: "As one of the *factors* of weather, such as temperature, humidity, or atmospheric pressure." So also the decline of English opera is to be attributed to a "factor." "But we, while lamenting that no English opera exists, overlook the most essential *factor* in the case. Take our music schools, for example. What is the Royal Academy of Music doing on behalf of opera? Absolutely nothing beyond providing a small supply of men for the orchestra."—*Daily Telegraph*, October 25, 1877. The Jesuits and Jesuitism have also their "factor." "Jesuitism has been charged with atrocious crimes, credited with fabulous influence, supposed to possess almost superhuman cunning. But through evil report and