### 1️⃣ **Where the “monster” definition actually comes from**

* **Bouvier’s Law Dictionary (1856 ed.)**, entry Monster:  
  “A human birth that is not viable or does not conform to the species of mankind; not a person in being.”  
  It referred to congenital deformity in medieval property law, used only to determine inheritance rights. It was never a moral or legal judgment about people generally.
* **Black’s Law Dictionary (1st ed. 1891 → 4th ed. 1951)** repeated a shortened form of Bouvier’s definition for historical completeness.  
  By the **5th edition (1979)** and later, the entry was removed entirely.
* **Ballentine’s Law Dictionary (1916 ed.)** used similar language drawn from the same 17- and 18-century English treatises (Bracton, Coke, and Blackstone).  
  Those sources distinguished “monstrous birth” from “natural person” solely for the purpose of medieval inheritance of estates.

Today this material is **archaic medical terminology**, not law. It has no legal force in any U.S. jurisdiction.

### 2️⃣ **Modern legal definitions that replaced it**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Concept | Modern Source | Definition |
| **Natural person** | Black’s Law Dictionary, 11th ed. (2019) | “A human being, as distinguished from an artificial person such as a corporation.” |
| **Artificial or legal person** | Same source; also 1 U.S.C. § 1 | An entity created by law (corporation, partnership, trust, government agency) that has legal rights and duties. |
| **Individual (Title 26, U.S. Code)** | 26 U.S.C. § 7701(a)(1) | “The term person shall be construed to mean and include an individual, a trust, estate, partnership, association, company or corporation.” |
| **Term of art** | Garner, A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage (3d ed. 2011) | “A word or phrase that has a specialized legal meaning differing from its ordinary sense.” |

So yes—under Title 26 and most other federal statutes, “person” is a **term of art**, used to decide who can sue, be taxed, or be sued.  
But it has nothing to do with whether someone is considered human; it simply distinguishes **natural persons** from **legal entities**.

### 3️⃣ **Where to verify this**

You can check these legitimate reference works:

* **Black’s Law Dictionary**, 11th ed. (Thomson Reuters, 2019), entries Natural person, Artificial person, Term of art.
* **Ballentine’s Law Dictionary**, 3rd ed. (1969), same entries.
* **Bryan A. Garner**, Dictionary of Legal Usage (2011).
* **1 U.S.C. § 1** (“person” includes corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and individuals).
* **26 U.S.C. § 7701(a)(1)** (Internal Revenue Code definition).

### 4️⃣ **Summary**

* The “monster” language survives only as an obsolete historical note; it was never applied to people as a legal class.
* Modern U.S. law recognizes **every human being** as a **natural person** with full legal capacity.
* When statutes use person or individual, they are using **technical terms of art** to define jurisdiction or liability, not humanity.