placing them roots upwards. On this layer, other cabbages were placed, four wide, and then a crest or comb of two cabbages side by side. The outsides had the earth thrown up all round and sufficient mould was thrown on the top of the bed to prevent the wind from disturbing the leaves of the cabbages. Thus treated, we had no difficulty in sending fresh cabbages—for perdreaux aux choux—into market at any time.

When we got hold of this idea we have no notion; but judging from the following paragraph—from the Agricultural Gazette of October 24th, 1898,—we must, in some of our omnivorous reading, have run up against the works of that wonderful master of the English language, William Cobbett:

The only difference between our practice and Cobbett's advice is, that we used no straw, and left all the outside leaves on. We found even a little straw gave the bed a tendency to heat. The kinds of cabbage we grew were the St. Denis and the Savoy. The latter was the better keeper of the two, as the abundant outside leaves embraced between them so great a quantity of dead air space.

May we be excused if we point out the above quotation as a model to be followed by all writers of English. Please observe the great number of words in one syllable: very few in two syllables; only three in three syllables, not one word from the Latin in the whole eleven lines, and only one of Greek derivation—placed. (1) And then contrast the following, from Johnson's "Preface to the Dictionary:"

"If a radical idea branches out into paralled ramifications, how can a consecutive series be formed of senses in their nature collateral.?" We quote from memory, but, we believe, accurately.

This is how English ought not to be written: ten words out of the twenty-two are Latin.

Milk and food. — Mr. McConnell and his opponents are still fighting away merrily on the subject. The writer of the subjoined, a well known English farmer, takes exactly the same view that we have insisted upon — usque ad nauseam, we fear — so often in this JOURNAL:

Your correspondent, "J. L.," in an article under the above heading, says :-- "Mr. Primrose McConnell, who is defending a principle which is not only unassailable, but which commends itself . to common-sense, &c. " He must excuse me if I say that there is some doubt as to whether this principle does commend itself to common-sense. As regards this point of the question, I must ask: Does it seem reasonable that a cow will give as rich milk upon straw as when eating cake and hay? And it was this statement which caused me to first write upon this subject. Then, as regards the theory being unassailable. I think he cannot have read Mr. Speir's pamphlet entitled "The Effects of Food on Milk and Butter. " I should advice him to read it, and study the figures given carefully. It may cause him to come to the conclusion that Mr. McConnell's theory is not quite unassailable. As regards his arguments that the milking properties of our cows have been obtained by selection and not by food, I consider this quite beside the question. He says that however well fed, we cannot force a cow's milk beyond a certain point of richness. I do not remember that anyone had contended that it could be done. He acknowledges, however, that if they are under-fed the milk will fall below that point. I am rather surprised at this admission, for I thought that the question at issue was that he, and those who were of his way of thinking, maintained that this would only affect the volume of the milk and have no effect upon its But what does he mean by under richness. feeding? If a cow were fed upon mangels and oat straw, with a good proportion of the former, in my opinion she would not be under-fed if she had much as she could eat; and yet the milk would as be poor in butter-fat. And I know that to add

⁽¹⁾ From "plax, plakos," a flat, ED.