

Liddell's and Scott's Greek-English, and White and Riddle's Latin-English Lexicons, we have not a respectable Dictionary of the English language itself? What would be thought of even a school-dictionary of Greek, which would not enable a boy to read Homer? Yet let any one try to read Spencer, Shakespeare, or Milton, depending wholly on Worcester and he will find himself without help just where he needs it most. Latham's Johnson's Dictionary is in many places better without the *Latham*. Wedgwood's Etymological English Dictionary, if

completed would do very well for one who could distinguish the wheat from the chaff, the fanciful from the real. The best is perhaps Webster's English Dictionary revised by Goodrich, Porter, and Mahn, and how bad is the best will be found by any student who tries to trace by it any old English word from its primary to its present meaning. But why complain of the want of an English Dictionary? He who would have an English Grammar above the level of a third rate school-book, must learn German and procure Maetznar, Fiedler and Sachs, or Koch.

### EDITOR'S DRAWER.

**THE NEW SCHOOL BILL.**—We have received a copy of Mr. Mowat's School Bill, but must defer remarks 'till next issue.

**OUR CIRCULATION.**—Our subscription list has rapidly increased during the past month. All who feel willing to canvass for subscribers would oblige by sending for a circular giving our terms to agents.

**EXAMINATION QUESTIONS.**—We have now given all the examination Questions except the Second Class Algebra paper. We have had considerable difficulty in getting the necessary type. Having found it impossible to get it in Canada, we sent to New York, but even then a very imperfect font was forwarded. We have sent to New York the second time, and hope it will come in time for next issue.

**VAGARIES OF CORRESPONDENTS.**—The vagaries of some of our correspondents would be exceedingly amusing, if they were not so very annoying. In a large number of instances, teachers discontinuing or changing their post offices, neglect to mention the post office, where they have been receiving the *Teacher*, and we have to search our whole list to find them. Several have even neglected to give their names! A genius whose Inspector had ordered the *TEACHER* for him, and who had been receiving it for six months, sends us the following wail:

**GENTLEMEN.**—In regard to your monthly journal I don't want you to send it no more because you won't get no pay from me for it, I don't send you this before because I would thinking that you would not continue to send it, after receiving no answer, I don't think that you will send it no more after this.

I remaine your

### PRIZE ESSAY.

The Essays received by us on the "Requirements of our Rural Schools" were referred to a Committee consisting of Dr. McCaul, of Toronto

University, and Dr. J. H. Sangster, of Yorkville. The names of the writers were not, and could not by any possibility, be known to them. They read over carefully and critically the essays sent to them, and gave their award in favor of the essay having the motto, "*Ora et Labora*." This essay was written by Mr. Frith Jeffers, second master, Picton High School, and will be published in our March number. Mr. Jeffers may well be congratulated on the success he has achieved in the face of keen competition. Drs. McCaul and Sangster are entitled to our cordial thanks for undertaking and accomplishing the difficult and laborious task of deciding upon the merit of the essays, and their names are a sufficient guarantee to all parties that the award has been made with perfect fairness and impartiality. They also speak in terms of praise of the essay having the motto "*Amicus*," written by Mr. George B. Elliott, of Ottawa.

### TEXT BOOKS.

We have received a communication from Dr. Sangster in reference to a remark by Mr. Dickenson in the January number of the *Teacher*, page 16, that "Dr. Sangster stated at one of his Institutes recently that the fittest place for them, (our Text Books on Grammar,) was at the bottom of the sea." We were about to have it put in type for insertion when we found unfortunately that it had been mislaid. We can only now, therefore, give the gist of the Doctor's remarks, as nearly as we can, reserving publication till a future issue.

Dr. Sangster denies having made the remark attributed to him. He expressed no opinion on particular Text Books, but spoke at his Institutes in general terms of the evil of placing too much reliance on any text books, and pointed out the benefit that would, in many instances, result from doing away with them altogether. From this it appears that his remarks were incorrectly reported, and bear a totally different construction from that put upon them.