



SHOCKING BARBARITY.

SCENE—A BALL-ROOM IN MONTREAL.

Mr. Blank—a military-looking gentlemen, who has lately arrived from England,—is introduced to Miss Thomasina Shoddy, and leads her out for a dance.

Miss S. (loq.)—“What Regiment do you belong to, Capt. Blank?”

Mr. B.—“Oh! I’m not in any Regiment.”

Miss S.—“Are you not in the Army, then?”

Mr. B.—“No! why do you ask?”

Miss S.—“Oh! I thought you were introduced to me as Captain Blank.”

Mr. B.—“Quite a mistake, I assure you. I am travelling at present for a Tea House!”

Miss Thomasina collapses, and faintly requests to be taken to her Mamma!

NOTE.—Next day she met the supposed Tea Man walking in Great St. James Street, with the wife of a highly distinguished military officer, and again collapsed on discovering that she had been cruelly quizzed.

A CRITICAL CORRESPONDENT.

The best way, generally speaking, to satisfy any correspondent of a journal, is to print his letter. The Cynic is not quite sure that his critical friend, “A School-Boy,” will be pleased with this arrangement. However, he shall have no reason to complain that he has not had an opportunity of making his views public:

MONTREAL, Jan. 29th, 1869.

DIOGENES, being such a very clever Cynic, should, while criticising others, be particularly careful how he himself writes—vide page 118 of this day’s issue, where he says in the article, “Equations not easily solved,” line 14, “Two policemen were then sent for to arrest him, and he assaulted them also.” Now, I was, when at school, always taught that it was ungrammatical to say, use or write “for to”; and, had I been writing the article alluded to, I would have written “and he also assaulted them.” Oh! oh! DIOGENES, I would recommend you to go to the High School and be taught grammar.

Now, like a man, acknowledge this “soft impeachment” in your next number, and admit that you have, for once at least, written bad grammar, or ungrammatically. One line under your notice to correspondents will satisfy

A SCHOOL-BOY.

The Cynic has a few words to say with respect to this communication. First, from the handwriting, which is that of a man, and from certain incautious words, e. g.: “now, I was, when at school, taught, &c.” it is clear that the letter was *not* written by “A School-Boy.” Secondly, it displays an amount of culpable ignorance that would hardly be tolerated in a Montreal school-boy; though, at the same time, it is an average specimen of the criticism with which DIOGENES is occasionally favoured.

The writer is evidently desirous of placing himself in the same position to the Philosopher that Mr. Washington Moon holds to the Dean of Canterbury. The latter having pub-

lished a small work on “The Queen’s English,” the former, according to the *Edinburgh Review*, “amused himself by demonstrating that while the Dean undertook to instruct others, the author was, himself, but a castaway in matters of grammar.”

In reality, there is no analogy between the two cases. Mr. Moon was in the right, whereas “A School-Boy” is wrong: the Dean, too, was wrong, while DIOGENES is right. But to the proof. The Cynic stated in his last number that a man who had received money to buy medicine for his child, spent it on whiskey for himself, and then “assaulted his wife.” The next sentence is as follows: “Two policemen were then sent for to arrest him, and he assaulted them also.” The *soi-disant* “School-Boy” refuses to take the obvious sense of these words, and instead of reading “two policemen were sent for,” prefers to believe that DIOGENES used the expression “for to arrest him.”

The insertion of the preposition “for” before the infinitive was very common in Old English, and even in the English of the 17th century. The following examples at once occur to DIOGENES, and there are doubtless many others: “What went ye out for to see?” Matt. xi., 8. And again, “There are yet but twelve days since I went up to Jerusalem for to worship.” Acts xxiv., 11. There are probably few scholars in Montreal who can point to the time when this idiom died out; but as it is no longer in use among the best writers or speakers, it will in vain be sought for in the pages of DIOGENES.

DIOGENES begs to state, as the Dean of Canterbury said to Mr. Moon, that “he does not write for idiots.” If he had anticipated the possibility of “A School-Boy’s” misunderstanding him, he would have inserted a comma after *sent for*, and have thus obviated all difficulty. “By perspicuity,” as Quintilian observes, “care is taken, not that the reader may understand, if he will, but that he *must* understand, whether he will or not.”

As regards “A School-Boy’s” second objection, that the phrase “he assaulted them also” is incorrect, and “he also assaulted them” correct, DIOGENES defends the original expression. The drunken man had assaulted his wife. When the policemen came, he assaulted them also,—i. e., in addition.—If DIOGENES had written “he also assaulted the policemen,” it might have been inferred that the man had done something to the policemen previous to assaulting them. If “A School-Boy” will look in his Bible to 1. John, iv., 21, he will find the word “also” placed at the end of the verse, exactly as DIOGENES has used it. Dr. Blair, speaking of adverbs, says: “In writing,—where a man speaks to the eye and not to the ear, he ought to be accurate,—and so to connect those adverbs with the words which they qualify as to put his meaning out of doubt, upon the first inspection.” This is precisely what DIOGENES did, and what “A School-Boy” didn’t.

This grammatical discussion has been almost forced upon the Cynic, and is doubtless very uninteresting to the general public. But it is not uninteresting to the Philosopher himself, and may be of some use to “A School-Boy,” unless he is obstinate or a fool. No apology whatever, therefore, is offered to the public, and DIOGENES retires to his Tub, serenely self-satisfied, having vindicated his “grammar,” and “chawed up” his critic.

NEAT—BUT NOT GAUDY.

Some time ago the *Witness* stated that it would write out the advertisements of any persons who wished to make use of its columns. DIOGENES sincerely trusts that the following singular specimen, cut from Monday’s *Witness*, is not the composition of any one in the office:

Washing done by a Norwegian woman capable of giving satisfaction, or will go out to do so if required. Apply, &c.