

to receive quite as much adulation from apothecaries as are the inventors of quack medicines and patent hair dyes from those who vend their nostrums.

The Dominion of Canada has not been exempt from the nuisances referred to; several volumes of so-called distinguished Canadians have been published in Montreal and Ottawa in which many of the memoirs are manifestly autobiographical. Enlightened posterity will not be led astray by these false histories; they will be rejected as having no authority when reason and truth have assumed their sway.

Of the professions referred to, lawyers and actors are less liable to the imputation of self-laudation than others. In the first place there are few people interested in their false praise; in the second place, the followers of these two professions have always to exercise their talents before the public in a manner which renders undue puffing worthless. The lawyer in addressing the Bench and an intelligent jury, at the same time addresses a discriminating audience who are not likely to be misled by antecedent puffs in magazines, newspapers or biographies, and who judge for themselves and make their decisions by the effect which the speech of the advocate has upon them; and so with the actor, all the preliminary puffing, all the false praise heralding his advent to the theatre, will only tend to prejudice him with his auditory, unless the characters he represents are well sustained. Such puffing, which is too often resorted to for obtaining printing, or "dead-head" seats, is synonymous with injustice, as oftentimes when mediocrity is lauded to the skies, genius is neglected. So, too, with "critiques," which are too often incited by prejudice, or spite, or to display the wonderful acumen of the critic. We often read criticisms in which the writer makes his ignorance, dulness, and presumption conspicuous, and which have no greater effect than enticing a novice in play-going to take an orchestra chair.

It is a mistake to suppose that meritorious lawyers and actors depend upon "four feet posters" and "city items" for their reputation, that rests upon the judgment of an enlightened and discerning public, which decides for itself after witnessing the forensic and histrionic powers of the advocate and tragedian or comedian. Judicial reports and records give unerring testimony as to the ability of lawyers and judges, and an actor's good reputation, acquired by the constant exhibition of his powers, and the long pursuit of his profession, if endorsed by the public, is sure to be well founded.

That this system of puffing professors of every art exists notoriously and widely there can be no doubt, and it would be a good thing if some honest Editor would show the matter up to ridicule and expose the folly of men puffing themselves and thereby making fools of others, and point out that the system of puffing and humbug is always connected with imposition and extortion, and sometimes with injustice and oppression.

Thomas D. King.

CORRESPONDENCE.

It is distinctly to be borne in mind that we do not by inserting letters convey any opinion favourable to their contents. We open our columns to all without leaning to any; and thus supply a channel for the publication of opinions of all shades, to be found in no other journal in Canada.

All communications to contain the name and address of the sender.

No notice whatever will be taken of anonymous letters, nor can we undertake to return letters that are rejected.

Letters should be brief, and written on one side of the paper only. Those intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, 162 St. James Street, Montreal; those on matters of business to the Manager, at the same address.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—In answer to the query of your correspondent "Euphrosyne," I would say that the presentation took place in the evening. I fully agree with her that it is the prerogative of royal personages, such as the Princess of Wales, to establish a fashion; and in the case of garden parties, &c., the wearing of the morning costume is one consistent with good sense. Our Queen is exercising an indisputable right in saying in what manner people should attend her receptions, and any one who does not wish to conform to her wishes can exercise his right of staying away. When it is the custom to attend a ceremony attired in a certain dress, it is self-respect and a desire to avoid notoriety that should induce us to follow the custom.

Oday.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—I beg to draw your attention to an article that appeared in the *Canadian Illustrated News* of January 24th, and which is a criticism of some of the answers accepted by your paper in the recent competition in Canadian History. In justice to myself as the winner of the first prize, and to avoid misapprehension, I beg to say that the answers to the hundred questions, as published in your columns, were *not* my answers, although the sense of nearly all of them was the same. I believe that in publishing them the Question Editor compiled as he considered the proper answers to each question from *all* the manuscripts before him, and with few exceptions the position taken by your paper is undoubtedly supported by the best authorities upon Canadian history. However, there are some debatable points, and I am happy to see them raised

by the correspondent of the *Illustrated News*, as it certainly is in the interest of Canadian history that these points should be settled. Some of his objections are made to the very answers in which I was ruled *wrong*, but, in view of the fact that in the course of a few days a pamphlet will be before the public containing my answers in full and notes upon the same, I will not at present go into the merits of the objections raised; but, fully believing that 99 of *my* answers were correct, and while referring any who may be interested in the same to the above-mentioned work, I beg to say that I will be very happy to defend my position in the competition at a later date, and when the public are placed in possession of the means of judging of my individual research, leaving to you or the other competitors the onus of answering that which does not concern me.

Yours very truly,

Henry Miles.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR.

SIR,—Your correspondent, "Euphrosyne," like many others who take upon themselves the office of censor, should read that familiar and oft-quoted passage from Burns, "Would the powers aloon," &c. While accusing "J. W. G." of writing anonymously, "Euphrosyne" is guilty of the same offence in a greater degree. I can afford to pass over the abuse, and let "Euphrosyne" exhaust her vocabulary of *choice words*, but must correct some mistakes. "J. W. G." does not aspire to the honours of the "Embryo Academy." Nor does he claim for his letter that it is a criticism upon Mr. Popham's article in the *SPECTATOR*, but simply stood upon the defensive against the uncalled for, and unjustifiable attack from the pen of Mr. Popham.

And "J. W. G." regrets that "Euphrosyne's" Art knowledge is derived from Mr. Popham's and Mr. King's letters. I think "Euphrosyne" is the only one that derived any advantage from them. Most of the readers of the *SPECTATOR* must have perceived that those letters were but the outpourings of years of animosity, but now they have shaken hands, smoked the pipe of peace, yet, alas! have not buried the batchet (if I may judge by Mr. King's last letter.)

Again, "Euphrosyne" labours under a serious mistake, when she asserts "J. W. G." desired to hide his name. He gave them the liberty in the office of the *SPECTATOR* to use it in full, if they thought proper, and Mr. Popham knew very well who wrote the article.

Now I ask any intelligent reader of the *SPECTATOR* to turn to the letter of J. W. G. and to that of "Euphrosyne," and judge for themselves who is abusive. Also to the first page of last week's issue of the *SPECTATOR*, and tell me if there is anything in J. W. G.'s letter, or if there ever appeared at any time in the daily press of this city, to equal the following: "The *Globe* fairly snivelled over Mr. Trenholme, tears stood in its dull eyes, its great jaw fell, and its great tongue wobbled." If the *Globe* forgets itself and uses unbecoming language, why do you retaliate, Mr. Editor, and then censure others?

Again, was it fair to keep an article of mine two weeks in type, and after I had read the proof, for you to take out whole paragraphs without my knowledge or consent? I know you have the right to conduct your paper as you please; but, in justice to myself and the article, would it not have been better to refuse it altogether than send it out in its mutilated condition?

As to the publishing of my letter, had you not, there were others quite willing, in the interest of fair play, to do so.

Yours respectfully,

J. W. Gray.

[NOTE.—With reference to the *Globe*, what was written was not anonymously, but over the Editor's signature.

With regard to Mr. Gray's article on "Art Criticism," it was not mutilated; the paragraphs omitted were redundant, and were struck out to save space.]

To Cousin EUPHROSYNÉ:

The classic authors and the poets up to the end of the eighteenth century, who have written about the Gods and Goddesses, and those whose reputation for ripe and good scholarship is established, have never used the word *twaddle*. Milton, who, in his "L'Allegro," has immortalized your namesake, perhaps your imaginary godmother, as "the goddess fair and free," never uses the word *twaddle*. Shakspeare, who, by the creative power of his genius, has, in "Midsummer Night's Dream," brought before us the kinsman of Hercules, and the Amazonian Hippolyta, does not use either the word *twaddle* or *tweedle*. Johnson and Richardson, in their dictionaries, have not used the word *twaddle*, although they give us the word *tweedle*, which is used by Addison in the *Spectator*; but whether he first introduced it into our language I do not know, neither do I know its exact derivation, as my education at the defunct "Ladies' Mutual Improvement Society" never extended to abstruse etymology.

The meaning given to the word *tweedle* is to handle lightly or unskilfully, and that of *twaddle*, according to our modern dictionaries, is insignificant discourse. Though you, my dear cousin, may object to the use of the word *twaddle*, as applied to the writings of Mr. Popham anent the proposed "Canadian Academy of Art," and may properly condemn "J. W. G.'s" addition of the useless and redundant adjective "*senseless*," deeming it uncourtly, yet, upon second thoughts, you will admit that Mr. Popham has laid himself open