

confound the phonographic world, and therefore retard the progress of our noble art-science. The author tacitly admits the solidity and popularity of the pure phonetic principle which gives the heavy sign to the heavy sound, by making it the basis of his own work. How many practical stenographers are ready to abandon this well-tried foundation, and build with other and lighter material?

### EDITORIAL NOTES.

The *Globe* has been arguing that the bad grammar which prevails is not traceable to newspapers. In the *Globe* itself we find this expression: "The sale will be made by tender, and as the stock is first-class there is little doubt *but* that the bidding will be lively." This little disjunctive conjunction made the writer say just the contrary to what he meant to say, which was, that there was little doubt that the bidding would be lively. The *but* not only throws doubt on the writer's assertion; it actually belies it. The sentence as transposed would read: "There is little doubt of anything but this, that the bidding will be lively—this is very doubtful." This is an illustration of "how not to do it."

The *Globe* reporter who woke up on a recent Saturday morning, after a hard night's transcribing of an important speech, must have echoed Job's exclamation: "Oh, that my words were written with an iron pen"—meaning the type-writer. The printers made horrible work of the transcript, and the caligraphy seems to have puzzled the proof-readers, for they let pass the errors in despair. The report speaks of matters declared by our "said Convention" to be within the competency of the Legislature, when the reporter meant "Constitution." The report further says that "no act of the Provincial *regulations* can become law," when the scribe wrote of Provincial *Legislatures*. The report speaks of Government action "behind which is *conceded* the party intent." The pencil-driver wrote *concealed*. One of two suggestions might be made in the premises: Let the reporter transcribe on a writing machine, or let the printers learn phonography, so that they may read the geometrical outlines, which would be far more legible than this reporter's "copy" seems to have been.

Prof. Marshall, the newly-installed Science Master in Queen's College, Kingston, was formerly connected with the College of Engineering in Tokio, Japan. In his inaugural he states some interesting

facts in reference to that country. Philologists will be chiefly interested in this allusion:—"As all the lectures were given in English, it was necessary that the students should know this language. Such a people [ignorant of science] you may imagine, not only had no words to express over modern scientific ideas, but their language was not even capable of expressing them. In these circumstances it was much better to use words already invented by the discoverers of the ideas themselves, and indeed by doing this they did nothing more than Europeans have themselves done, for nearly all our scientific terms are of Greek origin." And yet, though foreigners can learn Greek scientific terms through the medium of the English, English boys and girls can not be—or are not—taught in three years to read or write correctly a simple newspaper paragraph!

Punctuation is an important study, though usually neglected. The omission or insertion of a punctuation mark may completely alter the meaning or dull the edge of a sentence. Take this as a specimen, clipped from one of our daily papers:—"The attitude of the Republican papers after the great defeat of their party is one of depression, though some of them see destruction to the Democrats in that they have been too successful. One of them has Governor-elect Cleveland *trembling before his own colossal shadow and regretting his great majority, which is the very height of absurdity.*" To what does the editor allude as "the very height of absurdity"? Is it to the "colossal shadow"? If it be colossal, it is certainly a "very height." Or is it the "great majority" to which the editor refers? That would fit the expression, and the punctuation points in that direction. But no, that cannot be the meaning. If we take the whole clause from "One" to "majority" we can make sense of the sentence; but all this guessing and analyzing would be unnecessary had the editor inserted a dash after the comma following the word "majority." As the sentence stands it is forceless—a dash would give it point and power.

Mr. E. B. Eddy, the match-maker of Hull, Que., must have studied shorthand in his younger days. The newspapers tell us that he was in Boston when a recent fire occurred at his works. Immediately on its breaking out one of the managers telegraphed: "Your premises are all on fire. What shall we do?" Half an hour after the laconic reply came, "Put it out!"