

document, in which he humbly expresses his surprise at the prelate's conduct in the Vatican. He (Mr. Marchand) had permitted himself, said he, to believe that over sixty years of submission and devotedness to the Church entitled him to the full confidence of his superiors. Unfortunately, he had been mistaken. He was astonished that an archbishop would inform the Pope on a public measure without the official documents. In fact, all that His Grace could rely upon was reports of Conservative newspapers, the authors of which were perfect strangers to the bill itself.

Mgr. Merry del Val, on the other hand, wrote in answer to Sir Adolphe Chapleau that he failed to understand Mgr. Bruchesi's position.

The above are downright facts.—*Montreal Gazette.*

---

EDITOR OF THE CANADA EDUCATIONAL MONTHLY :

DEAR SIR,—I wish to address your many readers on the question of Latin and Greek in our schools.

The strongest argument in support of these ancient languages is that many English words are derived from them, especially from the Latin; and in order to understand these words clearly it is necessary to study these languages. I but partly agree to this assertion. Take, for example, the word "preposition," and let us suppose a foreigner, say an Italian, who does not know a single word of English, but who knows Latin, endeavors to make out the meaning of the word by tracing it back to the original. He knows it comes from two Latin words—"pre," meaning before, and "pono," I place. He will therefore conclude that a preposition is something placed before something. But has he got the meaning of the word? Might he not be inclined to call a prefix to a word a preposition? I am afraid our Italian would soon become tired of his Latin,

and would ask for a good English dictionary, in order that he might look up the meaning of the word. A few years ago an inspector, while examining my junior class in geometry, asked a pupil for the definition of a "line." Having received the correct answer, he asked for the derivation, which the pupil was not able to give. He then informed the class that it came from a Latin word, "linea," meaning a line. Did this information help the class to understand the definition any better? Why not also remember that the French word for line is "ligne"? But if tracing words back to their original language helps us to comprehend their meaning more fully, why do we not require our pupils to study Anglo-Saxon, since two-thirds of the words of our language are derived, not from the Latin, but from the Anglo-Saxon? When I was at college I took a short course in rhetoric, and one of the first rules which my learned professor gave me was: "When you have two words meaning the same thing, one of which is derived from the Latin and the other from the Anglo-Saxon, always use the word derived from the latter language." Thus "end" is preferable to "termination." After studying Latin for about seven years I felt like asking him why so much time was spent on Latin.

The Professor was right, because there is no language in the world which is clearer or more expressive than our good old Anglo-Saxon English. It is the language of our Bible, which, as a literary production alone, is not surpassed by anything in our language. In some cases Latin may help us to get the meanings of words, but it receives far more credit in this respect than I believe it deserves. The meanings of words are continually changing, many having an entirely different meaning now from what they had a century ago. It is custom and usage which give to words their mean-