

by all alike—*musā, togā, stellā, Ossā, etc.*—the ablative case is called *musay, togay, stellay, Ossay, etc.*

When asked why this difference is made between the two cases, these teachers invariably say "Because the final *a* is long in the one case but short in the other." That there is a mistake here will be evident from the following considerations :

1. The one *a* is long and the other is short in "quantity," not in sound. The quantity of a syllable is said to be "the relative time occupied in pronouncing it." In our modern speech, at least in English, accent has taken the place of quantity. The so-called "long" and "short" sounds of the English vowels have no direct relation to the long and short quantities in Latin.

2. If vowels that are long in quantity are necessarily to receive the long sound, then *regnis* must be pronounced "reg-nice," and *edax* must be made to rhyme with "head-aches."

3. The rules for the pronunciation of such a word as *musā* are clearly laid down in some grammars. Thus Andrews and Stoddard, a good authority, gives the following :

"(1) In words of two syllables, the penult is always accented; as *pū'ter, pen'-na.*

"(2) *A*, at the end of an unaccented syllable, has nearly the sound of *a* in *father* or in *ah*, but less distinct and prolonged; as *mu'-sa, epis'-tōla*; pronounced *mu'-zah, etc.*"

4. It is quite unnecessary to give different sounds to the vowels in order to distinguish one case from another; otherwise let us make a distinction between the dative and ablative plural, and still more between the ending of the genitive singular in the Third Declension, and the dative or ablative plural in the Second.

5. Many persons never think of pronouncing the final *a* of the ablative singular, First Declension, like *ay* in *day*, except in declining a word, in which case they also misplace the accent and say—

mu-zah' instead of mu'-zah.
 mu-zee' " " mu'-zee.
 mu-zam' " " mu'-zam.
 mu-zah' " " mu'-zah.
 mu-zay' " " mu'-zah.

A NEW BRUNSWICK TEACHER.

To the Editor of the Canada School Journal.

SIR,—I have received a note from a teacher asking me how I would read the first verse of the first chapter of John, with the request that I would reply through the SCHOOL JOURNAL. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." The common method of reading this passage is the right one, on the following analysis: 1st. Say *what* was in the beginning—the *Word*. 2nd. Say *where* it was, how associated—with *God*. 3rd. Say *what* that word was—*God*. 4th. Say (verse 2) *when* it was—in the *beginning*. This reading is supported by the authority of Rev. J. H. Howlett, Reading Chaplain of H. M. Chapel, Whitehall, and author of "Instructions on Reading the Liturgy," and is in strict accordance with the commentaries of Barnes, Scott and others on the passage. The Evangelist first announces *what* was in the beginning, then that it was united *with* God, and as a climax of this great announcement that it *was* God himself. But lest his evangel in all its grand announcements should be misunderstood, he adds, in the second verse, that "the same was in the *beginning*." My correspondent states that he had been led to understand that he should emphasize "beginning" in the first verse, and emphasize "word" and not "was" in the third clause. But the emphatic statement of the second verse shows that John's first important announcement was that the *Word* was in the beginning, and that the *Word* not only was *with* God, but *was* God himself, crowns the statement. This is the general way of reading the verse, and it is based upon a common-sense view of the passage. I have marked it as it is and should be read.

R. LEWIS.

WHAT MAKES THE ROWDIES.

To the Editor of the Canada School Journal.

On a scrap of paper which has served to wrap a mailed school periodical, my eye was caught by this paragraph :

"So long as we allow our public meetings, our lectures, our

church gatherings, to be annoyed, disturbed, and made unendurable by hoots, whistles, cat-calls, and general rowdyism; so long as we allow our nights to be made hideous by gangs of young men racing and howling in our streets, so long may we expect our school will be disorderly and unsatisfactory. But when our city governments shall see that order prevails on our streets at night and day; when our churches and Sunday schools shall determine to have and enforce good order; when we can have a public lecture in either hall or church, at which there shall be no ruffianism; when, in short, our public will so respect themselves as to compel others to respect their rights; whenever and wherever this state of affairs exists, then and there can be had a good, successful, and orderly school, and genteel, orderly pupils will go trooping home quietly and without carrying off any one's gat. The best teachers in the world cannot do it without the co-operation of the people."

This is a frightful picture of a wretched state of society, in which expenditure and loss must ultimately eat up all means, and prosperity cannot be secured,—to say nothing of comfort.

But is it the rowdyism that spoils the usefulness of the schools, or was it ineffectiveness in the schools that first permitted or caused the development of the rowdies? For these are like the fungoid growths of blight and mildew which sometimes devastate the gardener's crops. If he has been vigilant and industrious to keep up a vigorous growth, the leaves of his vines remain bright and healthy; they throw off the spores from which the fungi grow. Is it not so in the schools? Children naturally love to learn, and to learn with others in emulative squads. If they get some fresh knowledge every day, of a kind that satisfies their desire, and leads them to anticipate the next point which is to be shown to them to-morrow, they will prefer the school to the street; especially if the room is bright and neat and comfortable. There will be no street school to go to, because none of the children will be idle or demoralized.

Instead of the *compulsion* which is a hard necessity in the case of the hopelessly depraved, let early measures of PREVENTION be put into immediate effect. Choose for the primary school the most winning, most steady, most tactful and expert of the whole corps of teachers; and let the next best be placed in charge of the next grade, and so on. Give a tithe of the cost of patrol and prosecutions, to supply these schools with all needful means and conveniences. Visit the busy little midgets, who will be delighted to see that their doings are noticed, and who will read to charm you, and do slate work to astonish you, if you only give them and their teachers countenance and chance. And so your future community will be saved from blight.

W.

Mathematical Department.

Communications intended for this part of the JOURNAL should be on separate sheets, written on one side only, and properly paged to prevent mistakes. They must be received on or before the 20th of the month to secure notice in the succeeding issue, and must be accompanied by the correspondents' names and addresses.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON (ENG.).

MATRICULATION, JANUARY, 1880.

ARITHMETIC AND ALGEBRA.

TIME—THREE HOURS.

Examiners—Dr. John Hopkinson, M.A., F.R.S., and Rev. Prof. Townsend, M.A., F.R.S.

1. From $\frac{1}{10}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ of a mile subtract $\frac{3}{4}$ of $\frac{1}{2}$ of a foot, and express the result in metres. (One metre may be taken as 39 $\frac{1}{2}$ inches.)
2. Multiply 0.0316228 by itself, giving the result correctly to six significant figures.
3. Obtain the square root of 0.03456789 correctly to seven places of decimals.
4. Find the product of 0.538461 and 0.3285714, reducing the result to a vulgar fraction expressed in its simplest form.
5. Given that a gallon of water weighs 10 lbs., that a cubic foot of water weighs 1000 ounces, and that a litre is a cubic decimetre; find how many litres there are in a gallon.
6. Find *r* and *s* in terms of *a* and *b*, *p* and *q*, so that $x^4 - px^2 + qx^2 + rx + s$ may be divisible by $x^2 + ax + b$, whatever *x* be.