

shall probably continue to be, a student. My future calling will not remove from me my studious habits nor my interest in schools and scholars. It would be impossible for me to look with cold neglect on the profession of my youth. Wherever my future calls me, whatever may be my occupation, I will always have for the profession itself an earnest thought, for those engaged in it a deep sympathy, and for the friends I found in it a warm heart.

After the conclusion of Mr. Armstrong's reply, regrets at losing one tone so highly valued as a scholar, teacher and friend were expressed by the following gentlemen: Rev. Mr.

Lyle, Geo. Dickson, M. A., W. H. Ballard, M. A., Chas. Robinson, M. A., P. S. Campbell, B. A., and S. McKeown.

Mr. Armstrong thanked them for their very kind remarks and said in parting with them he would offer at the Christmas examinations a medal for the best poem on some Canadian subject, written by a student of the Collegiate Institute, and that he would continue to do this annually as long as he felt able.

## COMMUNICATION.

*To the Editor of the Harrillora School Magazine.*

SIR,—I would ask the favor of being allowed, through the columns of your Magazine, to call the attention of the teaching profession to a scurrilous review of "Cicero Pro Archia," which appeared in the last number of the Educational Monthly.

The introduction, in so far as it describes Cicero's life, is my own composition; in this there is not an error. True, in the first sentence "was" is to be supplied, but this, is an ellipsis, found in the best writings, being more graphic and concise.

The remaining portion (relating to the character and writings of Cicero) consists, verbatim, of passages from Mommsen's, and Merivale's History of Rome; yet this is set down as not being *dummy* English.

*An Verò.*—This is, word for word, § 438 Madvig's Latin Grammar.

The *bold* explanation is *literally* a quotation of Mommsen's History of Rome Vol. I. p. 323 n. It is the teacher's part to see that pupils know what the functions of a consul are.

When I consider that, in all the above cases, due acknowledgment was given to the authors, by inserting the title, and page, of their works from which quotations were taken, I cannot come to a conclusion other than that

the intention, from beginning to end, was to misrepresent and malign.

With respect to Sanscrit roots, I would ask the critic to look into the vocabularies of any school classics, published in England, e. g.

"White's Grammar School Texts" wherein, although edited for school-boys, Sanscrit roots are given.

It is surprising that the Editor of the Educational Monthly should have inserted such a piece. The philology is the *crudest* imaginable. Crude roots!

Standard dictionaries, e. g. White & Riddle's unabridged, Longmans, Green & Co., 1880, give primary, secondary, and tertiary roots. In a great many instances the primary roots cannot be determined.

Again, the critic spurns: "When the context makes it quite clear *as to what* is meant"; yet he says: "The Editor has the proper idea *as to what* the character of the notes should be." Critics should not copy diction which they themselves condemn. Further comment is useless. Thanking you for the favor.

I remain yours very truly,

A. L. PARKER.

Collingwood, June, 1881.