

THE DAILY EXAMINER.

MARCH 12, 1887.

Let the People Judge.

The Patriot adopts a lawyer-like method of discussing a bad case. It abuses THE EXAMINER.

It utters not a word of apology for the fulsome certificate of Mr. Donald Allan McDonald's character, impertinently addressed by it to a people who know Mr. McDonald much better than any one connected with the Patriot knows him.

This contention, it will readily be seen, has nothing whatever to do with the questions at issue. Moreover, it is not true. We challenge the Patriot to prove that THE EXAMINER has ever refused a ready acquiescence in the decisions of the people, properly and legally expressed.

By the way, here is a specimen of the respect in which the Grits hold the people. The Grit candidates in Cape Breton were defeated, and the Grit organ there says:—

"Like the swine possessed of the devils, electors rushed madly to their own destruction. Thousands of years have little changed the perversity of the multitude. Take an example from a history familiar to at least some of the electors of this country. Look at a nation wrested by the miraculous power of Jehovah from a galling slavery, and shouting the praises of a splendid deliverance on the shores of the Red Sea. But how soon we find the same multitude grovelling in the attitude of worship before the image of a calf—a golden calf—a boodle calf, such as we mourn to say the people of this province prize far above a pure and honest administration of public affairs.

We submit that before it takes THE EXAMINER to task, the Patriot should attend to those of its own Party who express disrespect for the judgment of the people.

In the meantime the Patriot might, if it can, advance some reasons for advising the people of the Third District to vote Mr. McDonald in and the Hon. Donald Ferguson out.

Queen Square Gardens.

ACCOUNTS FOR THE LAST THREE YEARS.

As will be seen by the following statements, the expenditure of the first year, owing to the quantity of permanent work performed, was much greater than that of either of the two following years; as, for instance, such items as hot-water heating apparatus for Glass house, and for grading and fencing, which will not occur again. The outlays of the second and third years were less than that of the first by the sums of \$505 and \$766, respectively.

The deficits of the three years altogether now amount to \$501.73; that of 1885, namely, \$37.72, alone forms the greater part of it, and was caused chiefly by the breaking out of the small pox, which interfered with the collections that year. Only \$116 was collected, against \$815 the previous year. Besides this shortage, the Strawberry Festival proved a failure, owing to wet weather, and the Government grant was also reduced by \$50.

In 1886 (the third year) there were no collections made, the only sum received for that year being that realized from the sale of votes, polled in aid of the Square, some weeks ago.

Among the property acquired for the use of the Square, and now held in the interest of the undertaking, may be mentioned the Glass house, heating apparatus (which latter is of the best modern style and as good as new), about 15 hot-bed frames and sashes, large stock of valuable plants, supply of flower pots, three lawn mowers, wheelbarrow, hand-cart, water-cart and hose, posts and wire fencing, 12

garden benches, etc., and a full assortment of garden tools, which, on the whole, are fully worth the balance now due, even after making a liberal reduction on the original cost.

The following are statements, showing expenses and receipts in connection with the garden for the last three years, separately, viz:—

FIRST YEAR—1884.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Queen Square, Broken stone, soil, ashes, and black earth, used in constructing walks, grass plots and flower beds, etc.

Cost of Square \$861 67

Glass House.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Carpenters, glaziers, masons and lumber, on account, etc.

Cost of Glass house \$519 71

Cost of Square and Glass house \$1381 38

Receipts on account, first year.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes From gentlemen collectors, summer 1884, etc.

Short for 1884 \$106 24

SECOND YEAR, 1885.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Queen Square, Stone, earth and ashes for Walks and Grass Plots, etc.

Cost of Square \$679 06

Glass House and Hot Beds.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Boards, scantling, glass, putty, nails, boxes, etc.

Cost of Glass House, &c. \$197 11

Total \$876 17

Receipts on account, Second Year.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Second Strawberry Festival, Gentlemen collectors who were prevented completing their work, etc.

Short for 1885 \$347 72

THIRD YEAR—1886.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Queen's Squares, Earth, ashes, cartage, &c., &c.

Cost of Square \$414 76

Glass House and Hot Beds.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes Balance due Poole & Lewis' old account for lumber, etc.

Cost of Glass house &c. \$200 16

Total \$614 92

Receipts on account third year.

Table with 2 columns: Item, Amount. Includes The only amount on account of this year was the sum realized from votes sold Feb., 1887, etc.

Short on account 1886 \$47 77

Add shortage of two previous years, 1885 \$347 72

And 1884 \$106 24

Total shortage (which includes a number of unpaid accounts) \$501 73

ARTHUR NEWBERRY.

Charlottetown, March 11, 1887.

THE morning dress. It is said that a lady's standing in society can easily be determined by her dress at the breakfast table; an expensive, showy costume indicating that the wearer has not yet learned the proprieties. But no one need be afraid of being called shoddy if her loveliness is as apparent by daylight as at the hops. Perfect beauty is never the attendant of disease; above all of those diseases peculiar to women, and which find a ready cure in Dr. Pierce's favorite prescription. Price reduced to \$1.

Traffic on the Canadian Pacific Railway was seriously interrupted last week in British Columbia by freshets in the mountains.

Agents for the German Government have purchased 200 horses in Ireland at a high price.

Notes on Parsing.

[At the meeting of the Educational Association held last October, a resolution was passed, asking that a column be requested weekly in the city papers for the criticism of difficult points in English. Mr. T. A. Lepage was asked to take charge of the same. We publish to-day, as an introduction to a weekly series, the paper read by Mr. LePage before the teachers on that occasion. All correspondence connected with this department to be addressed to Mr. LePage.]

EVERY one on examination finds that there are two tendencies at work in speech, analysis and synthesis. The one aims to build up sentences with as few words as possible, but then the words are massive; being constructed in fact of several distinct parts, one of which contains the leading idea (which we call the root), the others—which we call prefixes or affixes—having the power to indicate the value of this root in the words that group themselves round it. This is the synthetic mode of speech; it gives such words as *assiduous*, *irresistible*, *congregation*. The other mode, the analytic, is in its extreme form monosyllabic, and gives separate words not only for the root-ideas of speech, but for all the ideas of relation attached to these. It is true that there is no language entirely synthetic, the extreme form of which would give a sentence in one or two words. The Russian must be an approach to it, or it greatly belies appearances. Such a language would have no prepositions, no recognized conjunctions, but few signs of definite and indefinite; all these would be brought out by apparently arbitrary changes in the prominent, necessary words. Latin is in great part such a language, much more so than Greek; and French much more so than English. Yet both tendencies are ever at work, and it is quite impossible to say which tendency is the earlier. The need of precision calls forth the analytic mode; the need of compactness, the synthetic. We do not know if the first man that spoke used only monosyllabic words—each of which had a distinct meaning of its own—and afterwards grouped them into larger words, having a more complex meaning; or if they found themselves using the larger words, not knowing where they came from. What is the case now has probably been the case from the beginning: out of the stock of current words we are ever building compounds; and then we wear these compounds down till they are no longer recognizable as such, and in time one here and there drops from the rank of words which yield a mental picture to the rank of words or parts of words that merely shade these mental pictures. The word *assiduous*, which is now so sober and respectable, must, when it was first used, have meant, and sounded as odd as, the combination "sit-at-it." He is an assiduous fellow, just meant. He is a "full-of-sit-at-it" fellow. The words which we call roots, and which are so pregnant with meaning, are for the most part of one syllable; but whether these are original roots or have themselves a history back of them which would resolve them into earlier compounds whittled down cannot be stated with certainty. Man, having the capacity for speech, developed it; how, we cannot say. Having something to work on, he might build new words; but of the first words we know almost nothing. It seems, indeed, a pure accident that with certain sounds there are connected certain ideas. We learn to connect them; but the connection is arbitrary, accidental. Why the syllable *noct* in Latin, *nykt* in Greek, and *night* in English means what it does (and these forms are the same words with dialectic differences) is probably as accidental as the meaning now attached to the verb "boycott." Had Boycott's name been Girl-crib, we might have had this latter word instead, and it would have served its purpose equally well. A mere accident has given us this word, and it is probable that all words are in origin remembered co-occurrences, which are fresh long enough to give the word currency and are then forgotten. We do not believe that men at first said "Go to, let us make speech." Without speech, indeed, it would have been difficult to hold the consultation. I know that the popular idea is that the first man was endowed with a full-fledged language; but I know also that he would have found provokingly awkward a vocabulary whose value he had not learned by association. An actually new word gives us no clue at all to its meaning; we may guess this from its connection; but, to be sure, we need to be told it by one who already knows, and this again implies a previous medium of communication known equally to us both. Language-building probably never went on any faster than it does to-day, nor any differently. We have a large accumulation now, and from these we are continually dropping the unnecessary ones or elaborating the uses of the others; but new words come slowly and have to be assimilated one by one. It has been so always. When human needs were few, words were, in proportion, few; by interchange, by my giving you some sound that I struck on somehow, and learning from you some other sound you struck on, and then remembering the coincidences, slowly and gropingly were the foundations of language laid. We do not suppose that the languages of this planet are the languages of anywhere else. They originated here; it is difficult to imagine that there is a universal tongue which was miraculously given to the father-man. If there was, it is certainly now lost. It seems to me that speech is as much a human invention as writing; and what a long, laborious thing it was to represent sounds and thoughts to the eye, on y those who have studied the matter know. Sounds became words by remembered association; the sounds themselves may have been spasmodic, inarticulate efforts under stress of circumstances to shout out something. Probably there was nothing deliberate about the process. You cannot invent occasions; and each new word was the product of some new occasion, and thus came to signal like occasions. Such words may have been simple or complex according to the feeling which forced them out. They may, on becoming current, have been worn down to something smoother, or elaborated for varieties of occasion. But, whatever the early history of language, this much is certain, that whenever sufficient words had gathered for ready speech, the two tendencies I have spoken of were already active,—the tendency to form compounds which ultimately coalesced into an apparently simple word, because convenient, representing a new unity; and the

tendency to clip words, especially those most in use, thus giving them less a personal and more a relational value. Such may in the end cease to be separate words, and get to be but parts of words, prefixes or affixes. Take the syllable *en*. It is no word now, yet it has the force of *make* either at the beginning or end of words. *Enrich*, *sadden* and *enlighten*, are cases in point. It was once a word; it is now merely a sign of energy.

Words thus split up into picture-words and shade-words; these are continually combining to give the panorama of speech. The ranks of the more abstract indefinable words are recruited from the ranks of words embodying physical conceptions, and these again are recruited as new concrete demand attention. The stream, thus fed and thus evaporated, flows on. Now the difficulties of parsing are just the difficulties of speech; to have any satisfactory method of parsing, one must have some such idea as I have outlined of the main characteristics of speech. The essential thing to be seized is this, that, probably, only those words can be parsed which represent definite things, and are not merely signs. It is an absurdity, speaking strictly, to call the word 'and' a conjunction. It is not a conjunction,—it is a sign of conjunction. Two things or statements are conjoined; they form the conjunction: the word 'and' is rather a conjunctive. But to call it so is after all to ignore the preceding history of the word; to ignore it as a picture-word, which it once was; and to treat it as a shade or sign-word, which it has now become. It is said to have once meant *going further*; was in fact a participle whose agreement has been obscured or lost. It would be difficult to recognize it as such where it is written now. It is to give it more importance than it deserves to say: "And" a present participle, unattached, used absolutely that is: though this is true historically, it is tedious, burdensome; it presupposes a history of words, and this few ever care to have; and besides, it overlooks the reason why the word *and* is so used. I mean it to connect, and do not care for the time where it came from; to me it is a sign of conjunction. Now treating the word thus practically, instead of historically, I am directing attention to the use of the word; in the first case to earlier stages of its history. A full parsing requires both; it seeks to state what a word does, that is, its function; and also why it does it, that is, its individual value, the ordinary connection between meanings and form. In other terms, a word is to be viewed partly in the light of its lineage, and partly in the light of its own peculiar energy. Along what line has it come down? and whither is its face now pointing?

Now, in so many words is this connection between form and meaning obscure, that we content ourselves with mentioning the functions only, and this is the case with the words called particles, prepositions and conjunctions. Whenever function obscures form, the emphasis must be laid on function. To take an illustration. Such words as *in*, *out*, *by*, were indisputably once adjectives of place, as *this*, *that* and *you* are now. They are still virtually such in the words 'inside,' 'outside,' and 'by-way.' But it is usually so difficult to connect them with substantives, as all adjectives really are, that grammarians have given up the attempt to establish this connection, and interpret them with the nouns that follow. They say that the words 'in,' 'out' or 'by' is put before some more definite word to add on some new idea. Now, when these words which are signs of energy or relation, that fix in any word the value of the root-idea, are combined into one word with the root, there is no difficulty in parsing. It is easy and correct to call 'assiduous' an adjective of quality. But it would be difficult to parse by itself each word in its analytic equivalent 'full-of-sit-at-it.' We may state the relation of four of these words to the fifth, which is the root, but it is only the phrase as a whole that can be parsed. It is folly to try to parse separately each word in such phrases as 'at all,' 'in short,' 'on a sudden.' These expressions are as yet analytic in form, but they are a unity in thought, and so must be taken together. If you can trace the phrase you are a philologist as well. These phrases are survival of fuller ones which now only suggest an intelligible idea. Latin gives us an oblique case of an adjective for each of these, and it is well known that a preposition in an analytic tongue usually replaces an oblique case in a synthetic. The Latins said *subito* where we say 'on a sudden'; yet our phrase is no more disconnected in thought than the Latin single word. And the parsing of it should be as concise.

We do not try to parse the first syllable of "also," "although," because there the union is complete and is recognized in the form. Yet often the union is complete in thought before it is complete in form. Take the word "drill-shed," for instance; the form is compound, though yet it represents a new unity and is correctly parsed as a compound noun. We feel that the first word need not be taken by itself. You cannot satisfactorily call it an adjective. Now such compounds are first written as separate words, as in the phrase "The Education Act"; then with a hyphen as in the phrase "policy-holder," and lastly together, as in "ironmonger," "iceberg." Yet the union is as close in the first stage as in the last, as far as the thought goes; and only frequency and convenience of use are needed to effect the union in form. And therefore parsing must recognize not only compound nouns, but compound verbs and adjectives, etc., and group them as one in thought in all stages of formal union. In such a phrase as "The Prince Street Methodist Church Sunday School Picnic," we have one huge compound noun, made up of a series of substantives whose position subordinates them to the last and determining word.

What is called parsing must be as applicable to the language of the street and the handbill, as to that of the most polished writers. Parsing is just a criticism of speech-forms, whether these be polished and regular, or rude and irregular. Life is too short for such correct expressions as a "Picnic held by the school which convenes on Sunday in the Church of the Methodist body, situated on a street which bears the name of Prince." It must not be forgotten that the essential thing in any sentence is the meaning. It is this that determines the treatment of the form, and no sentence can be scientifically regarded except in the light of this. The mind having perceived the relations that hold in that speech-organism, a sentence, gives out in detail the history and function of its component parts.

Carpets, Oilcloths, AND HOUSE-FURNISHINGS.

WE offer the Largest Assortment in the City in these goods, and at prices very low during March.

28 BALES ROOM PAPER NOW READY.

See our Sample Books before buying elsewhere. Sheets, Table Linens, White Cottons, Pillow Cottons, Towels, Prints, Tickings, Gray Cottons, Gingham, SEERSUCKERS.

A very large assortment of LADIES' CORSETS, at extremely low prices.

JAMES PATON & CO., MARKET SQUARE.

Ch'town, March 12, 1887.—dy wky

AT COST!

FOR 30 days I will SELL AT COST, an immense lot of HARD & SOFT HATS,

ALSO, 300 WHITE AND FANCY SHIRTS, some of which are slightly soiled, at half price. This is the cheapest lot of Hats and Shirts ever offered in the city.

can buy Remnants and Ends at your own figures. A special bargain in MEN'S UNDERWEAR. Shirts of every description, Scotch Tweeds and Worsted Suits made in latest style, and at bottom figures.

CALL AND BE CONVINCED.

D. A. BRUCE.

Ch'town, March 12, 1887.—eod & wky

LONDON HOUSE.

House-keeping Goods, New White and Gray Cotton, New Printed Cottons, Bleached Sheetings, Unbleached Sheetings, Pillow Cottons, Table Linens, Towels, Toweling.

THESE goods have just been opened for Spring Sale, and having been bought before the recent advance in Cottons, will be found extra value.

CARPETS! CARPETS! Brussels, Tapestries, Hems, Floor Cloths, Matting, Hearth Rugs, Door Mats, Lace Curtains.

Tailoring Department.

A lot of Spring Tweeds just opened.

HARRIS & STEWART,

SUCCESSORS TO GEO. DAVIES & CO.

Ch'town, March 7, 1887.—wky

MARCH SALE.

THE people are sick reading advertisements all about Big Discounts and void of meaning; but what L. E. PROWSE advertises to do, you may be sure he will do.

PLEASE READ: A lot of Remnants of Dress Goods, about half price. A job lot of Corsets less than half price. A magnificent lot of Embroidery, 20 per cent discount. Job lot of Dress Goods, 20 to 25 per cent discount. Black Cashmeres and Merinoes, excellent value. Gray Cottons, White Cottons, Sheetings, Shirting, Tickings, &c., very low.

Two Thousand (\$2,000) Dollars' Worth of Hats FROM 20 TO 50 PER CENT. DISCOUNT, FOR 15 DAYS ONLY.

NOW IS THE TIME TO BUY HATS CHEAP

TRY US: WE MEAN IT EVERY TIME.

L. E. PROWSE,

SIGN OF THE BIG HAT, 74 QUEEN STREET.

Ch'town, March 4, 1887.—eod & wky

