the proposition; otherwise, it will be allowed to speak for itself. They are these.:—

I. The vocabulary of every language contains a vast number of words that are practically useless
(a) To any particular individual.
(b) To the community in general.

A single catalogue of a library, a museum, or even of a florist, will not fail to satisfy the most incredulous that there are many words which are of no practical utility to him. Half-an-hour spent in turning over the pages of a good dictionary will suffice to remove doubt, if any exists, as to the fact that many words are practically useless to the community in general.

II. The vocabulary of every language is divisible into two distinct classes of words; viz.:—
(a) Words without which it is impossible to speak or write upon any subject whatever.
(b) Words which are only used upon given occasions, or under particular circumstances.

The former may be termed the *permanent vocabulary*, the latter the *auxiliary vocabulary*; or, to be more precise, the latter are the auxiliary vocabularies, for words of this class are divisible into a series of distinct vocabularies.

The auxiliary vocabularies are all composed mainly, though not entirely, of substantives. The permanent vocabulary embraces all words other than those that belong to the auxiliary vocabularies.

This proposition indicates the superior importance of the words of the permanent over those of the auxiliary vocabularies, or either of them.

III. All words have a numerical value. The numerical value of the words of the permanent vocabulary is individual, that of the words of the auxiliary vocabulary is generic.

For example, the words "and," "the," "some," "I," "shall," "will," "you," "she," "has," are words belonging to the permanent vocabulary, and are obviously of higher numerical value,—*i.e.*, are used more frequently, whether in speech or writing, than "come," "call," "stop," "wait," "therefore," "afterwards," "long," "find," "agree," which in their turn are obviously of higher numerical value than "offensive," "defend," "entail," "connect," "avert," "attract," "cultivate," "subordinate," "appreciate," also words of the permanent vocabulary. It is also obvious that the numerical value of each of these words is individual; that is to say, if the value of the word "and" is represented by the number 40, that of "come" may be represented by 20, that of "offensive" by 1; or, in other words, for every use of the word "offensive," the word "come" is used 20 times, the word "and" 40 times. These figures are, of course, given solely by way of illustration.

In the case of the words of the auxiliary vocabularies, the numerical value, on the other hand, is not individual, but generic; *e.g.*, "bread," "meat," "coffee," "tea," "plate," "knife," are words of the auxiliary vocabulary of the meal table; and "rhubarb," "castor oil," "pills," "plasters," "leeches," "blisters," are words of the auxiliary vocabulary of the chemist and druggist.

One word peculiar to the meal table is practically used as frequently as another, and may be said to be of equal numerical value. The same may be said of the words peculiar to the chemist and druggist. But any one, the druggist himself excepted, must be an unhappy mortal who uses the one vocabulary as frequently as he does the other.

IV. The numerical value of words may be ascertained, if not exactly, at least approximately.

Thus, we may take a book, and, beginning at the beginning, write down each word upon its first appearance, and for every subsequent appearance place a tick against it. It is clear that the word with the greatest number of ticks is the word of highest numerical value in that book, and the words without a tick the words of lowest numerical value. A second, a third, or any number of books may be treated in the same manner. If they are dissimilar in character, the relative value will necessarily differ to some extent; but, by adding the total numerical value of any given word common to all, and dividing it by the number of the books used, the numerical value of that word in those books, taken collectively as well as individually, may be ascertained.

V. The learning of the individual words of any language, whether to speak, read, or write them, is a pure effort of the memory, sometimes, though comparatively rarely, aided by comparison.

This proposition needs no present comment beyond this, that it must be in the interest of the learner to learn the words he has to learn in the order of their value to him.

VI. Every language has a method of combining words peculiar to itself, though more or less common to other languages of the same stock. Its peculiar method of combination may be styled its mould.

The next proposition, and the examples given under it, will illustrate this.

VII. The mould of any foreign language may be learned, without knowledge of the words or grammar of that language, and is learned most rapidly, by comparison with that of the native or some other foreign language. The peculiarities of the native language cannot be learned, without comparison of its mould with that of a foreign language.

Thus the Englishman says, "We are thirsty;" the German says, "We are thirsty;" the Frenchman says, "We have thirst." The Englishman says, "I do not know;" the German says, "I know it not; the Frenchman says, "I not know." The Englishman says, "How is your father? He is not very well;" the German says, "How finds himself, your Sir Father? He finds himself not very well;" the Frenchman says, "How himself carries Mister your father? He not himself carries not very well."

VIII. A thorough practical knowledge of a language does not necessarily involve any theoretical grammatical knowledge of it.

We learn to speak, read, and write, as we learn to walk, run, or jump; and as by practice we may walk, run, or jump well, without knowing why, when we jump and thus leave *terra firma*, we do not go straight to heaven, so may we speak without being able to explain the grammatical structure of a single sentence.

I will not say it positively, but I have a notion, that if all the best speakers and writers that we have, unless they happened to be somewhat young, were examined in English grammar by a sharp Board School boy, most of them would be plucked. How could it well be otherwise, when in the school-days of persons now of middle age, English grammar was left to the vulgar, by those who considered Latin grammar the proper thing for gentlemen, and French for ladies.

IX. The accidence of a language can be tabulated. Each form has a numerical value.

To chop the accidence up into small pieces, and to distribute those pieces throughout the numerous pages of a book, is to treat accidence as geography is treated by the makers of dissected maps, with this difference. The grammarian has all the disadvantages of dissection, without any of its advantages. He takes his little block, looks at it, examines it, even learns all that is upon it. What then? It is part of a great whole, but he knows not, he sees not that whole. The geographer is better treated; he has his picture of the whole country. He sees where each little piece fits in. Ought not the accidence of each language to be tabulated, printed in bold and distinguishing type, and suspended on the wall, that the whole may be visible at a glance? I think it should.

X. The syntax of a language cannot be tabulated. It must be stated in rules, with their exceptions. These rules, however, are capable of contrast or comparison with the corresponding rules of the syntax of any other language.

From these ten propositions I make the following deductions:—

First—If the numerical value of individual words can be ascertained, it is obvious that words should be learnt in the order of their numerical value; it is also obvious that they should be combined, or formed into phrases and sentences, in the order of their numerical value; it is further obvious that, if so combined, the mould of the highest numerical value must first come to the surface, and others follow in its wake in the order of their respective numerical value, and that the particular form of the accidence of the language and the particular rules of its syntax must be developed and presented in the same order.

Secondly—If words, moulds, accidence, and syntax are respectively, whether separately or collectively, learned and explained in the order of their numerical value, the language must be learned more rapidly than is possible by any other mode of procedure. If words, moulds, accidence, and syntax are dealt with in their actual utility, no labor is spent in vain, and time and strength are saved for other work.

It need hardly be said that the pupil cannot do this work of marshalling and classifying for himself, or that each individual teacher cannot do it for him. It must therefore, if at all, be done