

is in the act of inflicting the punishment, when a stranger enters the ante room where the boys are assembled and asks the cause of 'the boy's being punished; he is informed of the circumstance, and says, "Well, if he is guilty he deserves to be punished." Of the boy's guilt he has no doubt, and consequently uses the Indicative Mood. It may appear to you that I have magnified this difficulty, but I have invariably found that, simple as it may seem, it is a point which I had difficulty in mastering, and which I have found is a stumbling-block to students. With the desire to be practical I have simply attempted to indicate, in terms as plain as possible, the plan with which I have been most successful in getting my pupils to master the Subjunctive Mood.

When the use of the Present Indicative in hypothetical clauses is fully understood, little difficulty will be experienced in determining when to use the Present Subjunctive. A few words on this point may not be entirely thrown away. When there are two things that are liable to be confounded, if we get a clear idea when to use the one, the use of the other will be more easily understood. If we know when to use the Present Subjunctive it will materially aid us in determining when to use the Present Indicative in hypothetical clauses. In listening to a sermon some time ago on evolution, I heard the minister make use of the following. "If the Mosaic account of the creation be true, evolutionists are in error." Now let us consider the statement for a moment. Why did he make use of the expression "evolutionists are in error"? From his sermon and from what was passing in his mind, he was certain that the Mosaic record is true because only on his belief of the correctness of the account could he make the assertion that "evolutionists are in error." The speaker misrepresented what was passing in his mind by using the Subjunctive instead of the Indicative.

Take another example, viz.: the one given in our authorized textbook, and by pursuing a similar line of argument you will see clearly that the speaker misrepresents what is passing in his mind when he says "If it rain we shall not come." What would lead the speaker to make use of the expression? We must think exactly as he did, and he transfers himself forward mentally to the time of starting; then the only reason he could possibly have would be its raining at that time. Change the expression to "If it does not rain we shall come," and all becomes perfectly clear. When, then, you will ask, is the Present Subjunctive used? The best answer that I can give is to be found in Mason's Advanced Grammar, pp. 438 and 439; and in his remarks on the Subjunctive Mood in the preface to his Grammar.

There is a point here to be strictly guarded, that is, not to confound this use of the Subjunctive with that found in suppositions respecting the future, treated as "a mere conception of the mind," and to express which the past tense is employed. I may here refer to the *infallible* guide we used to have for the correct use of the Subjunctive Mood: "When contingency and futurity are both implied, the Subjunctive; when contingency and futurity are not both implied, the Indicative." This is entirely wrong, and should be vigilantly guarded against as a fruitful source of error, since it contains only part of the truth.

But the most perplexing part of the subject remains to be considered, viz.: whether there is a Future Subjunctive or not. If you examine the works of Abbot, Mason, Angus, Bain, and Fleming, you will find that Bain, Fleming, and Angus have a future tense in their paradigms, Mason has none, and Abbot (if I may be permitted to use the expression) is on the fence. Were we to decide this matter by numbers, Mason's testimony being alone would go to the wall, but let us appeal to a higher authority than any of these, viz.: Language. What does it say in the matter? Take an example: "If Mr. Bishop should advocate the N. P. his popularity with the Reform

party would decline" (assumed for the sake of argument). The occurrence of the probability spoken of in the sentence, if it should be brought to the test of reality, would be in the future. The mental position in which the speaker places himself is to regard it as past. Let me reconcile these statements, contradictory as they must seem. The sentence may be reconstructed to the following, and yet convey the same meaning. "If Mr. Bishop were to advocate the N. P. his popularity with the Reform party would decline." I think any and all of you will agree with me that the verb in the hypothetical clause is in the past tense. But this argument fails, when applied to the consequent clause. The best way, then, to dispose of the difficulty is to place ourselves in the speaker's place mentally. The supposition is "a mere conception of the mind." Mentally, the speaker transfers himself forward to a period to which the probability of which he speaks is a past event. In simpler language, the speaker views Mr. Bishop's advocacy of the N. P. and his consequent fall in the Reform estimation, as accomplished. Bearing in mind the fact that mood has reference to the mental attitude of the speaker, any one who regards my statement of the question, so far, as correct, must admit that the verbs in the example are in the past tense. Consequently I think we must come to the conclusion that Mason is right. What the others call future he calls a past-paraphrastic.

These are the principal difficulties I have experienced in studying and teaching this subject, and the plans I have taken in overcoming them. If any teacher present has met with the same difficulties and has received the slightest hint that will be of any value I shall be satisfied. But let me in conclusion urge upon you all the necessity of investigating for yourselves, and not to accept anything simply because the text-book says so, but because you are satisfied it is right.

#### THE NEW EDUCATION.\*

His subject was: "The New Education." The lecturer, after a few remarks on the course of lectures which the Y.M.C.A. had arranged this winter, and the efforts which it was putting forth to assist itself as an educative force in Quebec, proceeded to discuss as a preliminary the civilization of the present time. Progress and order, he said, were the two great factors of our civilization, but they were neither constant nor always sympathetic. Ever and anon they make a shuttlecock of citizenship in the restlessness of Liberalism and the reaction of Conservatism. As an instance of this he pointed out the political antagonism as it is to be seen in the history of the nations, and which seemed to point to civilization as anything but a harmony. It was necessary, therefore, to seek the counterpoise which is apt to be overlooked in the general movement of promoting a true civilization. Christianity is undoubtedly the greatest of the forces which has tended to bring harmony out of the discord in human nature. The effects it has produced established a fair induction that it is a divinely appointed instrument for the elevation and improvement of men. There is a spurious kind of Christianity which has blurred the pages of history. But the true Christian civilization, the highest recognition of the moral, has in it no retrograde activity. It promotes in man a confidence, a *forwardness*, not however from the evil he finds in others, but from the good he finds in himself. Over-confidence on the part of Christianity is bigotry, and bigotry promotes the harmony of Hades; it is the conceited ignorance of a blinded hope, it is superstition with its inherent darkness rendered visible by a mere glimmer from the true light. In other words, bigotry is the caricature of dogmatism, and *dog-matism*, as the Rev. Sydney Smith says, is *puppy-*

\* Address delivered before Y.M.C.A., by John Harper, M.A., Rector, High School, Quebec.