

attempting to reconcile it with the doctrines of modern grammarians. It must be vigilantly guarded against as a most fruitful source of error. Containing only part of the truth and being very vague in its directions, the learner should not admit it into his counsels.

The most perplexing part of the whole investigation of this interesting subject is to determine whether there is a future subjunctive or not. By examining the works of Bain, Fleming, Angus, and Mason, it will be found that the three former include a future tense i. their paradigms of the subjunctive, while Mason has only a present and a past, the future of other *grammarians* being called past periphrastic in his grammar. Were this matter to be decided by appeal to reputed authorities, the solitary testimony of Mason might be outweighed by the formidable array of witnesses on the other side of the question. But there is a higher authority than authors, however great may be their claims to respect. Language is the great arbiter in all such cases. What, then, is the testimony of language respecting the verbal forms in question? Take the example, 'If Mr. Henry should advocate that measure, his popularity would decline.' The occurrence of the probability expressed in the above example, if it should be brought to the test of reality, would be in the future. The mental attitude in which the speaker places himself is to regard it as past. Let me reconcile these statements, contradictory as they must seem. In the first place, the argument of equivalents may be applied in fortifying my position. The sentence may be reconstructed in the following form, and yet convey the same meaning.—'If Mr. Henry were to advocate, &c.' The veriest tyro in grammar would at once say that the verb in the hypothetical clause is in the past tense. So far this argument is valuable, but it fails when applied to the verb in the consequent clause. The best and most philosophical way to dispose of the difficulty is to consider the mental attitude of the speaker. The supposition is, as Mason says, "a mere conception of the mind." Mentally, the speaker transfers himself forward in the future to a period of time in regard to which the probability of which he speaks is a past event. In other words, Mr. Henry's advocacy of the measure and his consequent fall in public estimation, the speaker mentally views as accomplished. Bearing in mind the fact that mood has reference to the mental attitude of the speaker, anyone who regards my statement of the question, so far, as correct, must admit that the verbs in the example given are in the past tense. Language has been consulted, and its testimony is that Mason is right, the opinion of such eminent grammarians as Bain and Angus to the contrary notwithstanding.

There is no other point that presents a serious difficulty. In the foregoing I have, without any attempt at felicity of diction, endeavored to throw light on those features of the subjunctive mood that perplex the learned. If only one teacher will receive a hint that may prove of advantage, my end will be served.

No one who presides over the intellectual interests of the young, and who is animated by the spirit of the true teacher, would delay a moment in adopting the new conjugation, if he only reflected that the practice of teaching a code of grammatical laws, without investigating whether they are recognized by language or not, is highly prejudicial to the development of clear, vigorous, and independent thinkers. May the watchword of the teachers of Ontario be, "Ring out the old, ring in the new."

THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN.

BY D. C. M'HENRY, M.A., PRINCIPAL OF THE COBOURG COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE.

A recent writer remarks that "the air is thick with schemes for the education of women." If this be true, no apology is needed

for the action of our Executive in selecting it as a topic for the consideration of this Association.

Doubtless there are some present who regard the discussion of such a subject as unsuited to the practical purposes of our convention. I would share in that opinion if our discussion must necessarily partake of the aimless, desultory character which this and kindred subjects too often receive. Believing, however, that the higher education of women is intimately associated with the best interests of the teaching profession, and susceptible of a practical consideration, I shall try to treat the subject as fundamentally important, accepting in part the principle enunciated by John Stuart Mill, "that the standard of the education of women in any country will be the measure of the education of the men of that country."

If we would check fanciful innovations and encourage reasonable changes in our endeavor to improve the educational condition of women, we must seek a rational basis of action. In fixing on such a starting point, we shall find that our views of the final cause of the existence of woman will largely determine our ideas as to her legitimate spheres of action, and the corresponding educational qualifications to which she is entitled.

I. WOMAN: HER NATURAL SPHERE AND NATURAL ABILITIES.

The minor theories which are entertained on this point may be conveniently reduced to two: (1) that woman was created for the service she can render to man; (2) that she was created for some end proper to herself. The former, as explaining the purport of woman's life, may be subdivided into the physical theory, the domestic theory, and the social theory.

The Physical Theory, common to all savages, whether savage tribes of heathendom or the savage individual of Christendom, may be dismissed with the remark that to consider the moral and intellectual nature of woman as a sort of superfluity, and to treat her as a mere animal link in the chain of life, is a monstrous doctrine, a gross impiety against our human nature, and suited only to the ages of barbarism.

The Domestic Theory is almost universally accepted by the civilized world, and is notably favored in England, where an ideal home is a synonym for all that is good and desirable. It finds expression in the remark, "Woman's sphere is the home." Let her but pass the limit of domestic functions and relations, and she is regarded as "out of her sphere," in a fair way to become unwomanly and masculine.

Very beautiful, very proper, perhaps, but like many beautiful things and theories, often unreal, impracticable, and misleading. That the home is woman's proper kingdom; that all pertaining to its order, comfort, and grace naturally falls to her charge, and cannot be transferred to man; that woman's life, without such a domestic side, is incomplete—all this is very true. We all admit that while a man may buy or build for himself a house, it takes a woman, a true woman, to make it a home; that the more womanly she becomes the more will her true and charming personality appear in that home; transformed from what man, alone, could make it—a place of eating and sleeping—into the abode and embodiment of all that constitutes a happy home.

We all know the innate desire of woman for home-making, as natural as nest-building in the bird, nor would we attempt to eliminate the one personal element essential to its homelikeness, around which cluster the aggregate of home comforts, great or small—the one who is

"An ear that waits to catch
A hand upon the latch,
A step that hastens its sweet rest to win;
A world of care without,
A world of strife shut out,
A world of love shut in."

Unhappily, however, in this stern, practical world of ours, amid the vicissitudes of a busy age, the exercise of this instinct in woman is frequently interfered with.

We have traced to its main source the "sunshine of domestic life." Let us proceed to a closer analysis of this sunshine. Does it consist in the presence of one who by some means or other becomes "lady of the house," even though the embodiment of a dozen servants—housemaid, housekeeper, and cook—all rolled into one such mistress? Such a wife is only a higher style of domestic. Let us not forget that she who presides in our model home must possess habits of reason as well as domestic order; a refined love of the beautiful, and a dignified kind of loving care, ever present but never intrusive; always calm, bright and glad-some. What is the source, the secret, of these higher essential