

present a good deal of difficulty; but very young boys can be made to understand the use of their English equivalents *shall* and *will*, and even *should* and *would*. Let me just give a sketch of the way in which these anomalies might be explained to boys, and this will answer a very important question, how far early English may be used in teaching boys modern English.

Take the word "drive." We want to express the future. We have no one word exactly fit to do this, but can use different combinations of words:—"I am going to drive," "I am sure to drive," "I am bound to drive." Now the verb "shall" means, or meant, "to be bound," or "to be sure." Hence it would seem that we should say, I shall to drive;" but the word "shall" being so close any ally or auxiliary of the verb as to be almost one with it, and being also, as we shall explain hereafter, an old-fashioned and conservative word, can dispense with the "to," which is the modern sign of the infinitive. Thus we have "I shall drive." But it is rude to say of a neighbour, or to a neighbour, that he is *bound*, or even *sure*, to do anything. It is far more polite and pleasant to say that he *purposes*, *wishes*, or *wills* to do it. Hence in the second or third person we use *will*—"He or you will drive." The same rule applies to *shall* and *would*, which are the past tenses of *shall* and *will*.

But why do we vary so curiously in the use of *should* and *would*, even when applied to the same person, as, "He said that we *should* fail, but I knew that he *would* succeed?" The answer is, there can be no possible rudeness in repeating what a man says of himself. If the man said he was sure to fail, there can be no harm in your saying it too. and using *should*, provided you do not say it as coming from yourself, but only say that he said it: "he said he *should* fail." But when you come to speak in your own person, *should* would be rude; and therefore you say, "I knew he *would* succeed." And the same explanation applies to "If he *should* fail he *would* deserve blame." To say, "he *should* deserve blame," would be a statement, rude and imperious; but that little word *if*, changing the statement into a condition, takes away the sting of imperiousness. There can be no harm in being as positive as you like in the verbs which you use about your neighbours, if your assertion is only preceded by an *if*.

Now what objection can there be to such explanations to qualify the good which they certainly must do? Some good teachers shrink with unnecessary dread from the very sound of the words "early English"? I should be as much disposed as any one to avoid anything like obtrusion of early English, or the mixing up of the study of early English with our subject. But there is a difference between study and the result of study,—a difference between proving and giving the result of proof.

Take the word *increasing*, in the phrase "by increasing his influence." To prove that this, in the earlier stage of the language, would have been written, "by *the* increasing of;" then, as we find in Shakespeare, or, "by increasing of his influence;" and thence to demonstrate that, in our modern curtailed phrase, *increasing* is, at least by derivation, a noun—this, as a demonstration, might be long; but to state it, explain it, and to make boys understand and reproduce it, would not, I think, be either long or difficult. If this were once inculcated, we might be spared the annoyance of hearing, and our pupils the perplexity of thinking, that every word that ends in *-ing* is a present participle. Again, take even so simple a sentence as the popular rhyme which asks, "Who saw him die?" How can a boy be expected to parse the word *die*, unless he has been told something about the old Infinitive? I believe some grammarians give the rule that *bid*, *see*, *feel*, *let*, and *hear*, omit the *to* before the following infinitive.

But would it not be as easy to say that the old infinitive had the inflectional ending *-en*, which was first curtailed and then altogether dropped; that the common colloquial words of all language are the great conservatives of old forms; and that, for this reason, a number of old verbs in very common use still adhere to the remnant of the old form, even though it has lost its distinguishing characteristic; and consequently, in the case of these conservative verbs, which are called auxiliaries, the convenient but modern innovation *to* is dispensed with? Again for older boys, it is most desirable that the very great difference between the meaning of *to* in "I like *to* walk," and "I came here *to* walk," should be carefully explained. Where Latin prose composition is to form a part of the school course, this explanation is a great help in preparing the boys for the different methods of rendering "to walk" in Latin. But even where Latin is not thought of, it is an easy and useful exercise for boys to follow the teacher while he traces how the old gerund, which is scarcely an infinitive at all, "to walk," i.e. "toward or for the purpose of walking," gradually thrust itself into the position occupied by the retiring inflectional infinitive, so as to be used even where there is no notion of purpose whatever. Thus *to*, in "to walk," now has forces that are totally distinct; it sometimes has its proper prepositional meaning, and means "towards" or "for the purpose of;" at other times, "to" has no meaning at all, but merely represents the vanished infinitive inflection.

It cannot but be useful that other anomalies—as for example, the formation of the tenses of the so-called irregular verbs, the anomalous plurals *fiefs* for instance and *thieves*—should be shown to depend upon laws of derivation or euphony, wherever the explanation is brief and simple.

Some may agree with me that such explanations are both possible, intelligible, and useful, and also that boys can reproduce these explanations in the form of systematic lessons. But they may ask, how are we to get the time for this extra work? I answer, by, dispensing with a good deal of our present work, which does not deserve the name of work at all—by teaching English naturally, and not as a mere step to Latin. I have heard some persons admit that in reality English nouns have only one case; but they defend the assertion, that there are three cases, by saying that the make-believe is "such a capital preparation for Latin." But a good many of the pupils in our schools will not go on to Latin, and they have a right to be considered. And besides, I have no faith in make-believes under any circumstances least of all in our profession, between teacher and pupil. Boys who are to write Latin prose will learn far more for the purposes of Latin by being taught in English the meaning of *to*, than by committing to memory the rule that there are three cases in English—the Nominative, the Possessive, and the Objective. It cannot be, in the end, expedient to treat one language as being different from what it really is, for the purpose of studying another language more accurately. I believe that the boa-constrictor is said to be an undeveloped lizard, and to conceal beneath its skin four rudimentary feet. The fact is interesting, and has its place and time in the broader studies of advanced zoologists; but who would help a child to understand a lizard better, or a boa-constrictor better, by calling a boa-constrictor a lizard? Both English and Latin will be better taught for being taught on distinct principles. For our classical teaching, as well as our English, requires improvement. The most ardent classicists ought, I think, to join in asserting the independence of English for the sake of classical studies themselves. Has it never happened to any of us, at the end of a lesson