

aesthetic teacher who did not himself understand the analysis of the sentences but who was ablaze with the love of beauty in its girls' boarding-school acceptance. It is certain that many pupils would never acquire what the self-constituted censors of taste would regard as real soaring poetical culture if they had to take flight from this hard intellectual ground of intelligent analysis, but the only loss to the state would be that of a few odes to autumn leaves and wounded hearts, and similar effusions in our weekly papers, and a vast amount of affected sentiment and affectation of taste.

Grammar is full of technical terms. It is impossible to teach the subject without naming the parts of speech, the inflections, the kinds of sentences, and these simple requirements involve about fifty technical terms. The minute study of the English sentence which precedes Latin prose composition involves many more necessary technicalities. The scientific study is concerned very largely with the defining of these terms, and has added a few and changed a few on its own account. But when those who object to these technical terms are asked which they would delete they usually conclude upon examination that we really need a few more.

We have not in this paper said all that can be said for Grammar, there are at least two or three other benefits accruing to the pursuit of it, but we humbly submit that, with the possible exception of Literature, there is hardly a subject on the curriculum which can muster so overwhelming a line of great and indisputable claims as this subject.

Historical Grammar might be taught as a department of English History and Grammar so far as it affects purity and power of rhetorical expression might be taught as a chapter of rhetoric, but what subject can make three just

claims so imposing as grammar makes when it claims to be *in the first rank as a science*, to be *the open sesame to sound scholarship in foreign languages*, and to be *the only legitimate introduction to art*, as those infallible educational philosophers, the Greeks, rightly held it to be.

It is announced as the intention of those in authority to absolve candidates for second-class certificates from an examination in this subject. In other words, there is to be a gap of one year in the High School Grammar course, and this the very year which precedes the matriculation and second-class examination; the very year when our pupils are reading that English which has most need of analytic powers; the year in which Latin Prose and Greek Prose, and French and German Prose demand the most accurate insight into English syntax. We protest against this with whatever weight the arguments of this paper may lend to our protest, and we are in a position to state that some of the masters of this Province who know most about the subject, who have taught it for five, ten and twenty years, and who have the interest of solid attainments and broad intelligent literary culture most at heart, are opposed to the change, and that those masters who favour the change are not men of long experience in teaching the subject, do not profess special knowledge of it, and are not impressed with its profound and vital relations to the study of foreign languages, and to the study of our own classical writers.

We trust that all friends of scholarship, in the true sense of the word, and particularly that all college men, will weigh these suggestions, and that if any concession be made to cheap and flimsy sciolism it may be with a grave and adequate appreciation of the proposed change. If it be held, after serious deliberation, that we