

organon to logic, and is destined to revolutionize its study. The laws and processes of thought will gain more from the patient observation of both normal and abnormal phenomena of speech than from any other source or means. Metaphysics proper and ontology have been dethroned from their long usurped dominion over mind and conscience, and shown to be largely word-play and idolatry of verbal figments. Through this science of language scholasticism has received its long-deserved but long-averted death-blow. Again, the historical study of language from the subjective side has opened up what is really a science of itself, the science of meanings, or sematology. Here, as we cannot follow the methods of the physical sciences exclusively, the results are not so certain on a wide scale as those of the morphology of speech, but general principles of incalculable importance have been firmly established. More and more it is illustrated and evidenced that reason and speech are inseparable in growth and development, that speech is not merely the servant and organ of reason, but its necessary complement, its expression, and its physical stay and support.

So too the history of thought has been laid bare in its great outlines. Etymology, safely and surely applied to the analysis and explanation of our refined, comprehensive, elusive metaphysical terms, shows them to have been in every instance derived from simple primitive ideas formed by the earliest men by generalizing observation of the every day processes of nature, the actions of men and animals, generalizations from most elementary data, resting wholly upon a physical basis. And the lesson is being applied to the undermining of a vain "intuitional" philosophy, mis-called the philosophy of common sense, and false from the very founda-

tion because it ignores the fact that "sense" is historically a generalization and abstraction from successive observations through the senses.

But scientific etymology has made gains for us of a still more practical kind. It has added immensely to our knowledge of the history of mankind. It is in fact the only sure instrument for opening up the undiscovered tracts of time, known vaguely by the name of prehistoric ages. Wherever families of speech are well established on the basis of structural principles, we can get back to the primitive vocabulary of the speakers and so learn their circle of ideas, the degree and extent of their civilization, their habits, customs and laws; and, by combination with geography and prehistoric archæology, their actual movements, social changes, and even a skeleton of their history may be constructed. This has been most successfully done with the two leading races of the world, the Semitic and the Indo-European, whose languages have been most closely studied, and have yielded results more wonderful and instructive than any historical investigation ever attempted in any age or any region of the earth.

Having thus set forth some of the reasons why the science of language is entitled to a place in popular education, it will be proper to try to show in a general way, or at least to suggest, how such teaching can properly be accomplished. All that can be attempted here is to throw out a few hints as to what might properly and advantageously be taught in the several grades of our educational institutions.

Should the science of language be taught in our common schools? Most certainly. At least something that it has to tell the world of general utility and fundamental importance in mental training should be taught to those who have no other intel-