

I would wish to press on your attention next, that training has constantly been assumed to be identical with, or at least to be included in, discipline. It certainly is contained in discipline; but I would point out that it *also* lies outside it, as is apparent from what I have said. To the neglect of the distinction which I have drawn between these two educational notions is due the corresponding neglect of a whole side of education. Had schoolmasters seen that mental training can be given by the study of language as the concrete embodiment of thought, and that accordingly you could give food to the mind, while, *at the same time*, securing the training of it, I think school would have been a pleasanter place, and the results of school work, both intellectual and moral, would have been much more satisfactory.

It is manifest that when a schoolmaster realizes that he can truly *train* the mind by getting it merely to understand literature, he will be the more ready to believe in the real or substance of language in education than if he regards reading as giving merely the matter of thought. He will see that the organism of words as making sentences has not to be studied with his pupils as an organism in order to secure training, but simply as substance or reality. And in this there will be a great gain for his pupils. The most real of all "things" are the thoughts of man. Food is what the hungry want, drink is what the thirsty want, and all human beings hunger and thirst more or less. One true thought, take it whence you will, once fairly rooted in the mind of a boy, will do more for him whether he is to be a shoemaker or statesman, than grammar or the calculus or the syllogism will do. So subtle are the secret relations of the material of feeling and the suggestions of experience which are always flowing into our consciousness, that one such rooted

thought quickly finds some worthy mate, and is the father of a whole tribe. Nay, even a partial thought which fails to sustain itself, but dies where it took root, is not wholly lost; it enriches the soil and stimulates future productivity. Mind is not the machinery of thinking only, but it is a complex of substantial thought, and you nourish thought in the young only by thought.

Let us conclude, then, that by the study of language as a concrete study, as substance, as reality, we both feed and train the mind; we enrich the blood of mind, so to speak, and we teach it its courses.

Now, it will be apparent that if I had to choose between the formal or grammatical, and the real or substance of language in educating youth, I should unquestionably prefer the latter, and leave grammar out altogether. For more than 2000 years the formal has in all subjects been too much with us. Definition, precept, dogma, can be easily set down in propositions, and prescribed for a boy's learning. The work is memory work. The progress of the pupil thus seems to be something measurable in respect of quantity, and the master's task is easy; whereas, as a matter of fact, the true process of education is a matter of quality, and is not measurable.

You will not conclude, I hope, from this that I am disposed to set aside the formal in language—grammar. I have shown its bearing on the discipline and strengthening of the mind in all its relations, including the conduct of life. But I very decidedly hold that in the education of a boy or girl, language is to be regarded mainly as a concrete study, and that, as the medium of all thought, it is to be assigned a much more dominant place in the school than has hitherto been assigned to it.

What is the actual state of things? The technical arts of reading and