

wine," who was Archbishop of Canterbury from 731 to 734, had occasion to notice the fruits of that system of education which had been instituted by Hadrian, the companion of Archbishop Theodore. Entertaining upon this theme, he made a passing observation: "For the exercise of the mind, nothing has been found comparable to the study of the philosophy of grammar, except the mathematics." I have not quoted these words for their singularity, but for an opposite reason; namely, because they formulate what I take to be the prevalent opinion of the whole period since education was first made a matter of earnest enquiry and investigation. This old notion has governed the course of literary education for centuries, and, new lights or new experiments notwithstanding, I think it must in the main continue to govern it, because I believe it to be founded in natural truth.

In fact, grammar is the natural focus and centre of all philological study, and it is easy to see that this must necessarily be so; for as the spring of all language is predication, and as with the progress of development the act of predication becomes highly complex and elaborate, some habit of analysis is requisite if the mind is to keep pace with its own creation. Grammar is the psychological analysis of predication. We are too prone to hold elementary grammar cheap merely because it is elementary, and because it is supposed to be common knowledge; but it is in reality the first condition of our bringing a scientific mind to bear upon the phenomena of language. Whatever we learn by comparative philology goes but to constitute a periphery which resolves, or ought to resolve, round this central "hub" of linguistic science. . . .

There is no one but is the better for a well-trained grammatical habit of mind. It is this habit which culti-

vates language as an instrument of thought, which facilitates lucidity in diction, and prompts the most harmonious and interpretative tones in reading aloud. The parts of speech are not exhausted when they have been learned once for all; they are not fixed and rigid; they are full of the elasticity and variability of life; they have their transitions, graduations, refinements. Take the familiar little words "they," "their," "them." These were demonstratives before they were personal pronouns, and when they became personal pronouns, they did not forfeit the right to be demonstratives. Does this seem pedantic, dry, and uninteresting? Unfortunately it is apt to be so voted, and one of the consequences is, that we never can be sure we shall hear these words rightly delivered. Familiar and beautiful sentences are too often marred from this cause. "We have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them." The right reading of this versicle turns upon the delivery of "their" and "them;" and that right delivery will be insured by the knowledge that they are demonstratives. It is not so well known as it deserves to be, that the secret of good reading lies, not so much in the correct pronunciation of the big words, as in the appropriate intonation of the little ones. . . .

In considering the study of English, I have taken it for granted that the first place is due to its educational aspect, and that, if this is well ascertained, the course of scientific enquiry may be left to take care of itself. It is important to realize the broad difference between educational value and scientific value. Educational value is measured by its usefulness in opening the mind of the learner; but scientific value is independent of the measure of usefulness in every sense. —*Professor John Earle, in The Forum.*