

nected in sense he would find that the man would know enough to reply as correctly as an average school-boy, provided the questions were asked without technicalities. If the teacher were to suggest false answers, as for instance that "therein" belongs in sense to "open" the man would look sceptical, or even question the statement. Now how far does such knowledge fall short of that necessary for grammatical analysis? Surely all must agree that it needs only a few technicalities to reach the standard. Few will dispute this, but now many will say that is only common sense applied to language and everybody in learning to speak learns to make that application. Precisely so, and no better definition of grammar can be made than this if we regard Grammar in this fifth argument as the solid foundation of the study of Literature. Grammar is common sense applied to language. For the understanding of easy colloquial English and of all such English as the illiterate use or hear no greater knowledge of Grammar is needed. For reading the Bible, for buying and selling, for reading Burns and for the short, easy speeches of Shakespeare no further Grammar is needed than common sense applied, untechnically and unconsciously, to English, and if there were no other forms of English this fifth ground of defence for Grammar might be at once abandoned.

But the truth is that within the English language there is another language which for convenience we shall call *learned English*. To the illiterate it is an unknown tongue, to the half-educated reader it is a region toward which he looks with some horror, in which he occasionally wanders with uncertain step, from which he hastens with perplexity and fatigue and of which he speaks with ardent but spurious admiration. It is the region of Milton and Burke, of Hume,

Gibson, Dr. Johnson, De Quincey, Savage and Browning. To say that the *Paradise Lost* or the *Reflections on the French Revolution*, or De Quincey's *Cæsars* are difficult reading for the illiterate is to imply that by an effort and with a lexicon they may understand these works, but that is far from the truth. The only true statement of the case is that learned English is a foreign language to them, less intelligible to them than the language of Chaucer would be.

Many of our great writers were men who had become so familiar with language in its grammatical aspect, and so thoroughly familiar with the long, complicated, inverted, and involved sentences of Virgil and Livy, that such constructions had become the mother-tongue of their maturer years and were used by them freely and habitually with perfect clearness and force. Grammar is usually regarded as a merely non-productive element in education, but in this matter it produced a form of literature which could never have come into existence had not its authors made a prolonged and minute study of syntax.

Now just as this learned English was itself a product of familiarity with the classical syntax so it has never been easy to any but classical students and it may be safely risked as an assertion that not one per cent. of those English people who have not studied Latin have ever read the *Paradise Lost* through, and those of this class who have read it have almost uniformly believed it dull and overrated.

Any who are not familiar with the power of sentence-analysis possessed by the average candidate for a teacher's certificate in Ontario should ask those who have examined such candidates for information. We would suggest that the examiners be asked whether the average candidate could determine the relations—the sense-relations without any technicalities—