

the Classics would practically cease here for the simple reason that the classical master who rarely has his fair share of time now, would need nearly twice as much then and get not one minute more. It is hoped that those who are most concerned in this part of the subject will not take these words amiss, for both the so-called practical people and the so-called artistic people are the enemies of English Grammar and of the Classics equally.

There is a body of technical terms used in common by the teachers of all languages, these are assailed as useless lumber and were it not that as a science Grammar is absolutely impossible without them it is more than probable that the teaching of them by the English master would cease forthwith. Teachers of Classics and of French and German, may regard this possibility with complacency, but they could not so regard the accomplished fact.

But really good classical scholarship is out of the question without a more than common knowledge of the English sentence. If this required proof it could be proved abundantly. For example, how can a boy be successful in handling indirect questions in Latin prose who cannot detect the construction in the sentence he is to translate? How can he master the use of the imperfect past tenses if he cannot recognize them in their concealed forms in English? What can he do with absolute cases and predicate nominatives and participial attributes if he can not understand them in the mother-tongue? In England, to be sure, the classical master teaches him the English sentence as well as the translation, and has unlimited time for both (from which some persons here conclude that English Grammar is not taught at Rugby and Eton), but in Ontario the teacher of Latin and Greek has scant time for merely the

translation and the *differences of grammar* in the translation and prose.

5. We must now pass to the fifth and last claim of English Grammar. To the English master and to the lover of Literature it is the greatest claim: it is that Grammar is the only solid foundation on which the study of Literature can rest. We do not wish to be misunderstood in this. Literature has relations to ethics, to æsthetics, and to logic, even to civics, and to theology, and there are not wanting those who believe that all these relations should be dwelt upon by the teacher of Literature, as Mr. Churton Collins' recent work on the subject has ably explained. But it must be obvious to most sensible persons that the first desideratum in High School Literature is that the student shall get a habit of understanding what the author has to tell him, in other words that he shall learn to read in a sense just one degree above that of pronouncing the printed words. This is perhaps the relation of Literature to Logic in its simpler sense. Now we wish to state emphatically and expecting temporary dissent, that without the essential knowledge of Grammar this power of reading with common intelligence is absolutely impossible. When a man who has learned to read, but has not studied even the elements of Grammar reads such a sentence as,—“I looked, and saw him open the book, and read therein.” He reads it as intelligently perhaps as a college president could. Does not this fact refute our proposition then? By no means. The man knows that “I” is the subject of the assertion, that “looked” makes an assertion, that “saw” governs “him” and that “open” and “read” both describe “him,” also that “therein” modifies “read.” If an educated person should take the pains to ask the man with which other words each of these words is most intimately con-