

dence of his progress by the preparation of a thesis, the completion of a research, the delivery of a lecture, or in some other way approved by the *Senatus Academicus*.—*The Academy*.

*Smattering and Grounding*.—It is hard to find anything new in speeches on education, but there is one passage in Sir John Lubbock's address at Bedford, containing a thought which, if not absolutely new, is yet sufficiently unrecognized to need a good deal of preaching. Speaking of the common objection to boys learning a variety of subjects, he said that he thought it arose "from a confusion between a smattering and a grounding in a subject." The distinction is one which greatly needs being insisted upon. The business of education, one is often told, is not to fill the mind but to train it. True enough; but training ought at the same time to give the boy the means of filling it himself, to open the doors, as it were, of various branches of study. In the treasure-house of knowledge there are many chambers, and each has its separate key in addition to that which opens the front door. Education should give us possession of as many of these keys as possible. How many each man can be safely entrusted with, it may not be easy to decide, but it is wrong to lay down too strict rules to limit the number. To learn the rudiments of several sciences, though it may be rashly denounced as "smattering," is a very different thing from that really injurious superficiality which consists in acquiring the common places of all.—*Pall Mall Budget*.

*Grammatical Laws*.—Words, or rather the arrangement of words, are certainly subject to laws, but the great difficulty of grammar is that these laws are so indefinite. And, instead of calling the rules of grammar natural laws, we should say that they are from first to last perfectly arbitrary, the rather clumsy invention of grammarians who are trying to reduce to rule a state of things which they do not quite know how to account for. If there be any analogy between grammar and any kind of law, it must be Common Law, which translates use and custom into legal right. If the laws of nature are infringed, we can confidently assert that some definite result will follow; but, if an ignorant person in speaking or writing sets all the laws of grammar at defiance, he yet succeeds in making himself perfectly intelligible to the person he is speaking or writing to. In short, the so-called laws of grammar are, strictly speaking, very much on a par with the laws of politeness; they can only tell us what are the modes of expression that will pass muster among educated people in the present day. For grammarians ought to remember that many phrases which were accepted in polite society a century ago, would now be scouted as ungrammatical. Again, there is no reason, still less law, why one word should become obsolete and another should hold its ground. Why, for instance, should