

*equivalent* to these Latin forms is 'true enough; but the pupil, in so learning the English verb, gets no idea of its peculiar structure. English grammar was originally based on Latin grammar, and has been ever since treated, except by a few German scholars, who have taken it in hand, analogically—*per aliud*, instead of *per se*, as it should be. Dr. Wallis, whose *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae*, published as early as 1653 is still worthy to be ranked among the very best English grammars that have yet been written either by English or American grammarians, was the first to see the error of this analogical treatment of English grammar. Alluding to his predecessors, Gill, Ben Jonson, and others, he remarks:—"Omnes ad Latinæ linguæ normam hanc nostram Anglicanam nimium exigentes multa inutilia præcepta de Nominum casibus, Generibus, et Declinationibus, atque Verborum Temporibus, *Modis et Conjugationibus*, de Nominum item et Verborum Regimine, aliisque similibus tradiderunt quæ a lingua nostra sunt prorsus aliena, adeoque confusionem potius et obscuritatem pariunt, quam explicationi inserviunt." That is, "They all subject this our English tongue too much to the rule of the Latin, and deliver many useless precepts respecting the cases, genders and declensions of nouns, the tenses, moods and conjugations of verbs, the government of nouns and verbs, and other like things, which are altogether foreign to our tongue, and beget confusion and obscurity, rather than serve for explanation."

If his successors had profited, as they should have done, by what he has so succinctly set forth in this passage, we should have had English grammar, long ere this, placed on its own bottom, and the fact would have been recognized and acted upon that modern English is no proper medium for grammatical discipline; and, in the absence of the study of Latin and Greek, a resort would have been had to Anglo-Saxon, both as a means of exercising the young

pupil in grammatical relations, and of tracing the origin of modern English phraseology. The writer of this article has frequently gone into country schools where they pretend to teach English grammar, and has heard both teachers and pupils talk about the agreement of adjectives and nouns, the government exercised by verbs and prepositions, none of which exist except to a very limited extent; and what is worst of all, when grammar is so taught, neither teachers nor pupils ever think, perhaps, what agreement and government really mean, so that a grammar lesson is made up of a set of meaningless, stereotyped expressions, whose idle repetitions leave the mind only the more vacant the more glibly they are gone over.

The study of grammar, if properly pursued, *ought* to be one of the most interesting of all school studies, revealing, as it does, the working of the ingenious and subtle organ the mind employs for the expression of its myriad impressions, thoughts and sentiments. As generally pursued, it is the driest, most barren, and most repulsive; as repulsive as what is called "composition"—an exercise which is generally hated with a holy hatred by all young pupils upon whom it is imposed, as it too often is, before they have any ideas to compose.

For some years past, the curriculum of study in our schools and colleges has been verging more and more toward the natural sciences. The great strides that these have made within the memory of living men, and their important bearing upon every-day life and the progress of civilization and refinement, render it difficult to resist their tendency to displace many of the time-honoured means of mental discipline. There is now a large class of educators in England and America, who look upon the study of Latin and Greek, for example, as a sad waste of time, when there is such an accumulation of useful knowledge in the world. This study, they argue, was all very