

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distortion le long de la marge intérieure

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear
within the text. Whenever possible, these have
been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	30X	32X
					✓				

Vol. II. No. 9. SEPTEMBER, 1882. { \$1 per annum.
10 cts. per No.

THE
EDUCATIONAL RECORD
OF THE
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC,

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE PROTESTANT COMMITTEE OF
THE BOARD OF EDUCATION, AND CONTAINING THE OFFICIAL
ANNOUNCEMENTS OF THE BOARD.

EDITED BY R. W. BOODLE.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Presidential Address at Sherbrooke.....	<i>R. W. Heneker.</i> 359
Reform of English Grammar.....	<i>Editor.</i> 363
The Quincy System	<i>Dr. Kelley.</i> 377
French Genders.....	<i>F. C. Emberson.</i> 381
High School of Montreal.....	<i>Cancz Norman.</i> 384
Future of Classical Study.....	388
Early Record of McGill University.....	391
Chat on Scholastic Matters	392
Education in Prussia.....	395
Educational Topics—Large Classes	396
Book Notices	399
Literary Department.....	401

MONTREAL:
GAZETTE PRINTING COMPANY.
1882.

PUBLICATIONS

— OF —

The Gazette Printing Company

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

THE GAZETTE

(ESTABLISHED 1778)

The Oldest and Best Paper in the Dominion.

DAILY, \$6.00 A YEAR. - - - WEEKLY, \$1.00 A YEAR.

THE LEGAL NEWS,

THE ONLY WEEKLY LAW PAPER IN CANADA.

JAMES KIRBY, LL.D., D.C.L., EDITOR. SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00 A YEAR.

CANADA MEDICAL & SURGICAL JOURNAL,

The oldest Medical Journal in the Dominion. Published Monthly.

GEO. ROSS, A.M., M.D., and T. G. RODDICK, M.D., Editors.

SUBSCRIPTION, - - - \$3.00 A YEAR.

THE EDUCATIONAL RECORD,

Published every month, under the authority of the Protestant Committee
of the Board of Education, and containing the official
announcements of the Board.

SUBSCRIPTION, - - - - - \$1.00 A YEAR.

Book and Job Printing Department,

THE BEST APPOINTED JOB PRINTING HOUSE IN CANADA.

Estimates Given. All orders by mail or telegraph promptly attended to.

ADDRESS.

RICHARD WHITE, Man. Dir.,

Gazette Printing Co., Montreal.

THE
EDUCATIONAL RECORD
OF THE
PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

No. 9.

SEPTEMBER, 1882.

VOL. II.

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

By R. W. HENEKER, D.C.L.

To the Teachers' Convention, Sherbrooke, July, 1882.

The address opened with a few words of welcome and encouragement to the assembled teachers. Attention was drawn to the different ways in which people devoted themselves to the work of education, in Roman Catholic and other Christian communities. The President then advocated the co-operation of religious with secular mental training; and, touching upon the question of superior education, maintained that the work of the State did not stop with the teaching of the three Rs. Taxes were levied from all classes for the benefit of all classes. If the State interfered in education, it should do so in a broad spirit. The rest of the address was occupied with the question of examinations.

I propose on the present occasion to deal with the question of examinations, a question of considerable importance, for we must fall back on the tests of our work if we are to form any true opinion as to whether the path we are pursuing is right or wrong. Now, the question of examinations is no small one. It presents itself under various aspects, but there are two sufficient for to-day in which we may, I think, profitably look at the subject and inquire as to the effects of the system. I allude to Competitive and Qualifying Examinations. The names are sufficiently explanatory in themselves without any necessity for a "rubric" to inform us of their meaning, and I may at once say that I do not refer to ordinary school examinations, but to those which are necessary

for a man's entrance into life. Nevertheless, the teacher is interested in the question, for he is called upon to fulfil his office, no matter what the end may be, and he more than any other will be able to gauge the effects of the system.

A competitive examination for the civil service, for entrance into the army and navy, or for any public employment, I hold to be *absolutely useless* and perhaps *mischievous*, as *at present* conducted. These you will say are strong words, but I think strong words are needed when we contemplate the evils which are incidents of the system. I do not think we in Canada have as yet suffered from the system as England has done, but the example of England is so often taken for granted by us as a trustworthy guide that a word in season may not be amiss on this important question.

If we take appointments to the army and navy as examples, we find that, yearly, many hundred youths go up for examination while the appointments are about one in ten of the candidates. What is to become, what does become of the nine-tenths who fail? And be it understood that failure is no real disgrace in these examinations, for when the appointments are so few the mere fact that a man is the eleventh in a hundred should not be made to tell against his capacity. An examiner is not always infallible. The fact that some ninety out of a hundred have at very heavy expense devoted themselves to a special class of work under men who are proficient in the teaching of such specialties as are likely to prove effective in an examination, and that in the matter of *general training* they *must* be behind those whose minds have not been so bent, but whose faculties have been developed on a broader basis, is really a lamentable circumstance. But setting aside the failures and looking only to the winners in the race, what do we find? What is it reasonable to expect from men so selected? Is mental training of this cramped character what is wanted for the duties of life? Does a merchant, a manufacturer, a banker, an engineer, select his assistants by competition? If any of us wish to find men in our ordinary work of life, do we adopt this Chinese principle. No! we see the men and judge of their fitness by other incidents in addition to their mental attainments. Some of the most highly gifted "servants" would make very poor men of business. In fact, it is rare to find men eminent for book learning capable of managing the ordinary business of life. The

qualities needed for success are almost diametrically different. Book-men are reflective, and are seldom men of action, and hence the benefits conferred by the public school system of England which trains boys by athletic games out of the class room, as much as by intellectual exercise in the class room, and makes the captain of the cricket eleven as important in the eyes of his schoolmates as the boy who excels in mental work.

I fear the day is past, however, when the saying of the great Duke of Wellington, that "the battle of Waterloo was won in the cricket fields of Eton College," can be made applicable to England. The Duke of Wellington's own history would inevitably in these days have marked him as one of the plucked ones in the competitive examinations. Only recently, whilst in England, I heard of the son of a distinguished soldier, who had been a field marshal of England, a young man of splendid qualities, fitted for command, but who failed in the competitive examination for the army, and who, nevertheless, was so determined to enter the service that he enlisted as a common soldier, his plea being, "I was brought up as a soldier; my mind from childhood was set on being a soldier, and in any other employment I should have been a fish out of water." Can the system be right which absolutely excludes such a man from the service, and places a mere book-worm, who scarcely knows his right hand from his left, in his stead? But it may be said: "The times are such that no State can afford to have fools in places of command or trust; whether in the Army, Navy, or Civil Service, strength of mind, soundness of constitution are of no avail against weapons of precision united with skill under intelligent command. Your remarks may be true as to the Army and Navy, but in the Civil Service there is more room for mind than matter; and then, what is a politician to do who is pestered by constituents for places for sons, nephews, and those who use politics for a living?" To this I answer that there is a higher duty than the convenience of politicians and their subserviency to constituents, and that *quality* in its broad sense cannot be gauged by examinations which are the result too often of "cram." The only proper examination is a qualifying one—and that should never be omitted—to see that a candidate is in fact qualified to fill the office to which he aspires. And then, for promotion in the service, let merit have its due weight and not mere *length* of service. Stimulate industry; and the cultiva-

tion of the qualities which render service efficient will follow. I know full well the so-called difficulties which surround the system of selection, but the well-being of the State requires it, and unpleasant duties fall to the lot of most of us in every day life. We act up to this principle in our private business transactions, and if it is right in the one case what makes it wrong in the other? I hope the day will be long ere the rigid adherence to a competitive system of examination will be adopted in Canada for the services under state control.

All this brings me to a conclusion which should, I think, come home to each teacher. Let the teacher so pursue his vocation that he may train the child in wisdom, as well as in knowledge; that he may ripen the judgment as well as instil facts and that, in so doing, he may bring into play the spirit of his calling, as well as attend to the mere letter; so that even the youngest child, even in the most simple lesson, may learn more than the mere repetition of words. As teachers, do your utmost to prosecute your calling with sincere devotion; look rather to the results shown by well-formed character than to brilliancy in the mere letter of the pupils' work, and your reward will come, if not in dollars and cents, yet in a satisfied conscience that to the best of your ability—you have done your duty.

Darwin's Resting Place.—The remains of Mr. Darwin were interred in Westminster Abbey by the side of those of Sir John Herschel, an immense crowd of all kinds, from the members of his own family to men of eminence of all sets and views, Ministers, chiefs of Opposition, statesmen, men of literature, art, science, and law, all crowding to render to Mr. Darwin's great genius and noble character the last tribute of respect. The burial in Westminster Abbey of one who has caused so great a change in European opinion in the direction opposed to that of orthodox Christian theology, is an event which could hardly have taken place ten years ago, certainly not amid demonstrations of such universal respect. Does it mean that the general belief in Christianity has greatly dwindled in the last decade? We should say not. Probably the number of real believers in Christ has increased, rather than diminished, in that period. But it does mean undoubtedly that men are estimated infinitely more by their characters and lives, and infinitely less by their mere religious opinions than they were then.—*The Spectator.*

THE REFORM OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR,

BY R. W. BOODLE.

Read before the Teachers' Convention, Sherbrooke, July, 1882.

All educators are happily now agreed upon the primary importance attaching to the study of their mother tongue; and this importance is not likely to be lessened when that mother tongue happens to be a language so rich in beauties and of such proud ancestry as the tongue we all speak. As an international study, in fact, English stands in higher education in a position similar to that occupied by the name of Themistocles in the voting after the battle of Salamis. While the educators of each nation give a natural preference to the study of their own language, in the second rank they are unanimous in placing the tongue of Shakespeare and Milton. And yet this study, which is on all hands admitted to be one of supreme importance, which will amply repay all the care and trouble bestowed upon it, is also a study fenced round with exceptional difficulties. It seems as if it had come about by the irony of fate that the language which is acknowledged to contain the names of many of the greatest writers since the Reformation, the language which, a century ago Hume predicted to Gibbon, is spoken open the length and breadth of this vast continent of North America and which bids fair to become the commercial language of the world, should be of all Aryan tongues the most illogical, the least in accordance with rule and analogy. Listen to two writers who have lately spoken upon the subject of English Grammar. "Scientific thinkers," writes Principal Dawson in an article contributed to the *Princeton Review* upon Evolution in Education, "Scientific thinkers fail to perceive the propriety of adhering to an old and worn-out alphabet, patched up to suit one language after another till it has lost nearly all semblance of representing sounds, and creates a mystery of spelling that repels and disgusts every learner, and wastes years of precious time, to the practical exclusion of millions from any benefit of learning at all. Nor is it easy to see the use of barring the access to knowledge with arbitrary and illogical grammatical analysis, with artificial rules cumbered with hosts of exceptions, or with linguistic and literary subtleties, all of which may be fit subjects for the exercise of

leisurely men of learning, but are in no way valuable as training in right thinking, speaking and writing." Indeed, Principal John, of the Mankato Normal School, Minnesota, is only within the facts when he writes *: "A scientific method can be applied to scientific matter only, and that cannot be found in the language which we write and speak. As it is perfectly anomalous both in its orthography and pronunciation, it must be learned, as it always has been, by the slow, illogical process of imitation and experience. This is proven by the fact that adult foreigners, whose reasoning faculties are fully developed, are constantly led astray by fancied analogies where none exist. If an adult foreigner cannot acquire the language by a scientific process, neither can a child; and the effort to teach it, however flattering it may promise in the outset, must end in disappointment."

The causes of the chaotic state of the tongue and grammar which we in America inherit are to be sought in the history and circumstances of the English people. It is no doubt, as Principal John and others before him have suggested, to the fusion between the Norman and Saxon tongues, and to the attempt to preserve the sounds and orthography of both, that we in part owe the formation of the most difficult and unphonetic language in the entire Go tho-Latin group. But the matter lies even deeper than this. It is not only the English language that stands in need of reform. English law has long waited in vain for a codifier to arise; the social life of Great Britain on all its sides, with the enactments and customs strong as law upon which its rests, is a subject of ominous forebodings to philosophers and of "remedial measures not a few" to statesmen. The curious fact has to be explained that while Great Britain has been more constantly employed in the work of reform than any country in Europe, and enjoyed the benefits of a free constitution when her rivals were groaning under the weight of tyrannical rulers, she is less modern in many senses than any civilised country in Europe or America. We may, of course, ascribe this in part to the energy which Matthew Arnold calls the "chief spiritual characteristic" of the nation, and which, he points out, "will not be very apt to set up in intellectual matters a fixed standard, an authority like an academy," which has been in France the chief

* *Education*, Nov., 1881.

cause of the logical nature of the language. But the underlying cause of all this is, I doubt not, to be found in the insularity of Great Britain, a fact brought into special prominence in an article lately contributed by the historian Freeman, to the June number of the *Contemporary Review*. England is in truth "Alter Orbis," "We grew up" he writes, "as an insular Teutonic people, a people of thoroughly insular mould, whose insular characteristics parted us in many things from every continental Teutonic people." Nor is this peculiarity confined to the English of Great Britain. "The great mass of dependent colonists of Great Britain," he adds, "are geographically islanders; and even those who are geographically continentals, are practically islanders..... Much of the distinctive character of the English folk in America, as well as of the distinctive character of the English folk in Britain, undoubtedly comes from this practically insular position of both." In other words, the insular position of our ancestors gave a distinctive shape to their problem of existence. They were freer than others, because, though quite as brave and quite as military as the rest of the world, they were less under the dominion of a military government, of a strong central authority. But the very fact that they were so caused the growth of a civilisation, then premature and abnormal, now unreformed and unidealised. From many of the problems that press for solution among the British on the other side of the water we are happily free, but our language is identical and stands in need of a reform that year by year makes more pressing demands for attention.

My purpose, however, in the present paper is not to deal at large with the English language, but with English grammar. Not that I imagine the two problems can really be viewed as distinct, for they are one at bottom. But for educational purposes it will be as well to confine our attention to the smaller part of the subject. And first we have to consider what ends are proposed by the study of English Grammar? To put the matter shortly, English Grammar, like Logic, is both a science and an art. It is a science inasmuch as the study of it enables us to trace the growth of the English language, to account for its forms and to estimate by these means the beauties of our literature. It is an art, too, because it helps us to correct speaking. Viewed as a science, English Grammar is, of course, deserving of attentive study, but

this study would take us much further than is necessary for the practical requirements of life. We should have to go into many of those "mysteries" that excite Dr. Dawson's scientific indignation. But it is English Grammar, regarded as an art, with which we are more immediately concerned.

And here we are met with a distinction that is made between the teaching of English and that of other languages. In teaching English Grammar, it is said, we are teaching the grammar of a language which we all speak, and therein lies the great difference between English and, say, Latin Grammar. This, of course, is partly true, but it is not the whole truth. "There is an easily conceivable state of things," writes Professor Bain, "that would dispense entirely with school instruction in the mother tongue. If the child were surrounded only by those who spoke correctly and well, then the education in the mother tongue would be perfect through unavoidable imitation. It is in so far as our actual position is different, that we need express teaching in the native tongue. The primary school has to fight against the low standard of the home, in language as in other things. The other schools maintain the same contest, and the further contest with what is bad even even in the speech of the educated, including the mixture of tares and wheat in the field of general literature." President Stark, of Kentucky, puts it more plainly when he says that "most of the pupils in our schools hear only bad English at home,"* and unhappily we are no better off in Canada than our neighbours in Kentucky. We must teach our pupils to say, "that sort of things," instead of "those sort of things," to make the proper application of "shall" and "will," to avoid such expressions as "I done it," and to answer the query: "How many sums have you done?" by "I have done ten" and not by "I did ten."

In view therefore of the actual requirements of modern education, I am by no means inclined to agree with the old school, who believe English Grammar to be useless, and tell us that the best training we can have is the study of Latin Grammar. "It is no doubt true," Mr. Roby allows, "that progress in the knowledge of language is to be attained only, as in other sciences, by the constant action and reaction of theory and

* *Education*, May, 1881.

observation of the comparison of phenomena in different languages with the special investigation of each for itself," but the fact is, as he points out in the preface to his Latin Grammar, in which we have the readiest instance of a philosophical grammar of a special tongue, that "each language has its own individuality, and this is distorted or disguised by being subjected to a set of general categories, even though guaranteed by Comparative Philology." In other words and first of all, English Grammar must be taught on the miscellaneous set of rules and usages which we are pleased to dignify with that title; and secondly, to make this grammar practical it must be cleared of all the accretions, that have been associated with it, and the distinctions that have been read into it,—partly from the analogy of the classical languages, partly owing to the fact that English was once a very different language from what it is now. For the main source of the confusion in English Grammar I hold to be the attempt to make the grammar of an analytical language as like as possible to that of a synthetical. English has mainly lost its inflections, and yet the scholar is taught to distinguish the genders of nouns and to find from four to seven distinct moods in verbs.

But besides the preliminary scepticism as to whether English Grammar should be taught at all, we are confronted with the further question as to whether it is best taught with or without a text book. Of course many elementary lessons in English have to precede the teaching of grammar, properly so called, but to those who consider that English Grammar is best taught verbally, I would answer in the words of Professor Bain: "To teach grammar without a printed text, is like teaching religion without a manual or catechism; either the teacher still uses the catechism, without the print, or he makes a catechism for himself. There can be no teaching except on a definite plan and sequence, and good, instead of harm, arises from putting the plan in print. The grammar teacher, working without books, either tacitly uses some actual grammar, or else works upon a crude, untested, irresponsible grammar of his own shaping." There is another question, however, of really deeper importance which is suggested by Herbert Spencer. "Intellectual progress," he writes, "is of necessity from the concrete to the abstract. But regardless of this, highly abstract subjects such as grammar,

which should come quite late, are begun quite early." Professor Bain, who is of opinion that "it is more difficult than Arithmetic, and probably on a par with the beginnings of Algebra and Geometry," considers that it cannot be effectively taught to the mass before ten years of age, the difficulties of grammar being the difficulties of all science, viz., generalities couched in technical language. Such being the case, and remembering how hard it is to get the youthful mind to make any approaches towards the comprehension of grammatical niceties, I should certainly be inclined to put the age for studying grammar much later than he does. Of course, as long as education is primarily literary and secondarily scientific, this will be impossible, as grammar lies at the root of all literary training. But the time is not far distant, we may be permitted to hope, when education will submit to the inevitable reform of allowing the culture of the powers of observation to precede that of the powers of reasoning; and not until this revolution takes place in education, will the study of grammar be relegated to its true place and its proper age.* Meanwhile we have to work out some scheme by which the study we are considering may be rendered at once sufficient for the purpose of instruction and logically consistent in itself.

"How little consistency there is in our grammars it is now my work to show, and in doing so I must ask your indulgence if I take you for a short time into dull and technical details. My excuse is that the subject requires it."

"The primary difficulty of English Grammar teaching consists in the fact that no two books upon the subject agree together. Between the ordinary books upon French or Latin Grammar there is substantial agreement, between the different English books there is so little in common that the pupil trained on

* The writer has received from Messrs. Ginn and Heath, of Boston, a book entitled "Elementary Lessons in English for Home and School Use," the first part of which is intended to show "how to speak and write correctly." From the teacher's edition which the writer received, many valuable hints and suggestions as to the elementary teaching of English may be derived. It is noticed here, however, especially because it is an attempt to base English teaching upon the powers of perception and observation. Its plan precludes it from comparison with ordinary grammars, the technical parts being rigorously excluded.

Morrison will have to unlearn much in passing to Bain, Mason or Morris. But even the grammars themselves, and the best of them too, are inconsistent in their conceptions. To take an instance from Morris : he refuses to recognise compound words and tenses in his verbal conjugations, while at the same time he ranks phrases like "on shore," and "step by step," as adverbs. At the present moment I am not contending for any special theory of English Grammar, I am only desirous to insist upon the necessity of *some* theory of the language being adopted.

The initial difficulty with which we meet in studying the English language is presented by the written equivalents for sounds, or in other words the alphabet. "The discovery that pronunciation is simply the rapid enunciation of the oral elements which constitute a syllable, and that the letters rarely suggest these, is of comparatively recent date. When a boy spells l-e-g, if he retains any impression of the sounds uttered, and attempts to combine them rapidly, he pronounce the word "elegy," and not "leg." It is therefore evident that alphabetic spelling does not lead a pupil to the proper pronunciation of English, but away from it; and but for the fact that the teacher pronounced every word for us, we should have been unable to read at all..... The wretched system of equivalents has expanded our notation until it is well nigh insuperable both to adult foreigners and to native children. Five simple vowels are made to represent no less than twenty-five sounds; and then, as if over-worked, no less than twenty-seven diphthongs are employed to relieve them. In consequence of this, we have no less than sixty-three methods of representing about twenty-two vowel sounds; a truly appalling array, and one which may well discourage both teacher and pupil."* To give an instance of this we may take the sound *o* in "hôte": this is represented by *oa* in "boat," by *oe* in "toe," by *ough* in "though," by *ew* in "sew," and so on by *oh*, *ow*, *oibe*, &c., several of these combinations standing for distinct sounds in other words. Nothing can well be more confusing; and the result is, as I saw it put naively in an Educational Journal the other day, that "we have no finished spellers in English, unless it be the printers, whose daily work it is to spell. No man of sense dare trust alone to memory to spell correctly all the words

he needs to use of a language whose orthography is so absurd and abnormal as is that of our good English."

To pass next to the classification of the parts of speech and the uses of words. What Dr. Abbott points out as a peculiarity of Elizabethan English, is almost equally true of English now, "almost any part of speech can be used as any other part of speech. An adverb can be used as a verb, 'they *askance* their eyes'; as a noun, 'the *backward* and abyss of time'; or as an adjective, 'a *seldom* pleasure.' Any noun, adjective, or neuter verb can be used as an active verb. You can 'happy' your friend, 'malice' or 'foot' your enemy, or 'fall' an axe on his neck. An adjective can be used as an adverb; and you can speak and act 'easy,' 'free,' 'excellent'; or as a noun, and you can talk of 'fair' instead of 'beauty,' and 'a pale' instead of 'a palleness.' Even pronouns are not free from these métamorphoses. A 'he' is used for a man, and a lady is described by a gentleman as 'the fairest she he has yet beheld.' Spencer asks us to 'come down and learn the little *what* that Thomalin can say.' To illustrate these uses from modern English would not be difficult, and such being the peculiarity of the language it would seem to be the first requisite of a grammar to point out, (1) the possible equivalents for each part of speech, (2) the possible uses of each part of speech. This in fact is done in Professor Whitney's "Essentials of English Grammar," where he gives the following substitutes for the noun:—

- (1) Adjectives; as 'the *good*' and 'a *stoic*.'
- (2) Adverbs after prepositions; as, 'since *then*.'
- (3) The infinitive of the verb; as, 'to be' or 'being.'
- (4) A sentence or phrase; as '*what he does* is well done.'
- (5) A word of any kind; as, '*loved* is a verb.'

Similarly it is not often pointed out that what is called the imperative of the verb is really an interjection, and that any part of speech may become such by being thrust into the sentence without government. Thus in the sentence "If! talk'st thou to me of ifs?" if is an interjection and ifs a noun. Again in the following "Eggs! what do I care for eggs," the first "eggs" is an interjection. Again, in parsing the adjective, it has always appeared to me that a very important distinction is lost sight of in grammars. Quite apart from its *material* use as substantive or adverb, we have what may be called its *formal* uses. An adjective,

as such, is always an attributive; though Morrison at least distinguishes between Attributive (which should have been called Qualitative) and Numeral adjectives. Let us take then its purely attributive uses, and we shall find that they fall into at least four distinct classes:—

- (1) *epithet*; as, ‘*a good man*.’
- (2) *appositive*; as, ‘*Deloraine, good at need*.’
- (3) *predicate*; as ‘*the man is good*.’
- (4) *proleptic*; as, ‘*to wipe a sword bright*.’

The pronoun is another point upon which English Grammar stand in need of accurate definition. Here we find great divergence; Mason and Morrison differing from Morris, Bain, Morell and Smith as to what constitutes a pronoun. The two former include the possessive, while the latter do not. Mason’s view of the pronoun includes all classes and he divide them primarily into substantive and adjective (like the Public School Latin Primer), and this is the view practically adopted by Lennie and Bullions. The former to clear up any difficulties that may occur gives the following rule: “A noun is always understood, when not expressed, after adjectives and adjective pronouns; such as, *few, many, this, that, all, &c.*”—where common sense shows us that the adjectives are used as nouns, and that the pronouns are nouns or are put for them. Calkin’s Swinton divides the pronoun into personals and relatives, explaining what others call adjective pronouns by Lennie’s expedient of nouns being understood. Morell and Smith talk of “adjectives” that “are frequently used as pronouns.” Morris, on the other hand, says that “many pronouns are used as adjectives.” Bain who treats of the relatives *but, when, where, &c.*, in his chapter on pronouns, divides his adjectives, like Whitney, into pronominal, &c. It is quite clear that English grammarians have not made up their mind as to what constitutes a pronoun. Morrison adheres to the old definition, as a word used instead of a noun to prevent its too frequent repetition. Warned by Bain’s criticism that such a definition is inapplicable to interrogatives and indefinites, the other grammarians simply define it as a word used for a noun. Bain himself states that “the pronoun differs from the noun in expressing a thing, not by its own name, but by a reference or relation to something else.” Whitney defines a pronoun as “a kind of substitute for a noun.”

As an illustration of the curious ignorance that some grammars show in regard to the English language, I wish to call attention to a rule that is given by Lennie. Most grammarians quite rightly distinguish between the *direct* and the *indirect* object, though some unnecessarily distinguish the former by the term accusative, the latter by the term dative—unnecessarily, I say, because the two cases though distinct in Anglo-Saxon are identical in modern English. In regard to this very simple point, Lennie has the following rule: “When two objectives follow a verb, the *thing* is governed by the *verb*, and the *person* by a *preposition* understood.” This manner of explaining normal constructions by “understanding” words that never were really “understood” is a vice that has overspread the grammars of all languages, and is particularly misleading because it disguises the real nature of a language and its construction. Bullions, however, who uses the term “remote object” for *me*, in “John gave me a book,” and explains it in the same arbitrary way as Lennie, introduces a further complication by his rule: “Verbs signifying to, *name*, *choose*, *appoint*, *constitute*, and the like, generally govern two objectives, viz., the direct, denoting the person or thing acted upon, and the indirect, denoting the result of the act expressed; as ‘They named him John.’” Here if a term be needed for “John” it would be more correct to call it with Roby (*cf.*, School Latin Grammar, § 434), a “primary oblique predicate” of *him*, or an “oblique complement” as in the Public School Latin Primer. I have introduced this point to show that the confusions of grammarians are not confined to the accidents but are rife also in the syntax.

The confusion, however, culminates when we come to the verb. Instead of following the simple plan adopted by Morris, of parsing each part of the verb separately, recognising only such tenses and moods as are actually found inflected, and considering the others as anomalous compounds, each grammarian attempts some sort of logical conjugation modelled upon the Latin and Greek verb. Thus we have a pleasing variety of moods, and this is further complicated by the endeavour to view the present, past and future tenses in different lights, as indefinite and emphatic, progressive and completed. The fusion of these different ideas and the determination to find them everywhere, has led to very ridiculous results, as I shall presently show you by example from

Mason's Grammar. The indicative, imperative and infinitive moods are recognized by all, and the subjunctive by all but Morell; but from this point we are plunged in confusion. Lennie, Swinton, Bullions, Morrison, Morell and Whitney, add a potential mood; Morell and Whitney, a conditional; while to make matters more complete, Whitney throws in an obligative mood. The result is, of course, utter chaos when we come to the naming of tenses. The words *I should be smitten* are called conditional by Whitney, indefinite future subjunctive by Bain, future potential by Morrison, secondary or conditional form of the past indefinite subjunctive by Mason, past and future potential by Morell, past potential by Lennie, Bullions and Swinton. The evil, however, does not stop here. Grammarians with a turn for logical completeness, like Mason, have no pity on the memory of learners. He liberally gives the indicative and subjunctive 12 tenses each and recognizes such monsters as 'to be being, I have been being, I shall (and should) have been being—smitten' (there are in all ten forms tabulated by him that no one ever uses). He stops here, yet why should he do so? Why does he not go on to the bitter end and tabulate under another mood, all the changes he can ring on *can*, *might*, &c.?

Now when you remember that learners rarely complete their English grammar upon one book only, and therefore have to relearn these distinctions from time to time; that the distinctions are absolutely valueless, and that every body differs about them; and that every idle piece of information is not only bad in itself, but stands in the way of something better,—you will, I am sure, agree with me on the necessity of the adoption of some scheme for reforming English grammar. But how is this to be done? I shall content myself with discussing a few principles which appear to require settlement one way or the other, as a preliminary step.

The first question that naturally presses for an answer, is a fundamental one. Should each separate word be parsed separately or are we to take expression by expression? For instance, are we to take the phrase "shall have been" as a future perfect tense, or whatever other nomenclature we may adopt, or is it to be parsed as three words, *shall*, a verb of the present tense; *have*, an infinitive; *been*, past participle? This is a question that really underlies the whole theory of grammar, and in the case of a

synthetical language admits of a very simple solution, viz., that each word must be taken separately. But English is an analytical tongue, and only confusion would result from applying rigidly the method of Latin to it. We may perhaps learn something here from listening to the latest teachings of comparative philology. It was Professor Sayce that brought into striking prominence the doctrine that "language is based upon the sentence, not upon the isolated word."^{1*} This was not a new doctrine for it was anticipated by Waitz and by an anonymous writer in 1831, from whose work on "a new Theory of Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric," Sayce quotes a law which is very much to our purpose, viz., that "it is not *what* a word signifies that determines it to be this or that part of speech, but how it assists other words in making up the sentence..... the (separate) words of a sentence are significant only as the instrumental means for getting at the meaning of the whole sentence or the whole discourse." Looking then at grammar from this point of view we should base our parsing upon analysis, and not analysis upon parsing, and we should lay it down as a primary rule that a part of speech may be either a *simple word*, a *compound word*, or a collection of words or *phrase*. It should be clearly pointed out that the functions of individuals words, like *sheen*; *as*, *like*, *but*, &c., are fluent and liable to pass into one another. Thus for instance in the line, "Constancy dwells in realms above," *above* is an adjective; in "a voice from on high," *from on high* is an adjective; and if we carry our analysis further, "*on high*" is a noun; or going still further, "*high*" is a noun.

It seems to me that the work of parsing will admit of simplification if we remember that four, and four only, relations exist between words in a sentence, and that this is not only true of English but of other languages. These relations are Agreement, as between subject and predicate; Government, as between verb and object; Qualification without either of the former, as between adverb and verb; and Conjunction, distinct from apposition which is, of course, a form of agreement. To beginners these relations are easily brought home by signs, so that a sentence can be written down on the black board in such a manner that the relations between the words are made perfectly clear. I myself have often

* Principles of Comparative Philology, by Sayce.

used the following signs: to express Agreement, the sign of equality ($=$); to express Government, an arrow head pointed towards the word governed (\rightarrow); to express Qualification, the multiplication sign (\times); to express Conjunction, the sign of Addition ($+$).

In regard to the names of the verbal moods I feel great difficulty. It would be easy to call the verbs in-expressions like, "if he *be*," and "though he *go*" subjunctives and all the rest of the composite tenses subjunctive phrases; but I feel the force of Mason's objection that "*subjunctive* is altogether a bad and misleading term; for the indicative may be used as freely as the (so-called) subjunctive in clauses which are *subjoined* to a principal clause, and the subjunctive is often used in clauses which are not subjoined to others." People "confound a subjunctive mood with a conditional sentence, and gravely tell us that when an action is stated conditionally we get the subjunctive mood." By way of illustration Mason instances the sentence, "If he *is* at home, I will speak to him," the first clause of which is subjoined, and yet not subjunctive although conditional.

One last suggestion. Our English Grammar should be as short as possible. It is for this reason, as well as because it contains less which the student will have to unlearn, that I prefer Morris's short Grammar in the Primer Series, and that with, all their faults Morrison* and Lennie are tolerable. Even what Professor Whitney's calls *essentials* are almost as numerous as what other people calls *accidents*. "Grammar," says an enthusiastic writer quoted by the Philadelphia *Teacher*, "encloses within itself, as the nutshell encloses the kernel, all the rich mysteries of the study of language. Make the children see this." This is true enough of Latin, Greek and German; but the sentence that follows ("Show them that they never can understand their beautiful English tongue," &c.), marks this as meant to apply to English. Now English is quite exceptional; it can only be said to enclose within itself "the mysteries of the study of language," in the sense in which the surface of the earth encloses the facts of her previous history and that of the pre-historic races that inhabited

* Morrison's work has other redeeming qualities. The selections from English poetry and prose are admirable, not only as illustrating the text, but from the literary point of view.

her. Therefore, English Grammar can never be made the model for other grammars, however necessary it may be for students to acquire a practical knowledge of English before prosecuting other studies. English is in fact a "peculiar" language, even if it shows no affinities to that of the "peculiar people."

I might say much more, but time and your patience would fail me, and besides, I feel that the reform of English Grammar to be thorough must begin much further back; "When I see," writes Principal John, "how successfully time-saving machinery has multiplied the possibilities of life in other departments of industry, I am astonished at the passivity which tolerate a language insuperable to foreigners, and one which takes the entire period of minority for natives to acquire. Not twenty per cent of educated people can write a dozen pages absolutely free from errors of orthography, and those who did not learn to spell early in life are in almost as hopeless a condition as foreigners..... If we could have a phonetic language, the antagonism between sound and sight would vanish, and spelling would no longer be the art of concealing pronunciation. All efforts to obviate the difficulties by improved methods are lost labor; the language itself must be reformed." I almost feel inclined to agree with Principal John; but then again I remember the philosophic law that things constantly tend to the reassertion of a previous condition under altered forms, and recent scientific writings have familiarized me with the form of my remote ancestor "hanging with apelike glee,

By his teeth or tail or eyelid,
To the slippery mango-tree."

The poet of primitive man goes on to tell how

"There he woo'd and won a dusky
Bride, of instincts like his own;
Talk'd of love till he was husky
In a tongue to us unknown."

And then I recall the Frenchman with his gesticulations and shrill tones, the German with his gutturals, the Englishman with his hissing sibilants and strange oaths, and the Scotchman whose fun will not bear translating; lastly, I think if the noble American, the originality of whose wit consists in its contempt for spelling and grammar: Carlyle too, floats before my mind with his doctrine of silence and his picture of the great "in-

articulate man; and I think of the cynical remarks of Talleyrand and the author of the book of Job about darkening counsel by words, and language being mean to conceal our thoughts: till I begin to feel that perhaps I was wrong in expecting grammar, at all, the tendency being the other way, and that we may possibly come to depend, in the long run, like a fair of sympathetic lovers, upon a language of looks and sighs, varied, to suit other requirements, by grunts and yells. However, this is a prospect horrible for the schoolmaster to contemplate, for then our occupation, like Othello's, would be gone; so, perhaps, we had better take for granted the other alternative.

THE QUINCY SYSTEM

COMMUNICATED BY F. W. KELLEY, PH. D.

Much attention has been lately turned to a new educational movement, which has already exerted a most powerful influence on teaching in the neighbouring States. From the town where it originated it has been called the Quincy Movement.

CAUSES.

Thinking parents had for some time been dissatisfied with the results of the training of the public schools. For years their children had pursued a long and continuous course of study, yet at its close they were unable to read a paragraph from the newspaper or periodicals without faults in pronunciation and expression; to write a letter without glaring errors in spelling, grammar, and arrangement of thoughts; to add up a commercial account quickly and correctly; or to give a clear and connected account of what they had learned in history or literature. "In a word," says Gov. Long, "graduates are leaving their schools soaked with lessons, who cannot put a thought into words or a purpose into action." The School Board, presided over by Chas. Francis Adams, Jr., gave the subject careful study, and decided to revolutionize the whole method of teaching.

WHAT IT IS.

In answer to inquiry Superintendent Parker says:

"The good work is going steadily and surely on. I am devoutly thankful that I can help a little. What little I have done has been done under the oppressive sense of the immense need of

better teaching. *The future life of our country depends entirely upon it.* The Quincy system, so-called, is an attempt to apply the science of education. It is only an attempt, and compared with what can be done for children in public schools it is far from being a complete success. The results of the work in the Quincy schools mark the transition from the old lifeless text ways of teaching to the living way, which will develop the whole mind and the whole man. The so-called Quincy methods learned and simply imitated would produce a result as poor as the methods which we are trying to avoid. Now to answer the question. On the one side is the nature of the mind to be developed, on the other the nature of the subject with which the mind is to be developed. The perfect adaptation in teaching of the subject to the mind is the perfect method. Any book that treats thoughtfully of one or both sides is the book for the teacher to read. First, study psychology in Porter, Hamilton, Spencer. Master the subject of sense preception before you take any other step. Read Joseph Payne's Lectures on the Science of Education, Lectures on Teaching by J. G. Fitch, Tate's Philosophy of Education, Garvey's Human Culture, Spencer on Education, and kindred books. Above all, in the school room ask yourself at every step, Why do I take this step? Have I a *good reason for it?* Am I doing this because I was taught so or because my superintendent tells me to do it in this way, or *because it is adapted to the nature of the child's mind?"*

Many teachers will see while reading this that they have been themselves teaching according to the Quincy methods. Many others—mere routine teachers who teach because they cannot find anything else more profitable to do, and go through a dull routine in the school-room—will see very little meaning in it. There is no place, always excepting the nursery, where one is called on for the active display of so many varieties of talent and ability as in the school-room. There is no person except the mother, who needs to be so capable, so accomplished, so consummate in methods as the teacher. These two, the mother and the teacher, make the scholar, the orator, the statesman, the theologian, the man, the woman. They take the tender, pliable, budding nature and surround it with circumstances best suited to its individual development. For each child has a nature of its own and requires special treatment. As the florist gives to each plant the

soil, the warmth, the moisture, the stimulus, the sun, the shade, as he prunes it at one time and at another allows it to flourish in wild luxuriance, so the mother, the teacher, adapts to each child according to its development, to its needs, the special culture and treatment suited to it, changing this from time to time as the child changes.

OBJECTS AND METHOD.

The object of the Quincy System is to transform the public schools from machines to living organisms, to make growth take the place of drill, to put life and soul into routine, and make the school-room a pleasure house rather than a weary prison. "When a child leaves the Quincy Grammar School he should be able to read well and understandingly at sight ordinary reading, speak the English language correctly, write a letter in a neat, rapid and legible hand, perform any arithmetical problem he would be likely to meet in practical life, and be able to think and reason."

The methods by which this most desirable result is obtained cannot be given in full here, but they may be suggested. The recitation in History is thus conducted: Each pupil writes in the form of a letter to a friend all he knows concerning a certain topic, as, for instance the settlement of Montreal. This is not only an exercise in composition, but in penmanship, orthography, punctuation, capitalizing and letter writing. The mistakes are afterward pointed out and corrected, and the pupil, if apt, soon learns to write page after page correctly at first draft. The pen is used as freely by the student as the tongue in ordinary schools.

The recitations in Geography in the Grammar schools are sometimes thus conducted: A miniature wagon containing sand is wheeled before the class, and the subject of the lesson practically illustrated by what may be called world-building. Suppose the subject is Africa. Teacher and pupils outline the continent, heap up mountains in one place, scoop out valleys in another, draw the lines of the water courses, locate cities, deserts, capes, until the real Africa seems to lie in little before them. They search with Livingston for the sources of the Nile, they push their way with Stanley across the Dark Continent.

The knowledge of the pupil as to the significance of words is aided by "learning at least four lines of choice poetry each week." This exercise is seen to improve the pupil in reading and in the use of language in a marked degree. It is also an excellent prac-

tice for the cultivation of the memory and a source of much pleasure to the pupil.

In nearly all the Quincy Schools the children sing fifteen minutes each day. "This furnishes a pleasant means of recreation, improves the voice, materially aids the instructor in the teaching of reading, and what is of far greater importance, is beneficial as an aid in securing to the children health."

A love for reading is fostered by the teacher, who takes some standard book into the school-room and reads from it, and talks about it until "each child is full of enthusiasm concerning it, and all are anxious to read the book at their homes." The principals of the several schools are allowed to select from the town library a certain number of books in proportion to their number of pupils, and keep them for as long a period of time as may be thought necessary.

Quincy having a population of over 10,000 inhabitants, is compelled by law to make provision annually for giving free instruction in industrial and mechanical drawing. It is argued that drawing is as much an implement in general education as reading or rhetoric; it involves accuracy of perception, love of order, and nourishes originality. "It enables the people of a State to run the race of life with the advantages that intellectual skill can add to physical force, and it elevates the morals by calling the mind to the intelligent study of the beautiful."

Daily physical exercises are held in all the Quincy schools under charge of a competent teacher. Special regard is given to the way in which the children stand and walk. "Prizes have been given to the best school and also to the best individual gymnasts in some of the schools, thus inducing a healthy rivalry among teachers and children that has resulted in much good.

In the High School a system of training is given to the graduates to fit them from the trying position of teacher. So when a vacancy occurs in the regular corps of teachers, by sickness, absence, or other cause, a person thoroughly acquainted with the plan of work can take the vacant place. This also makes it easy for the teachers to visit each other's schools and compare methods of instruction. The demand for Quincy teachers is so great that these pupil-teachers wish for a time to teach in the schools in which they have served their apprenticeship, and find abundant openings when they desire to go elsewhere.

The aim of the Quincey schools is to have "every child educated physically, mentally, morally; and when, in addition to true mental and physical development, all who enter the portals of the primary department shall leave school to enter upon the practical duties of life, having within them the germ which shall develop into true manhood and true womanhood, then and not till then will the ambition of the directors of the education of the young be satisfied."

THE FRENCH GENDERS.

BY F. C. EMBERSON, M.A.

The Gender of French nouns must firstly, where possible, be determined by their

(A.) MEANING.

RULE I.—Masculine are Males, Months, Measures and Winds; Words not nouns but used as nouns, and Compounds of a verb.

RULE II.—Feminine are Females, Fêtes, Flowers in *e* mute, and compounds of *mi*.

In words not having these meanings (and also where the same word is used for Male and Female) the gender is known by

(B.) TERMINATION.

RULE III.—All are Masculine (including those in *-ge*, *-isme*, and *-iste*.)

except nouns ending in { *-é*, *-ée*, *-ie*, *-ion*,
-lle, *-tte*, *-nce*, *-aison* } which are Feminine. Also, most other nouns ending in *-e* mute are feminine.

(C.) MASC. EXCEPTIONS.

UNE { arrêté, beurre, marché, été.
 UN { côté, café, comité, congé; blé, dé, thé.

(D.) FEM. EXCEPTIONS.

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| (1.) UNE { Verge, image; page, nage, cage. | |
| Horloge, marge; plage, rage, charge. | |
| (2.) Chanson, croix, clef; | Dot, dent, eau, |
| Façon, foi, fois, forêt; | Fin, faim, peau. |
| Part, paix, poix; | Rançon, leçon, loi. |
| Mort, main, noix; | Nuit, soif, voix. |
| Vis, chair, boisson; | Cuiller, cour. |
| Vertu, moisson; | Toux, mer, tour. |

(3.) Most nouns in *-eur* mean "a man who does something" (e.g. 'acteur' a man who acts) and are MASC. by Rule 1. Also malheur, bonheur are MASC.

But nouns in—*eur*, which means a thing or quality, are mostly feminine. Such are

Ardeur, odeur, saveur, senteur; Douceur, douleur, sueur, splendeur;
Les couleurs, candeur, clamour chaleur; Verdeur, vigueur, vapeur, valeur;
Epaisseur, hauteur, largeur, longueur; Profondeur, grandeur, grosseur, langueur;

Pesanteur, pudeur, horreur, humeur; Mœurs de rigueur, rougeur rumeur; Laideur, terreur, teneur, tumeur; Liqueur, erreur, ferveur, fleur; Fraicheur, froideur, fureur, peur.

After taking the Dictionary for half an hour, daily for a few days, and determining the gender of each noun as it comes, by the three Rules given above, quoting aloud the rule which applies in each case, the gender of the 11,000 nouns which follow these rules will be recognised almost instantaneously when we are speaking the language.

To the exceptions we shall still more readily assign the right gender, that is if we will learn them by heart, write them out once or twice from memory, and then repeat them aloud in a sort of sing-song every day for a little while. They will probably be found easy to learn and hard to forget, for they are linked together by the strongest law of the Association of Ideas,—that of Resemblance. The resemblances in this case are of Rhyme, Rhythm and Alliteration, all three. In some cases there is an association also in meaning, as where the feminine nouns in—*eur*, which imply size or extent, are grouped together in two consecutive lines.

A list of the few words which are Masculine in one signification and Feminine in another, will be found in every grammar.

It will be seen that some nouns in—*e mute* are not provided for. Their number may be thus estimated. The French language, as now in use, contains about 25,000 words. Of these nearly one-half, say 12,000 are nouns. The gender of 8,000 of these nouns may be determined unerringly by the three Rules and the 21 lines of exceptions given above. About 4,000 nouns end in *-e mute*. Of these about one-third are masculine. About half of

these Masc. nouns are either provided for by RULE I. above, or end in—*ge*,—*isme*, or—*iste*. Most of the rest have a foreign look and fall under the following Rule.

"Words which were Masculine or Neuter in Latin or Greek and are adopted into the French language with a termination in—*e mute* are Masculine in French."

In any case if we have to use a word in —*e mute*, and do not instinctively assign it the right gender, we shall be right five times out of six in making it feminine. Each careful student must make his own list of Masculine words in—*e mute*, which (like *beurre*, *châle*, &c.) are in common use.

It may be well to give some examples of the application of Rules I and II which are 'Master Rules', Rule III having no force when they can be applied.

In Rule I Males are of course Masc. Thus 'un cornette,' an officer in a regiment, is, of course, Masc., though *-tte* is one of the feminine terminations.

The word 'measures' refers especially to the words used in the French decimal system. Thus 'un centimetre', 'kilo-gramme,' are Masculine.

Months and Winds are Masc. Thus we have 'le Septembre,' 'le bise.' Examples of words which are not nouns used as nouns are, 'le a,' 'le b,' and the other letters of the alphabet; 'le jaune' the colour yellow, 'l'Allemande', the German language (adjectives used as nouns,) 'le boire', 'le quatre', &c.

Compounds of a verb are Masculine, although their termination be feminine; thus we have le porte-feuille, le garde-robe, &c.

As to Rule II. females like 'la jument', the mare, 'la sœur', &c., are of course feminine.

Fêtes and Saint's days are feminine. Thus we have 'la Tous-saint,' 'la S. Jean-Baptiste.' Le Noël alone is Masc. La Mi-mai and other compounds of *-mi* are feminine. Minerals and trees are mostly Masc., even when they end in —*e mute*, e.g. 'le frêne', 'le chêne'. Some flowers in —*e mute* and some mountains ending in —*e mute* are masculine. When they do not end in —*e mute* they are masculine by Rule III of course.

THE HIGH SCHOOL OF MONTREAL.

The following communication was sent to the city papers by Chairman of the Protestant Board of School Commissioners for Montreal. As it contains much useful information upon a matter of great importance, we reprint it for the benefit of our readers.

I gather from a recent conversation with an influential resident of Montreal that considerable misconception still prevails with regard to the cost of our High Schools to the rate-payers of this city. I desire, if you will allow me, to remove, if possible, once for all, this misconception, and to clear up the whole question. It is scarcely needful for me to go back to the past history of the High School for boys. It was in existence before I came to Canada. Nor am I called upon in this letter to revert to the causes which, in the years 1867 and 1868, crystallized our public school system into its present form. Suffice it to say that in 1872 the then School Board purchased the piece of land between Peel street and Metcalfe street, and in 1877 erected thereupon our present school building. The lot was bought for a sum which was considered a low figure in those days, and the situation is in all respects a most eligible one.

The Commissioners had in 1872 pledged themselves to establish a High School for girls, and they were permitted by Government to issue bonds, in order to raise the requisite sum for the erection of this and other necessary school buildings. It was, also, thought desirable to combine both High Schools under one and the same roof. Whatever may be the opinion as to the abstract advantage of such a plan, it can scarcely be questioned that the arrangement is an economical one. Some teachers are employed in both schools. Their time is saved. Fuel is saved, and the cost of maintenance is diminished. It is also in contemplation to erect the Senior and Preparatory Schools in the lower part of the lot, and to sell the old High School building.

In the years 1875 and 1876 the value of real property was exceptionally high, and the Commissioners were advised by competent persons not to accept less than a very liberal offer for the building in question. Subsequent events proved that they were wrong in following this advice, but they fell into the same error into which a large number of sagacious business men fell in those days of almost unexampled inflation, succeeded, as we all

know by a protracted period of extreme financial depression. The old High School is still unsold, from lack of an adequate offer from any purchaser, but it is utilized through its occupation by the Senior School.

I refrain from entering into the monetary condition of the Board. My purpose is to demonstrate that the High Schools have not been characterized (at the time of the erection of the buildings or subsequently) by extravagance, or undue demands on the purses of the rate-payers. We are bound by the law to educate all Protestant children up to the age of sixteen years living within the city limits, and desirous of attending our schools. Every such child in our Common schools costs to the rate-payers \$11.42 per annum. Now, let us turn to the cost of the High Schools. The High School for boys, including the Preparatory branch, and the High School for girls contained last year from 480 to 500 pupils. Shut up those schools, turn those pupils loose, and, if they ask for admission into the Common schools, as they would have a perfect right to do, and as many of them assuredly would do, the public educational standard would be lowered, and they would annually cost the rate-payers \$11.42 per head. Their present cost is \$10.86 per annum. This result is arrived at in the following way. We must justly charge against the Common School Fund the cost of education of forty-five pupils promoted from those schools to the High Schools on Commissioners' free scholarships. We must also take into account that the pupils of the High Schools pay higher fees than those of the Common Schools. In the Preparatory School the charge is from \$20 to \$35 a year per pupil. In the High School for girls the pupils pay from \$25 to \$50 a year, and those in the High School proper pay from \$40 to \$50 a year. Those parents who pay these higher fees are the persons, if any, who have some tangible ground of complaint, for they help by their payments to educate these free scholars. But, they themselves, or, I should say, their children are, as I have stated before, a charge on the citizens to the amount only of \$10.86 a head. Is it fair or just that the wealthier class, who defray the greater part of the school tax, should be denied any benefit therefrom? Should they be driven to send their sons or their daughters to more expensive private schools, instead of to the public institutions of which they are the main supporters? I may be told that many of

these parents can afford to pay higher fees, and that, if the High Schools were closed, several of the pupils would be sent to private schools. That may be correct. But we cannot be cognizant of such matters, since it is not for us even to know, still less to pronounce, as to who are rich and who are poor.

I say nothing of the disgrace which would justly attach to this city of Montreal, if the citizens were deliberately to denude the community of all higher education in our public schools. Possibly some parents may object to the mixture of classes which must of necessity obtain at the High School. Personally, I hold this objection to be one of small importance. The boys and girls who come up from the Common Schools receive Commissioners' scholarships as rewards for their diligence and natural ability. Intellect and self-denying industry, by a natural process, exercise a refining effect on their possessors, and though it may be that the manners and appearance of some of these scholars are somewhat rougher than those of some other pupils, I cannot admit that intercourse with them would have a deteriorating effect upon the tone of the school at large. I should apprehend far more evil results from rich and idle boys and girls than from poor and industrious ones. Those familiar with public schools and colleges in the old country must recall instances of boys and men who had worked their way up in the ranks of society, and attained educational advantages by their hard work and intense determination, and whose influence was rather beneficial than otherwise on those around them. A High School was not long since founded in Oxford, England, as a most desirable feeder for the University, and many of the highest dignitaries in Church and State in the Mother Land received their early education in schools answering to our Common and High Schools.

Again, I have been informed that by continuing these High Schools we interfere with the prosperity of the excellent private schools in this city. I utterly deny the truth of this assertion. On the contrary we do them good service. We create a healthy and vigorous rivalry, and facts show that the private schools in this city are in a flourishing condition. Then, in this country, every one under Providence is the carver of his own future. We acknowledge no class distinctions.

We desire to place elementary education within the reach of all, by reducing the fees of our Common schools to a minimum

sum; and by means of our Commissioners' scholarships we afford an opening to needy boys and girls, who desire higher education, who possess the capacity and the industry to profit by it, but who would otherwise be debarred from such advantages by lack of means. To the rate-payers generally we offer either a thoroughly sound commercial education in the Senior School, or a classical or scientific education, both of which are supplied in the High Schools.

I have heard it stated that those who really mean to advance will rise to the surface no matter what obstacles may lie in the way. No doubt this is true, and will be true in some cases. But how many failures have there been for one success! How many have lost heart and given up the struggle! Along the highway of earthly life lie the corpses of ruined hopes and baffled aspirations. All those who by dint of persevering energy have succeeded, would gladly spare their fellows the ordeal through which they have passed, and would rejoice to see a helping hand stretched out to one who is engaged in the noble task of cultivating the intellectual gifts with which God has endowed him.

As a matter of fact, the Senior School, of all our educational institutions, is per pupil the heaviest tax on the pockets of our citizens. But, firstly, it is a most admirable school, and secondly, if it were abolished, advanced classes would have to be formed in all our Common schools. This would be even a more costly business, inasmuch as we are bound to furnish the requisite education, and as the pupils of the Senior School pay a dollar a month.

We have also been accused of educating the rich in our Common schools to the exclusion of the poor. In the first place this charge is not correct, inasmuch as no applicants are denied admission owing to their poverty, and if a respectable parent, residing within one of our school districts, desires to send his child to one of our Common schools we are not justified in catechizing him as to his pecuniary resources. Nor can we be justly condemned if our Common schools are, owing to the efficiency of their training, attractive to more than one class of our citizens.

I hope that I have said enough to prove that to exclude higher subjects from the curriculum of our public education would be a shameful blot on our system, and that it would in all proba-

bility not involve any diminution of educational cost to our rate-payers.

Education is the handmaid to religion. The better we educate our girls and boys, the more useful do we render them as members of the community, and the more plentifully do we multiply their sources of happiness. The fabric of our public school system has been gradually raised and is advancing to greater efficiency. I trust that no one will be permitted to deform its symmetry and curtail its operations. As a community we are generous to those who are in need. Do not let us be niggardly in that which is more precious than rubies, namely—the training of the better and the higher part of man.

THE FUTURE OF CLASSICAL STUDY.*

Professor Huxley's position as to the claims of the natural sciences on the one hand and the Humanities on the other—of the “modern” and the “classical” plan of education, as they are commonly called—is, on the whole, if we rightly collect his meaning, something like this. The mediæval system of European universities, which with more or less minor diversity was in substance the same everywhere, embraced everything which to the best men of its day seemed best worth a man's knowing, and deserves our thanks and praise according to its time and work. But it became stereotyped and inexpensive. It was too narrow to hold the flood of new knowledge and interests let loose upon the world by the revival of classical learning. The Renaissance, in so far as it affected education, was the protest of far-sighted reformers against the bondage of mediævalism. The Humanities fought their pitched battle against the scholastic curriculum, and won it. Our present classical education represents the triumph of the *litteræ humaniores* three centuries and a half ago. But the Humanities, like the scholastic system before them, have in their turn become stereotyped. Now science has arisen and opened a new world, unfamiliar to the men of classical traditions, and often scorned by them; and science is fighting its way to its proper eminence as Greek did in the days of Erasmus. The leaders of

* Extract from a review of Professor Huxley's “Science and Culture and other Essays.”

science are the true Humanists of our own time, and the old-fashioned Humanities must give place to them. Now, if we were prepared to assume, as Professor Huxley to some extent seems tacitly to assume, that classical education had reached its final development, and that nothing more was to come out of scholarship and antiquities than was got out of them by English scholars forty or fifty years ago, we should entirely agree with Professor Huxley's conclusions. But, for our part, we are not prepared to assume anything of the kind. There are matters not adverted to by Professor Huxley, and to which, as they certainly lie outside his business, his attention may naturally have not been directed, which appear to us necessary to be taken into account before we acquiesce in the view of Science and Humanism as two litigant parties, or attempt to pass a final judgment upon their alleged strife.

It may seem a strange thing to say, but Professor Huxley has underrated the strength and the victories of science. They are not confined to the bounds of natural history or physics, or to any or every branch of what we call the natural sciences. The modern spirit of science is too mighty and subtle not to penetrate into every region of the field of human knowledge. It is transforming and requickening the Humanities themselves; and we make bold to say that classical studies, so far from waning before the light of science, are awakening and waxing to a new Renaissance of which not we, but our children and children's children, will see the full splendour. What is it that Sir Josiah Mason's foundation excludes, and in Professor Huxley's judgment rightly, from the benefits and encouragement of his bounty? "Mere literary education and instruction," such mere drilling in language as until a recent date was understood to be the staple of our so-called classical learning. But our Universities are now awake to the truth that knowledge of the ancient languages is an instrument, not an end in itself. The end is another kind of knowledge, and knowledge not undeserving to be compared for worth with the knowledge of things and of nature. It is the knowledge of man in the works of his hands and his thought, of the men from whom we inherit our laws, our art, and our civilization; the praise of famous men, and our fathers that begat us. Socrates and Plato, the fathers of philosophy; Pericles, the father of statemanship; Alexander, the father of conquering

civilization; Ulpian and Papinian, the fathers of scientific law; Trajan and the Antonines, of administration and government; Homer, the father of poetry; Phidias and Praxiteles, of sculpture—these last the masters of all followers in their craft unto this day—and Aristotle, the father of science itself; surely of these men and their work we cannot know too much, and even a little knowledge of them would be ill exchanged, for a man who does not mean to be a chemist, for a little knowledge of the atomic weights of elements.

But this, some one will say, is not what comes of our so-called classical education; what we get from our classical teachers is only verse-grinding, scraps and odds and ends of half-understood Latin and Greek, and a general contempt for knowledge that is not of Latin and Greek. This has been only too true; but we hope it will not be true much longer. Cambridge, the head and fount of the old verbal scholarship, is transforming her classical curriculum. Not through mere linguistic attainments, but through scientific philology, scientific archaeology, scientific study of ancient history and philosophy, will henceforth lie the road to the highest honours. We shall no longer have accomplished classical scholars who stand mute before a coin or an inscription, and cannot tell a work of the school of Phidias or Praxiteles from a late Asiatic or Roman imitation. Let the teachers of natural science look to it on their side that their own special studies do not degenerate into mere book-work; such barren catalogues of undigested facts and such an empty show of paper knowledge as Professor Huxley lifts up no uncertain voice against. Then, when at last a true and lively knowledge of man and of his history goes hand in hand with a true and lively knowledge of nature and her works, our schools will produce results worthy of their noble means, and science and culture will be no longer names to bandy in controversy, but firm and inseparable allies. Science has come upon our Humanists as from a region of mystery, like the nameless champion of the legend, clad in magical armour and wielding invincible weapons. But the champion is a friend and deliverer; well for them that receive him, and ill for them that in rashness and little faith repel him. But is there not already a working alliance? Are modern philology and archaeology "mere literary education and instruction"? We conceive not; and we call Professor Huxley himself to wit-

ness. In his Aberdeen address he expresses the wish that there should be a Professorship of Fine Arts in every University, and that its functions should somehow be regularly connected with the Arts curriculum. We are happy to think that this is exactly what is being done, or in a fair way to be done, at Cambridge. The study of classical antiquity through classical art is there rapidly becoming a living and working branch of the general classical studies of the University. But this, some one will again say, is dreaming of the future. Are we satisfied with the present? Are we content that there should be University dignitaries who do not know one end of the solar spectrum from the other, and bishops who show their competence to criticize biological theories by supposing that the blood-corpuscles are formed by coagulation after death? We answer, unquestionably not. We hold that the elements of natural knowledge should be an integral part of general education. But we would make room for them—as we have already said on other occasions—not by ceasing to teach the Humanities, but by teaching them better.

—*Saturday Review.*

An Early Record of the McGill University.—Some of our readers will be glad to see the following curious cutting from an old paper which we reprint exactly as we found it:—

UNIVERSITY OF M'GILL COLLEGE,
MONTREAL.

THE CAPUT of the COLLEGE having this day received, through the Principal, an Official Communication of the Confirmation by Her Majesty of the STATUTES of the COLLEGE, avails itself of the earliest opportunity of announcing the COURSE of LECTURES to be delivered in the College during the Current Term:—

On Classical Literature—By the Rev. W. T. LEACH, A.M., Professor.

On Mathematics and Natural Philosophy—By EDMUND A. MEREDITH, LL.B., (T.C.D.) Principal of the College.

On History—By the Rev. JOSEPH ABBOTT, A.M.

On French Literature and the French Language—By LEON D. MONTIER, Esquire.

Fees, £3 6s. 8d. per Term, or £10 a year.—Board, including Fuel and Candle, £3 5s. a month.

J. ABBOTT, A.M.,
Secretary.

Sept. 21, 1846.

A CHAT ON SCHOLASTIC MATTERS.

Some months ago an English schoolmaster contributed a pleasant paper to *Macmillan's Magazine*, entitled "More Diversions of a Pedagogue." There were many points of interest brought up by this paper, and we should be glad to print it in full, but as the space at our disposal is limited, we must be content with a few selections which, if not always conclusive, will be found at once entertaining and suggestive. The writer, Mr. J. H. Raven, M.A., of Beccles, looks at everything from a purely practical point of view and feels rather a contempt for the "flood of educational matter let loose upon the world."

"Few of those who write, and fewer still of those who speak on the subject, can be suspected of ever having spent an hour a day for half a dozen days consecutively in actual teaching. The fact is, the practical pedagogue has little time for advancing his theories; the theoretical pedagogue in nine cases out of ten is a man of theory only. Consequently, education is mainly in the hands of men who have their theories, but have little time, and probably less inclination, to propound them; while talk about education is mainly left to those who have no opportunities for testing their theories practically."

Among other matters that are constantly discussed is the substitution of "modern" for classical education. Notwithstanding all reforms, however, the modern sides of English schools are in a minority of something like one to five, and on the classical sides classics and mathematics still occupy far more time than other studies. "There are several minor reasons for this, but, I believe, the main reason why classics and mathematics remain as the principal methods of education is this, that the conscientious and experienced pedagogue is very loth to sacrifice that which gives him the best grip of a boy's mind—that he will not give up *lessons* in favour of *lectures*. Any person who has had experience in teaching will recognise the distinction. You can make a lesson out of languages and mathematics; but as far as one can gather from experience, what are called lessons in science, history and geography, evaporate into lectures, admirably suited to eager and attentive pupils, but quite unfitted for the great majority, the uninterested and inattentive.....Supposing, then, that in classics and mathematics he has the main ingredients of a system that

will interest and improve and sharpen the intellect of his thinking and more gifted minority, and at the same time give him continual chances of coming hand to hand with the unthinking majority, and of wrestling closely with them in a *lesson*, is it probable that the practical teacher will feel desirous of exchanging such a method for one which naturally tends to resolve itself into the *lecture*? ”

In regard to this question the writer advances what may seem a paradox, but which, he believes, is quite true, that “ many boys who can get on pretty well in the Latin and Greek are too stupid to do English.” “ Teaching English with small boys generally comes to this, that they are set down to read an easy author with notes, and expected to interest themselves in derivations of words from languages which they know nothing at all about, and in the analysis of sentences which they can understand without it, or cannot understand with it; and to be mentally exercised in receiving matter which, if the book be easy, gives them no trouble, and, if it be difficult, presents them with difficulties for the solution of which a complete explanation must be given, or they are helpless.”

Mr. Raven then devotes several pages to the task of illustrating the schoolboy’s nature,—with its natural conservatism, its literalness, and matter of fact style of going to work—by amusing mistakes made at different times; adding that possibly these mistakes, “ may in a very small degree serve a useful purpose in warning the man of educational theories only, that schoolboys are not so ready as is sometimes imagined to hand over their brains for a master to exercise and pull about as he wishes. On the contrary, they are very jealous of attempts of the part of outsiders to get hold of those commodities. They much prefer secreting them in inaccessible corners of the skull, and putting them to work only for their own purposes; whether those purposes be the reading of the lightest literature, the calculation of their own or a rival’s batting average and bowling analysis, or the concocting of mischief. They are not eager for knowledge, nor do they thirst for truth. Their ambition is commonly confined to the prospects of going into the army or navy, or farming and enjoying sport over their own land.”

Taken literally this description of the English boy is pretty wide of the Canadian. Though not eager for knowledge, Cana-

dian boys are generally quicker witted than their English contemporaries. But, thought their ambition does not turn as a rule in the direction of the army or the navy, it is undoubtedly true that the outside attractions of the rink, sliding, &c., take the place in the mind of the Canadian that is occupied by cricket in England! Our readers will be amused by the following passage upon the schoolboy's sense of humour.

"The boy decidedly has not a fine perception of humour. Let no pedagogue dream that his choicest witticisms are really appreciated. For ulterior purposes they are frequently received with great laughter. But the average boy is not really tickled by that which most provokes the amusement of his betters. Two things, however, excite his genuine mirth. One, a bodily slip, fall, or accident happening to one of his fellows; or, still better, to his master! The other, a chance allusion to the name or nickname of some boy in his form; still better, again, to the name or nickname of the master of the form. Thus, not long since at a concert at a well-known public school, a song containing an allusion to beetles was received with the greatest applause, because 'beetle' was the nickname of one of the masters who happened to be present. These are things that always cause the boy to give way to inextinguishable laughter. On the other hand, many mistakes which most tend to upset the gravity of masters he regards as boring incidents, useful only by way of occupying time, and postponing inconvenient questions."

The paper concludes with a timely protest against the disposition to subordinate literary to scientific training; to look upon the former as useless and impractical and the latter only as worthy of the attention of educationists in the nineteenth century.

"If the systems and methods of the professional are such as to irritate the lay educationalist, some of the tenets of the layman are equally irritating to the professional man, who after inheriting a system and practising it has honestly found that, in his opinion, it answers its purpose. And it is especially irritating to see how in appraising 'the relative value of knowledge,' an immense amount is said in favour of such sciences as chemistry, botany, anatomy, and comparatively little in favour of literature; and how it seems to be assumed that true religion is fostered by observation and study of the Creator's works as manifested in matter, much more than by the study of His highest work—the

mind of man. By some it would seem to be held that the conformation of Shakespeare's skull is a thing of equal interest with the productions of his brain; the history of the earth's crust as engrossing as the history of those for whom the earth's crust was made; the study of human character on a par only with that of the limbs of a frog or the digestive process of an insectivorous vegetable. Man possesses nothing more interesting than his language; but according to some, it would seem that that is the one thing about him undeserving of analysis."

EDUCATION IN PRUSSIA.

Our readers may remember a short notice that we gave in our February number to a circular put forth by the Philosophical faculty of the University of Berlin. Since then an interesting circular has been issued by the Education Department of Berlin, the following account of which we extract from a letter contributed to the *Athenaeum*. Those who are not yet acquainted with the Prussian system will learn the general frame-work devised by this nation of schoolmasters.

"The circular opens by affirming the distinction between *Gymnasien* and *Realschulen*, which corresponds nearly to our collegiate and commercial schools; and adds that the system of instructing the poorer classes *without Latin* in *Realschulen* has been found successful, and deserves further encouragement. This declaration is directed against the strong feeling of the pedagogues that without Latin there is no remission of ignorance.

"Some sensible remarks are made upon the purely formal study of Latin and Greek as eating into and destroying the higher and purer appreciation of ancient literature.

"The whole scheme, splendid as it is, seems to me to exceed greatly the possibilities of both average teachers and learners. It is a terrible burden on the nation, which may doubtless produce much diffused knowledge and much study, but which must, in the long run, enfeeble and wear out the manly vigour and freedom both of mind and body.

"I append the revised scheme for the *Gymnasien*, it being understood that the course is nine years, and that the classes begin with the sixth, ending with the first, and containing lower and higher forms in the last three. The numbers give the hours per week for each subject:—

	VI.	V.	IV.	III. A.	III. B.	II. A.	II. B.	I. A.	I. B.	Total	Alteration.
Religious Training . . .	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	19	-1
German	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	21	+1
Latin	9	9	9	9	9	8	8	8	8	77	-9
Greek	7	7	7	7	7	6	6	40	-2
French	4	5	2	2	2	2	2	2	21	+4
History and Geography	3	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	28	+3
Arithmetic and Math.	4	4	4	3	3	4	4	4	4	34	+2
Natur Beschreibung . . .	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	10	+2
Physics	2	2	8	+2
Writing	2	2	4	-2
Drawing	2	2	2	6	..

With the exception of the first year the number of hours weekly is accordingly thirty. We may infer from the table that Latin and Greek are on the wane and modern studies rising in importance through Germany."

EDUCATIONAL TOPICS.

LARGE CLASSES.

Is there anything more wonderful, more delightful to the average school visitor, interested in the young, than a large class of young minds under the charge of a single teacher? He enters the room most likely accompanied by a cicerone, and whether the children are influenced by juvenile caution at inspection, or by the injunctions of their teacher, or by unanimous agreement, that hands, feet and tongues, those irrepressible enemies to good order, shall, while the visit lasts, be put through the ordeal of stillness, these young heroes of the minute manage to maintain a very respectable behaviour, and, indeed, present in themselves a very interesting study. If our visitor did not go away charmed and quoting Cowper, he must either not know that poet or be a stoic. But a large class, though interesting to a visitor, is, unfortunately, a subject of most anxious thought to the teacher, the difficulty lying, not so much in repressing outbursts of youthfulness, which some people call maintaining order, as in obtaining possession of it, and directing it whatever emergencies may arise. To many, securing the attention of a class is a matter totally independent of its number; what will interest and secure the attention of the few, will have the like effect on the many, they maintain, though admitting that differences of temperament, ability, etc., may inter-

fere with its continuance, and these differences the teacher's own skill may modify.

Now if a class be numerically too great to admit of the teacher's continually recurring personal and mental contact, as often as needful, with each individual, no matter how perfect her instructions, or how great her efforts, the one will be fruitless and the other disregarded, according to the measure of her disability in this respect. Watch the effect in even a small class when your attention is divided between your class and a book. You try to arouse their curiosity beforehand by telling them you are going to read to them a most wonderful fairy tale, and that those who listen attentively will be well rewarded in hearing it; and you will find that for those who, all eyes and ears, call for another story at its close, there are as many who care nothing about it, in fact have not made the slightest effort to listen. If the story were told quite a difference would be observed. In the former case you were unable to exert the necessary influence which is required to make even a fairy tale take effect, and the scholars, perceiving this, take advantage of the situation.

Thus it is with a class of many pupils: they know that they and the effort to instruct them, are too great for the teacher; that laziness, inattention and mischief may escape detection where there are so many; and so we get the unruly class of the school with all its attendant difficulties. The addition of a very few pupils will make the class, already large enough, too great—five or six will be an addition most onerous, and the limited lesson-hour become a source of much worry, the teacher herself, anxious to get through the allotted work, helping the confusion by impatience and forgetfulness of the dignity and self-respect, which claim acknowledgment even from babes. An onlooker, if he could look coldly on and not let gentle mercy's pleadings excuse her, would see how far short her thwarted exertions fall, how unheeded,—and how her defeats re-act upon herself, making her unskilful, untrue to her abilities.

Look at the work of the two classes, one of ordinary size soon comes, if the teacher wills it, under her immediate supervision, and consequently good work will be the rule, and the pupils will become habituated to doing their work to the best of their ability; in the large one a great deal will necessarily have to be left to the pupils themselves in the way of correcting written exercises, etc.

With young children, the temptation to misrepresent their work and escape further trouble, is often too great to be withstood, and if this pass undetected it is carried on till they fast become masters in the arts of deception, and such is the corrupting influence of successful lying and deceit, that children who in former classes could be implicitly trusted become, in these classes, as conscienceless as the most untrustworthy. Scholars going from such classes are sure to distinguish themselves in no enviable way, and it will only be with time and the greatest possible care that the evil habits thus formed can be eradicated.

These are the classes where the mischievous boy finds free scope for his particular bent of mind, the classes of littered floors, where minute pieces of paper, which must have required unlimited time to reduce to such infinitesimal scraps, nut-shells, whittings, and the various other remnants of unrestricted youthful pastime, are scattered broadcast; the classes of mutual accusers—you sit like Solomon, listening to the rival mothers, and hear the one's evidence against the other, but unlike Solomon, fail to find any artifice that will extricate you from the dilemma. Here too, much time is expended in searching out hostile pea-marksmen, who, you are sure, are located in one certain part of the room, till a shower at your back causes you to look for assailants in a new quarter, and opens your eyes to the probability that each scholar may be a member of the tantalizing corps. These are the classes where transactions in exchange and barter are carried on most extensively, and the youthful speculators bid fair in shrewdness of bargaining to out-do another Vanderbilt, or a very Shylock in the flesh. These are the classes of continual "Please may I's," the classes of excuses: "I couldn't learn my lesson because I had to go a message, chop-wood, mind the baby," or "I lost my lesson-note,—a fellow snapped it, or the wind blew it away;" the heart that could withstand these excuses would surely be one of adamant! These, too, are the classes of lost books, broken slates, missing pencils; the classes which bring wrathful and indignant mothers "who chastise you with the valor of their tongues," demonstratively assuring you that you are totally wrong in putting the offence on their unblemished lambs, (generally the most mischievous in the class) and wonder at your short-sightedness in believing that "my Tom could do anything wrong." These are the classes that give back all their knowledge,

not indeed as great in bulk as the burden of Atlas, in a somewhat inverted not to say chaotic order; the classes, where the incipient mob-element shows itself in annoying coughs, undiscoverable stampings, whistlings, etc.; the classes that spoil good teachers, and which we should give to teachers of indifferent ability, or to such as cannot be spoiled.

BOOK NOTICES.

*Worms and Crustacea** is the title of Vol. vii of the "Guides for Science Teaching" issued by the Boston Society of Natural History. This excellent little work of 68 pages is specially intended for the use of teachers, but will also be found of great service to those who desire in private to obtain a general knowledge of the structure of the groups of animals of which it treats. The first sixteen pages are devoted to a description of the common earth-worm, and the *Nereis* or sea-centipede, which are taken as types of the classes to which they belong. The remaining portion of the book contains a very accurate description of the parts of the lobster, a crustacean easily obtained for study, and notes points in which other groups of crustaceans differ from that taken as the type. The book contains a large number of very good drawings, greatly enhancing its value. We can scarcely see how the publishers can give so much for so small a sum, the price of the book being only thirty cents.

Messrs. Ginn, Heath & Co.'s edition of the text of *Beowulf*† will be welcome to many students of the beginnings of English literature who have had to send to Germany for a text, or to secure an expensive English edition. It is admirably printed, with the lines numbered and a descriptive head-line added to each "fit" of the poem. The present reprint is from Heyne's latest edition (1879), the text having been revised and the accents corrected where necessary. A glossary translated from Heyne by the present editor and Prof. Robert Sharp of the University of Louisiana will speedily follow the text.

We have received from Messrs. Eldredge and Brother, Philadelphia, three volumes of the "Chace and Stuart's Classical Series." They are strongly bound, clearly printed, and in every way suited for school use. The *First Latin Book* is quite complete in its way. It is "intended to give the beginner in Latin sufficient exercise

* "Worms and Crustacea" by Alpheus Hyatt, Boston Society of Natural History. (Ginn, Heath & Co., Boston.)

† *Beowulf*; the Text edited from M. Heyne, by J. A. Harrison, Professor in Washington and Lee University. Mailing price 45 cts. (Ginn, Heath & Co., Boston.)

in inflections and the principal rules of syntax" and it fulfils its purpose wonderfully well considering the limited space at its disposal. Thus under the head of Pronunciation, we are introduced to the three methods (viz.: the Roman, Continental and English). Here and there we might like to see a change, e.g., in §82, *Rome* (at Rome) is locative and not, as stated, genitive. In § 97, the rules of the Oratio Obliqua should be more detailed; and in §100, the use of the Supine in—*um* to form the future infinitive passive should have been noticed. But the work as a whole is sound and sufficient, and particular care is taken to mark the quantity of syllables, not only in the indices, but throughout the Latin exercises. This is surely an improvement. The *Latin Reader* is intended as the next step, and contains selections from Phaedrus, Erasmus, and Cornelius Nepos. The notes if compared with similar works (e. g. Bryce) will be found to be both fuller and better, and the narratives are instructive. The only fault we find is that the references in the notes are exclusively to the companion Latin Grammar by Chase and Stuart. This, of course, is not a fault for schools that use this work; but as it can hardly be called a standard grammar, like the Public School Latin Primer or Roby, this will render this excellent little book less popular. The references are more general in the *Selections from Ovid's Metamorphoses*. This is the fullest selection from this work that we have seen. The notes are sufficient and appear to be generally accurate. In the remarks on Scanning, however, we notice something that should be qualified: "Wherever there is a short syllable, it must form part of a dactyl." Of course short syllables often come at the end of the verse in a trochee. Again, the explanation of *lactea* (I. 169) is at least doubtful, and a parallel for *pronepos* (xiii. 142), e.g., Hor. Od. III. 27. 73., should have been given.*

* A First Latin Book, with Notes and a Lexicon. By George Stuart, A.M., Prof. of Latin, Central High School. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Bro. Price, \$1.00. To teachers for examination, 60 cents.

A Latin Reader, with Notes and Lexicon. By the same author. Price, \$1.00. To teachers for examination, 60 cts.

Ovid, Selections from the Metamorphoses. With Explanatory Notes and a Vocabulary. By the same author. Price, \$1.35. To teachers for examination. \$1.00.

The Froebel Centenary.—The Froebel centenary was celebrated at Schleina during July with much ceremony. Over the last resting-place of this distinguished educationalist has been placed a cube, surmounted by a cylinder, on which rests a ball—emblems of the system which he introduced for the benefit of infants. The grave was formally and in a most impressive manner handed over to the guardianship of the local authorities by Herr H. Hoffman, of Altona, one of Froebel's pupils, and who was for some time resident in this country.—*The Schoolmaster.*

LITERARY DEPARTMENT.

MATTHEW ARNOLD IN DEFENCE OF LITERATURE.—FROUDE'S LIFE OF CARLYLE.—
JOHN INGLESANT.

It would be a strange thing if such a department as the present were to pass over in silence Matthew Arnold's Redr Lecture upon "Literature and Science." All that Mr. Arnold writes has the knack of attracting public attention, and upon such a subject as this, he could hardly fail to have something new to tell us or some new way of putting an old truth. His contention in his late discourse was that "If there is to be separation and option between humane letters on the one hand, and the natural sciences on the other, the great majority of mankind, all who have not exceptional and overpowering aptitudes for the study of nature, would do well, to choose to be educated in humane letters rather than in the natural sciences. Letters will call out their being at more points, will make them live more." This to many people will appear rather a bold stand to take at the present day, and the lecturer himself confesses it, contending for his own point of view because, it seems to him, "those who are for giving to natural knowledge, as they call it, the chief place in the education of the majority of mankind, leave one important thing out of their account—the constitution of human nature." Conceding the interest that naturally attaches to the knowledge of the results of science, Mr. Arnold urges that for the majority of mankind this knowledge does not take us far enough. "For the generality of men there will be found, I say, to arise, when they have duly taken in the proposition that their ancestor was a 'hairy quadruped furnished with a tail and pointed ears, probably arboreal in his habits,' there will be found to arise an invincible desire to relate this proposition to the sense within them for conduct and to the sense for beauty. But this the men of science will not do for us, and will hardly even profess to do." And this it is his further belief that men of letters and literature can do. "We shall find, as matter of experience, if we know the best that has been thought and uttered in the world, we shall find that the art and poetry and eloquence of men who lived, perhaps, long ago, who had the most limited natural knowledge, who had the most erroneous conceptions about important matters, we shall find that they have, in fact, not only the power of refreshing and delighting us, they have also the power,—such is the strength and worth, in essentials, of their authors' criticism of life,—they have a fortifying and elevating and quickening and suggestive power capable of wonderfully helping us to relate the results of modern science to our need for conduct, our need for beauty."

It was Matthew Arnold who popularised for us the term, which probably has caused dismay to many readers as a kind of mysterious entity, the *Zeit-Geist*, or, as we call it in English, the Spirit of the Times. No man formed a more important factor in this *Zeit-Geist* in his life than a man who died two years ago, and of whom we have heard a good deal since, I mean Thomas Carlyle. The appearance of the first instalment of his life by Mr. Froude has terminated, hardly in his favour, a controversy which was hotly waged for some considerable time and in many quarters. Scarcely had the papers published their obituary eulogies when voices of protest were raised. *Punch*, at first silent, at last pronounced a disparaging verdict. Our own *Bystander* showed its hostility from the first; the *London Spectator*, at first eulogistic, in a second article sounded a note of warning, hinting that Carlyle's was hardly a life distinguished by heroism, that his ideal was more perfect than his character, etc. Still no definite charges were brought against Carlyle till Froude published the "Reminiscences," whereat men's tongues were loosened. Mrs. Oliphant's *Macmillan* article hinted that he had not treated his wife as she

deserved, and Dr. Knighton gave his conversations with Carlyle in the *Contemporary*, which showed her in the light of a woman snubbed and silenced—and this too, when everyone knew, and Carlyle himself had confessed, that if she had not been Carlyle's wife she would have attained literary greatness of her own! A chorus of abuse followed. Swinburne called him, "The stormy sophist with his mouth of thunder, clothed with loud words," and his intellectual eminence began to be disparaged. The *Athenaeum* wrote: "Ecclefechan had declared that the earth did not move; Carlyle had said in many brilliant essays and lectures that it should not move; but it moved nevertheless." The *Spectator* and the *Saturday Review* agreed that with "full admiration for his extraordinary genius and stupendous industry, it is hard to recognize any distinct result of this exercise of energy." Subscriptions to the Carlyle monument began to fail and his star had plainly sunk to the nadir. One side of the dispute Froude's book has definitely set at rest. It will be impossible for the future to look upon Carlyle, as we once hoped was the case, as a Titan of literature equally great on the moral and intellectual side. He will always be remembered as neglectful of one of the great self-imposed duties of life, duty to and consideration for his wife. Her life must in many ways have been a miserable one, still "her high principles," Mr. Froude informs us, "enabled her to go through with it, but the dreams of intellectual companionship with a man of genius in which she had entered on her marriage had long disappeared; and she settled down into her place again with a heavy heart." The lesson drawn from her own experience that she preached to her young friends was, "My dear, whatever you do, never marry a man of genius," and in the late evening of her laborious life she is recorded to have said "I married for ambition. Carlyle has exceeded all that my wildest hopes ever imagined of him, and I am miserable." The relations between Carlyle and his wife are naturally the most interesting part of the volumes that have appeared, but one cannot rise from their perusal without other thoughts suggesting themselves; of the debt we owe to Jane Welsh for enabling Carlyle to do what he did for us; of the sacrifices that nature demands when any great work has to be done; and of the gloom that seems to envelop the life of the great prophet of this century, like clouds that gather about the mountain tops.

It is rather late in the day to comment upon a work that has been so widely read and discussed as Mr. Shorthouse's "John Inglesant," yet it will not perhaps be out of place here to point out the meaning of this work, appearing as does now after the conclusion of a prolonged period of religious and scientific discussion, culminating in 1874, the year of Professor Tyndall's Belfast Address. This was no less than a period of intellectual revolution, the results of which will be slowly gathered in succeeding years. Now every revolution divides into two periods—the period of Anarchy, and the period of Dormant Anarchy. The first is a period of open war, as was the case when Tyndall delivered his celebrated polemic; the second is a period of hastily patched-up peace, of apparent reaction resulting from the fears of both parties—of the party of progress and the party of order. Such a peace is always brought about by means of a compromise, not of course likely to be lasting, but such as appears to be the best settlement under the circumstances. This compromise found its literary expression in Mr. Shorthouse's book, the moral of which may be shortly summed up as Agnosticism *plus* Conformity to the Church of England, as opposed to the previous cry of Scepticism or Roman Catholicism.