

who care not for the appearance of their dress. They generally want their garments of a good material, and to fit them in a becoming manner. Our ideas and thoughts are also entitled to a becoming dress; and it should be our pride to clothe them with the most chaste and beautiful language, that they may hang around our person as jewels of unfading beauty, even as "apples of gold in pictures of silver." We, however, may know the meaning of thousands of the most beautiful words in our language; yet if we cannot discover the legitimate relation they bear to one another, and arrange them in a sentence according to the laws of syntax that govern them, we come as far short of the knowledge of the science of language as the architect of the knowledge of his profession, if he understand not where to place his timbers in a building, after they are furnished at his hand.

Grammar, well understood, enables us to express our thoughts fully and clearly; and also in a manner that will defy the ingenuity of man to give our words any other meaning than that which we ourselves intended them to convey.

In justification of a neglect to acquire a grammatical knowledge of the English language, some have argued that the best grammarians differ in their views of the science; and if the most enlightened upon that subject cannot agree, what evidence can be shown that there is any particular good in it? It is true, that our best grammarians may differ in their views touching some immaterial or technical points in the science. But this cannot disturb or interrupt the great channel or laws of language. Allow me to prove this to you right here. The Utah Library perhaps contains the productions of some hundreds of the best authors of which many countries can boast. These authors all

wrote under different circumstances, at different times, in different countries, and upon different subjects; and very probably no two of them could have been brought to a perfect agreement upon every point and principle of grammar. But will the most learned gentleman in this city go into that Library and point out one grammatical error in the writings of any of them? He may, perchance, do it; yet I seriously doubt it. There may be typographical errors found, which may have produced indirect grammatical ones; but a manifest grammatical error can hardly be found. This argument ought to silence every cavil on the subject, in my opinion.

There is no science so universally applicable to practicable purposes as that of grammar. Arithmetic, geography, astronomy, botany, penmanship, chemistry, and philosophy are highly profitable in their respective places. But there is no condition or circumstance in life in which grammatical knowledge is not essential, wherein mental action may be involved. We cannot think, write, or speak correctly upon any subject, without a knowledge of the laws of language.

Some persons, who possess not this knowledge, are vain and confident enough to think that they can detect and correct any error in language by the ear. It is true that persons of a naturally refined taste may, by carefully reading the productions of good authors, and by conversing with the learned, acquire that knowledge of language which will enable them to avoid those glaring errors that are particularly offensive to the ear; but there are other errors, equally gross, that have not so harsh a sound, and cannot be detected without a knowledge of the laws that are violated.

I can hold out no reasons or inducements for you to believe that you can acquire a knowledge of this science