

should miss the lower. But why they are denied the lower too, is a mystery which I must leave for solution to those who insist that women should remain just such as antiquated prejudice and effete conventionalism have ordained that they shall be.

Having at some length, though still most inadequately, contended that no differences of rank, or calling, or sex, justify any *à priori* restrictions on the essentials of education, which are in all cases the same amidst many differences of detail and of application, I have left myself little time even to hint at any of the recent signs of educational progress to which I alluded at the outset.

“Classical” Instruction.

The higher estimate of physical science, whether of observation, or of experiment, or of calculation, the better appreciation of language in general, and of the modern languages in particular, and especially of our own mother tongue, not merely in their so-called practical bearings, but as educational agencies and means, have induced a more rational estimate of the rightful place of the classical languages in education, and more philosophical and comprehensive methods of teaching them. The monopoly which they so long maintained is fast passing away, though it will still be long before they descend to their true and ultimate level. Lord Lyttelton, one of our most accomplished scholars, has thus spoken from the very place which I now less worthily occupy:—

“With respect to classical teaching, or at least the teaching of Latin, I must say for myself that I am content to rest the argument for it on somewhat narrower ground than is often taken. I fully admit the force of the direct considerations in favour of classical knowledge from the immortal beauty and the far-reaching importance of the literature to which it gives access. Still I must admit that when I consider the actual condition of literature as it is, and contrasted with former times—the immensity, the excellence, the value for culture, the practical utility of the literature of the last four centuries—to how great an extent, though no doubt far from completely, the benefits themselves of the classical learning may be attained through the modern languages—and when I consider the conditions of modern society, the multiplied demands on our time, the absolute need of much knowledge and information apart from the old learning, and to many, of the early acquisition of practical and business habits apart from books altogether—I cannot bring myself to the conclusion that in a literary and instructional view, the knowledge of Greek or even of Latin alone is indispensable to the higher classes, still more to those below them.”

Compare with this passage what Dr. Parr wrote to Mr. Berry in 1819:—“Away with your coxcombical prattle and your sectarian impatience about Greek choruses! Get Seale’s little tract upon metre: you may read the whole with your boys. But work them night and day with trochees, iambics, and anapæsts, and make them understand the names and the properties both of the simple and the compound feet. If you possess Heath’s ‘Notes upon the Greek Tragedians,’ you may read with your boys what he says. But again I tell you to keep close to iambics, trochees, and anapæsts. At some future time, read with them four or five times the admirable rules which Porson has laid down for iambics in his preface to the *Hecuba*. Read over with your boys the *Syntax of the Greek Grammar*..... This will be sufficient for a year or two; but when they have made real advances in Greek prose, read over with them the whole of Vigerus, with every note of Hoogeven and Herrman, and with the notes also of Zeunius..... Mr. Berry, what I now recommend is really one of the most useful parts of education. You should make them read

Vigerus in this way twice every year four five, six, or seven years. Pray, mind my detail. Moreover, to increase the stock of phraseology, let them read a good deal of Lucian, and make them consult their Vigerus..... After these things, your boys may proceed, if they please, to Herodotus and Thucydides. But do not meddle with them for many years..... Now, dear sir, I am going to meet your boys at the age of eighteen or nineteen, and mark me well. If they are diligent and clever, do you read over with them the whole, and I add the whole, of the *Port Royal Latin Grammar*, and advice them to read it themselves once a year for five or even six years. You cannot calculate the advantage of doing so till the experiment is made. There is another work which your boys, when they are seventeen or eighteen, should read. I mean ‘*Lambert Bos on the Greek Ellipsis*.’ Get the best edition, and with it get ‘*Palairot on the Latin Ellipsis*.’ You should also buy the last edition of ‘*Mattaire on the Greek Dialects*’; and if your boys follow the advice I am giving, they will turn Mattaire’s book to very good account when they are twenty-one or twenty-two years old. Parson Berry, make your boys good grammarians.” These are but samples of directions which occupy six printed pages, and which are preceded by minute time tables for every day in the week of the course prescribed for the first, second, third, fourth, and fifth forms. With the exception of a portion of an hour each day to be spent by the first and third forms in reading English, of a weekly English exercise by the second form, there is not an hour from first to last which is not devoted to Greek and Latin—Latin and Greek—chiefly grammar! This curious document well deserves the study of those who are sceptical about modern progress in education, though it may make some sigh for the return of the good old times, when, as Sidney Smith says, the occurrence of the flood, and the consequent shortening of the duration of human life, seem to have been forgotten!

Now, this change of sentiment is due far less to any depreciation of classics than to the higher estimate of the value of other subjects, even in those respects which have long been held to constitute the chief virtue of classical instruction. We hear much less than formerly of the impossibility of cultivating taste, and stimulating thought and imagination by any other agency than that of classics. We hear much less disparagement of our own language and literature, as well as of science, on account of their alleged utilitarian tendency. It is now more commonly than heretofore admitted that it is less the subject than the spirit in which and the purpose for which it is studied, that must be looked to for determining the mental, and especially the moral, influence of its study. Any subject may be studied for mean, personal ends, or for its own sake and the pleasure of the labour itself. And it detracts somewhat from the disinterested character and essential nobility of classical studies, that they have long been the passports to emolument in all the chief professions. Thus in the Church it used to be said that next to rattling judiciously at the right time, the best title to a bishopric was the editing of a Greek play. Our distinguished President has said in his recent “*Monographs*” —“The prelates of the Church were many of them good scholars rather than theologians, and they rose to the Bench as often by an edition of a Greek play as by a Commentary on the Scriptures. It is related of one by no means the least eminent, that he dismissed his candidates for ordination with the injunction to improve their Greek, and not waste their time in visiting the poor.” (p. 271). And I have heard that immoderate study of even the Greek Testament has been deprecated, lest it should corrupt the purity of the student’s Greek. It suffices to allude to law and medicine. When fewer golden prizes