

of experience, that the surest instrument that can be used in training the mind of youth is given us in the study of the languages, the literature and the works of art of classical antiquity." He proceeded to show by the evidence of the different professors that in every department the students whose mental training had been drawn from classics had in the long run an advantage over others in grasp of their subject whatever that might be; for his own department he remarked that this was no discovery of his own but the conclusion reached independently by Liebig before him; as concurrent testimony to the same conclusion he quoted the opinions of both of the senior professors of higher mathematics, with which the opinions of Professor Rammelsberg representing chemistry, Assistant Professor von Martens, representing Zoology, Professor Zupitza of the department of English language and literature, Professors Müllenhoff and Scherer of the department of German, Professor Zeller of Philosophical fame, and Professor Meitzen, instructor in economics and statistics closely coincided. I am aware that Professor Hofmann's conclusions (not his facts) are disputed; on the ground that the general superiority of the students trained in classics is due not to their classics but to other causes, to the higher class in society to which many of these students belong, to their larger share of inherited intellectual interest, their greater leisure for education and all the other incidental advantages which are enjoyed by the children of the comparatively well to do. But it is noteworthy that the assertion itself of such a general superiority in the classical students is not disputed in Germany, and when we find the same contention which Dr. Hofmann advanced, advanced also by the headmasters of the great English public schools, whose pupils all come from

the same class of society but are divided into a "classical" and a "modern" side, when again we find the same contention advanced even by those who strongly dissent from these same head masters on the special question of exacting Greek from all undergraduates (*vide* an article in the London *Spectator* for December 27th), there is, to say the least, a strong *prima facie* case made out in favour of classics, and the *onus probandi* lies with those who evade the natural explanation, which appears to coincide with the evidence of English as well as German experience, and select another explanation, which however plausible for Germany leaves the English evidence out of sight. I will only add in conclusion of this branch of the subject, (1) that I have avoided referring to those German professors of the natural sciences who insist on the value of the classics from a utilitarian point of view—from the point of view that some knowledge of Latin and still more in some cases of Greek is necessary to master the terminology of modern science with its Greek and Latin compounds—because I am discussing at present solely the educational not the utilitarian value, and because the utilitarian argument obviously applies just as strongly, to say the least, in favour of the modern languages as of classics. If the medical student, *e.g.*, is perplexed at every step of his course in biology by Greek words, yet when he has reached the higher branches of the subject he is not less handicapped by an inability to read the medical works of French or German or English authorities. (2) My reference to Professor Hofmann's address is particularly relevant to the subject I am discussing, because the protest which he uttered as Rector, and the accompanying written protest signed by the whole of the "philosophical faculty" (our "arts faculty") of the University