

the classical languages is one of the chief reasons for their superiority as educational instruments.

As vehicles, too, for the expression of thought, modern languages are vastly inferior in their structure, syntactical and etymological, to Latin and Greek, and are therefore vastly inferior for conveying a general notion of grammar and philology.

Nor, again, will the student find in modern literatures models of literary style either in poetry or rhetoric, or history or philosophy, to place for one moment in comparison with the models of Greece and Rome, models which have pleased in every age and formed every literature in Europe. On the other hand, without the knowledge of classical literature it would be impossible ever to appreciate or understand modern literature, abounding as it does with classical ideas and classical allusions. And, finally, the student who has a thorough knowledge of Latin will require less time in mastering the Romance languages—Italian, French, and Spanish—than if he were to study each of these languages separately and without such knowledge.

Such, then, briefly and I feel most inadequately stated, are the arguments which may be adduced in defence of the old time-honored classical education. Some of the arguments advanced, taken singly, may appear comparatively of little weight; but taken together they seem to justify incontestably the prominent position assigned to Latin and Greek among the subjects of the university curriculum. Most of the objections which have been brought against classical education are valid only as against education exclusively classical. They find no application in a university like this, where the course of study is modified in accordance with the spirit of the time and the wants of the age—where the great discoveries of modern

science, the great facts of modern history and philosophy, and the great truths of modern literature are not ignored, and where every subject is cultivated that seems worthy of cultivation. To one objection, and one only, is it my present purpose to refer. It is the usual objection of the utilitarian: "But what is the use of your classical studies?" implying by the question that these studies are of no practical utility in after-life and have no practical bearing on any of its callings. But such a view is based, as I said before, upon a shallow and superficial notion of what from an educational standpoint the useful in knowledge really is. Knowledge is useful not only in itself, but useful as an educational instrument. "The cultivation of the intellect," as has been well said, "is an end in itself, and a not unworthy one. Health is a good in itself though nothing came of it, and so the culture of the intellect is a good in itself and its own end." If it further such an end, classical study, even if practically valueless in the callings of after-life, is not useless to the classical student. If it has quickened and developed his intellectual powers; if it has given vividness to his imagination, purity to his taste, refinement to his feelings; if it has given vigour to his understanding, soundness to his judgment, accuracy to his reasoning; if it has given him wider sympathies and a more pathetic interest in life; if it has made him wiser, nobler, better than he was before, such knowledge and training is not *useless*, but, in the highest and most ideal sense of the word, *useful*.

In conclusion, I may be allowed, I trust, to say that while I have the strongest faith in the efficacy, as a means of mental culture, of the subject which has been entrusted to my charge in this university, I cannot conceal some secret misgivings as to my own ability to do justice