

though there may be other things as good, there is nothing better as a basis than a really first-rate classical training.

On this point, however, three provisos seem necessary.

(a) Classical education, as we know it at its best in England, is not undiluted Latin and Greek, but Latin and Greek language, history and literature, used as vehicles for general culture. You will remember Dr. Arnold's remark, that the sixth and seventh books of Thucydides are not ancient but modern history.

(b) In intellectual discipline, quality matters at least as much as subject matters. The substitute for a good classical education will have to be very good indeed. Slipshod French and inaccurate German won't do the same work that Latin and Greek do in a first grade higher school. And it is not easy to change a great educational tradition quickly. When you have a good teacher, of ripe experience and great influence, it would be madness to lose him. In all education quality matters, not quantity. And the higher the grade of education the truer this is.

(c) A great educational tradition is one of the most precious things in the world. It is the outcome of generations of hidden self sacrifice. It is the living influence which makes a school great.

The history of education teaches no lesson so frankly as this—that reform is always possible, but that sudden revolution is always disastrous.

(3) There seem to be at least four main types of curriculum which are at present needed in secondary education—the fully classical, the semi-classical (*i.e.*, Latin but no Greek), the predominantly scientific, and that which takes living languages alone as the basis of a training based predominantly on

linguistic discipline. All four, with some sub-varieties, seem indispensable. So long as all are made as good as brain, adequate equipment, and devoted service can make them, there is no cause to arrange them in a hierarchy of educational merit.

I would urge, however, that each alternative curriculum should have a distinct bias. If you give every subject a claim to an equal place in every course, you spoil all. But some initiation into scientific discipline, and some real introduction to humane letters, are absolutely indispensable in every curriculum. An education lacking either science or the humanities cannot be called a liberal education. It means, in Milton's words—

"Wisdom at one entrance quite shut out."

Some knowledge of man and some knowledge of nature; training in accuracy of observation, in truthfulness of record and in exact felicity of verbal expression are the indispensable factors. The balance of the studies, which will secure those benefits, may well vary according to very numerous patterns, and according to the needs and teaching power of individual schools.

Of course, a parent would choose one or other type of curriculum, according to his son's aptitude and probable future. But, beyond this, ought not the curriculum to bear some closer relation to the after-life of the boys in the school? Up to sixteen, I should personally say—perhaps not quite decisively as things stand, but nevertheless—no. The prime aim of a secondary school is to lay the foundation of culture—and it is hard to do that, according to the best standard of our time, before sixteen.

Beyond that age, it seems to me arguable that, without being specialized, the curriculum might be (so to