

sense of pleasure derived from them, but from the fact that boys have a longing for freedom without knowing what it means.

Prizes for good conduct or excellence of work are rarely mentioned. They may have been given regularly, but it is not probable that they were, for the State did not provide for them, and the pay of the masters was too small to afford them.

Music was not an indispensable part of a Roman's education. It did not at Rome, as in Greece, constitute a leading feature in their festivals and their banquets. The pride and vanity of a victorious general were more flattered by a magnificent triumph, which satisfied the Roman's love of display, than by a song of victory in his honor. The harp and the flute were used, indeed; but their gentle strains had no such charm as the clanging war-horn. The Roman dramas were shorn of the choruses that were indispensable to the drama of the Golden Age of Greek literature; a substantial prize was the object of the Roman athlete's envy rather than the laureled chaplet, the prize in the Greek contests. Hence, music was neglected at Rome: the charms of the soothing art were too subtle to influence the minds of a nation whose business was war.

The university life of the Roman youth resembles, in some respects, that of modern times. It consisted in passing a year or two in travel, the greater part of which was spent at Athens, that still, in philosophy, literature, and art, reared her head from amid the ruins of fallen Greece. Many of that country's philosophers, poets, and statesmen were taken to Rome as hostages; many, whose hatred of a foreign yoke forbade them to be witnesses of their country's disgrace, sought homes among the colonies which their ancestors had planted in the days of Greece's prosperity; but there still remained a sufficient number at Athens to retain for her the title of mistress of the world in intellectual culture. The Roman youth, therefore, flocked to her schools—some, to free themselves from the restraints of home, and find companions in dissipation, as many English youths of modern times resort to the Continent in order to free their fathers from an increase of personal responsibility, and return morally and physically ruined; others went for profit. They recognized the fact that the calm retirement, the holy air, that lingered around the temples and groves of Athens, the teachings of her philosophers, whom old associations still bound to the birthplace of their doctrines, gave ripeness of judgment, strength of character, steadiness of purpose, and independence of thought. Here, too, life-friendships were formed, as in the case of Cicero and Atticus, the former of whom, in his dialogues, constantly alludes to scenes in the city, and conversations held there, that show the depth of the impression made on his mind by his university life.

The development of the body was not so systematic at Rome as at Athens. The more violent exercises, as wrestling and boxing, were left principally to professional athletes. The *Campus Martius* was the lounging place of the Roman youth, whom laziness and the luxury of the baths did not prevent from taking open air exercise; but we miss the activity and system of the Athenian Gymnasium. The principal difference between the two nations in this respect lay in this fact: the Greeks aimed at the perfection of the whole, by making individuals perfect, as a result of which we find the Greeks models of physical development, while the Romans neglected individual training, aiming rather at a systematic whole; and this system is especially exemplified in the discipline of the Roman army, in which the skill of the general and the confidence of his soldiers were pledges of success rather than individual bravery. After the introduction of mercenary soldiers in Roman warfare, the Roman youth, untrained in the exercises of the Gymnasium, gave themselves up more to the pleasures of the gaming tables and the baths; and the neglect and abuse of the laws of health that followed was one of the causes of the nation's downfall.

I have attempted to give a sketch of the educational systems of the two greatest nations of antiquity. They differ to some extent in details; but the principal difference, as I have attempted to show, is in the ends they had in view in the education of their youth. Greece had the one object of making her sons Greeks—descendants worthy of their fathers who fought at Marathon, trained in the qualities of self-denial and prudence, and fitted either to command or obey. Rome, on the other hand, educated her sons in an aimless kind of way—as a matter of duty, which, as soon as it was performed, afforded a great relief. There is something very modern in this: a certain class, in our own day, send their children to school for a few months each year for a few years, and then consider their duty done, as far at least as education is concerned; and they complain loudly that there are legislative enactments for compulsory education. Their number is, however, fortunately for the country and happily for the children, growing fewer. It is not a mere guess at truth to say that the wide difference in the characters of these two nations, alike in origin, under the same climatic influences, and with the same form of government, which may be called a *limited democracy*, is largely due to the difference in their Educational systems. Their histories are a light to guide and warn: we can follow where they succeeded, and avoid the breakers that wrecked them. Above all, in these days of socialism and its kindred evils, we can take an example from the system of Greece, and in the school-room instil a love of country—make patriotism, not a general virtue, but a personal duty. By this means—for the principle is right and sound, and the judgment of ripper years will not find reason to depart from it—the storms of civil discord that now sweep over nations, and make thrones to totter, will grow calm, and give way to a millennial peace. Far in the future, when the death-knell shall have tolled a mournful farewell over our English language, and its urn shall have been placed side by side with those of Greece and Rome; when a new race, speaking a strange tongue, shall inhabit the earth, some antiquarian, perchance, writing on the educational systems of the Ancients, shall disinter blue-book on blue-book, educational reports, ministerial recommendations and the like—what discoveries will he make! He will find how many of Rome's and England's free-born sons were little higher than the brutes—millions knowing no other pleasures than those of sense; he will read that Greece was the acknowledged mother of literature, philosophy and art, and that her popular enjoyments combined the arts which charmed the senses and trained the intellect; and he will consider why so few years mark the length of Greece's rule, while the eagles of Rome floated victorious, decade on decade, through a monarchy, a republic, and an empire; and while, for centuries, England, old Ocean's favorite child, has sat on her island throne, fearlessly wielding the destinies of the world. I leave him to consider.

THE STUDY OF HISTORY.

BY T. O'HAGAN, BELLEVILLE.

There are few subjects of greater importance than that of history. If the proper study of mankind be man, then it behoves us to pay much attention to the study of history, which has for its object the vindication of man. History means well-nigh everything. It is philosophy, it is poetry, it is literature. Is not history a record of every subject? Is not the advancement of mathematics a history in itself? That Newton discovered the Binomial Theorem is a fact which comes within the realm of history. History is then a record of all that has transpired in the family of mankind. It is