

As instruments for the expression of thought—as pieces of mechanism—Greek and Latin are infinitely superior to any language ever elaborated by the mind of man. And this reason alone is sufficient to justify their selection for educational purposes, as being the nearest approach to a perfect type of language. Again: Without mastering to some extent at least the vocabulary of the Greek and Latin languages, no really precise knowledge can be got either of our own tongue or of any of the Romance languages of Europe—Italian, French or Spanish—to such an extent do the classical languages enter into their structure and composition. And, again: There is no subject of university study around which seem to centre so many subjects of general interest. Around it cluster all the facts of ancient biography and history, geography and philology. With it is associated a knowledge of ancient national life, public and private, of ancient law, of ancient religions. And lastly: The mere fact that a great part of the Holy Scriptures has come down to us in Greek (the New Testament was first written in Greek, the Old Testament was first translated into it), is reason sufficient, if none other existed, why a knowledge of that subject should be kept up in the universities of every Christian country. A knowledge of Greek is therefore indispensable to the theologian. But so is a knowledge of Latin to the lawyer, if he wishes to study some of the greatest works on jurisprudence in the original. So it is to the medical man, if he wishes to avail himself of the ancient medical writers. The scientist will find a knowledge of Greek a practical help both in understanding and forming his scientific nomenclature. The poet, the historian, and the philosopher can serve no better apprenticeship than in studying the masterpieces

of Ancient Greece and Rome; nor the legislator and statesman than in studying Greek and Roman life and laws and institutions. In short, by none of the higher walks and professions of life can the classical languages be neglected or ignored. "But," it is asked by many who acknowledge the value of linguistic study, "if languages are indispensable as educational instruments, why not substitute for Greek and Latin the languages of modern Europe? These languages are more easy of acquisition and therefore more attractive to the student. They are more useful practically, being, as they are, the key to literatures of no mean importance, as well as to much of the best original work, literary and scientific, of modern times; and at the same time they are no less valuable educationally as imparting a discipline, intellectual, literary, and æsthetic, in no wise inferior to the languages of Ancient Greece and Rome."

The literatures and languages of Modern Europe are no doubt too important, for some of the reasons mentioned, not to take a high position in any system of liberal education. But a satisfactory or efficient substitute for the classical languages, as a means of intellectual discipline, they never can be or become. Less difficult of acquisition they are, it is true, demanding little intellectual exertion, and depending for their acquisition almost upon the memory alone. But as educational instruments this is just their weakness. The process of translating French or German is, after the first labour is over, almost mechanical, a matter merely of looking out words in the dictionary; and in course of time it becomes almost intuitive and involves no intellectual effort whatever. But without intellectual effort there is no intellectual training, while the greater the effort the greater the culture received. The difficulty of