

of an exhausted erudition. There is nothing more remarkable than the general ignorance of many great classical scholars ; it is difficult for them to put themselves in touch with the modern world. If you speak to them of politics, they are apt to think that it is an animal in the Zoological Gardens. Grote was a politician before he was a historian ; Gibbon acknowledges his obligations to the experience he acquired as a member of Parliament ; but Curtius, the German historian of Greece, is a mere scholar—he describes events by skilfully piecing together texts from various authors, but he has no skill in animating details with the life of action. Heine visited Poland, at the age of twenty-one, and wrote an account of that country which is said never to have been surpassed in truth and in insight. This is what I should wish a scholar trained in modern literature to be able to do. He should possess the linguistic facility of a Russian, the political understanding of an American, the erudition of a German and the common sense and sound judgment of an Englishman ; nothing should be thrown away in his education, nothing should be regretted or thought better of when forgotten. He should not begin his education with a laborious scaffolding framed out of a dead past ; he should proceed from the known to the unknown. He should study the past only to understand the present better. I would, as in a classical education, begin with the study of languages ; the pupil should learn French, German and Italian, as many English children learn them from their nurses or their governesses ; but as soon as I was able I would aim at the production of a scholar's perfection. The pupil should grind at grammar and toil at translation and composition sufficiently to satisfy the severest test.

He should also be made to feel

that the principal use of language is as a key to literature ; that the value of speaking foreign tongues lies in its giving access to the thoughts of men ; he should know his Dante as well as a scholar trained in our universities knows his Æschylus, his Sophocles, his Euripides ; he should have studied with diligence and enthusiasm Goethe and Schiller, Racine and Pascal ; but the main training of his mind I would draw from history, and especially political history. During a life of more than thirty years spent in education at school and university, I have had full experience of the educative influence both of classics and history, and every year that I have taught history at the university has given me a stronger faith in it as a means of the higher education. Setting aside those students who have a marked aptitude for the moral or the natural sciences, or who are gifted with that peculiar insight into the properties of language which fits them to be classical scholars—and these classes form a small portion of the whole—I know of no study which produces such results as history, provided only that the history be properly taught. Even in pupils of a lower order of intelligence, the frivolous boy is turned by this study into a thoughtful man. The reason is not far to seek. It is essentially a manly study. The schoolboy coming to the university, if he submits himself to classical training, has merely to repeat the exercises of his childhood. If he devotes himself to history, he is introduced at once to those studies and those considerations on which the most mature men are accustomed to exercise their minds. History may, of course, by bad teaching be degraded into a mere effort of the memory, but if the political side is kept clearly in view, and the student is accustomed to trace events to their causes, to explain the present by the past, to dis-