

the ends for which they are taught; (1) This study imparts the knowledge of the grammar of two of the most refined and finished languages which have ever been used by man; (2) This study is the most efficient method of learning general or philosophical grammar; *i. e.*, of mastering the nature, the laws, and the history of language; (3) It brings the mind into familiar acquaintance with the literature, the history, and the life of the two most important nations of the world, with which, indeed, all the cultivated modern races and nations are most closely allied in their literature their life, their philosophy, and their institutions; last of all, this study is an excellent instrument of intellectual gymnastics, which would be worth all, and more than all, the labor it involves, were this the only result that should be proposed.

The inquiry would at once present itself; which of these is the supreme or the superior aid? On second thought, however, the question might arise whether these ends need be regarded as standing in the relation of formal subordination to one another; *i. e.*, whether any one of them is properly supreme. A thoughtful person cannot fail to inquire, if it be granted that mental discipline might be gained by this study, whether culture, as the wide and more elevated sense of the term, is not also desirable; and whether this may not, in many cases, be more valuable than sharpness and strength. It would be easier to answer the question, whether the special grammar of either the Latin or Greek languages should be proposed as the chief end of classical study, no reference being had to the power which it might give to read Latin and Greek authors, or even to study language and grammar in general. But perhaps it might not be easy to settle the question, whether the mastery of linguistic science should be made by any man, the chief end of studying Latin or Greek for a considerable part of seven to ten years. Were the ability to read with fluency, enjoyment, and appreciation, the literature of Greece and Rome to be proposed as the most desirable end of study, some would hesitate to set it so high as to overlook the other advantages which have been named. These questionings—not all of them easily settled—would point to the conclusion that all these ends are important, and that all should be sought for. Let this be conceded; the question will still return, which should be supreme—how far, if at all, should one be sacrificed to one or all the others? How can we arrange and estimate all these ends in that harmony which combines grace and strength which imparts culture and rewards by the consciousness of power? Our inquiries should be practical as well as theoretical. We should not conceive the ideal youth, or the ideal instructor, or the ideal university. We should conceive to ourselves the actual American boy, the American school, and the American college as they are—no, not as they are, but as we can hope to make them.

With this ideal before us, which we may hope to turn into the actual, let us proceed to inquire, what are the ends which we should propose to ourselves in classical study and instruction, and by what means can we attain them?

It will be my aim to show that every method of classical study and instruction is defective which does not propose, within a reasonable period of time, to enable the pupil to read the Latin and Greek languages with ease and pleasure. I maintain that from the beginning, this end should be constantly and prominently kept in view, that all the instruction should be regulated by this aim, and that whatever else is taught should be taught in subordination to this as the commanding purpose. I hold that if this object is made supreme, all the other ends which have been named will be achieved with greater certainty

and effect, and that this alone can be relied on to sustain the interest of either pupil or teacher in the studies and teaching which are required of each.

I must, of course, assume that the instructor is able to read easy Latin and Greek prose with some facility and pleasure; that he has a cultivated historic imagination with æsthetic sensibility and culture; that he is interested in English literature, and has some familiarity with the grammar and rhetoric of the English language. It would not be an unreasonable requisition to add that he should possess a somewhat familiar acquaintance with the French and German languages and literatures. But it is not necessary that he should be an advanced or consummate scholar in any direction, provided his conceptions of what he should impart to his pupil are liberal and elevated, and that in all these particulars he is considerably in advance of his classes. We do not require, because we have no right to expect, that the teachers of the elements of classical instruction should be accomplished linguists or widely read *littérateurs*, but we may presume that they have formed and endeavored to realize for themselves that ideal toward which they would direct and inspire their pupils. For one, I certainly should be very slow to trust a child of mine to a teacher in Latin or Greek who had never read his Virgil or his Homer for pleasure, and who knew and cared nothing beyond the correct translation and analysis of the selections with which his own school and college life had made him familiar. A teacher who has no attainments or aims higher than these, can impart little inspiration to others because he has none for himself. He can scarcely be trusted to teach even what he has learned, because what he knows has hardly become a possession of his own, not having been taken up or assimilated into his best inner life.

If I must look at things as they are, and adjust my remarks to the actual condition in which many classical teachers begin their work, I would say to every person who proposes to teach Latin or Greek; Do not content yourself with mastering your lessons, even if you are certain that there is not a point in the translation and analysis in which the most dreaded and exacting professor would find you deficient. Make it your first duty in the first month of your teaching—rather in the first month before you begin to teach—to master so as to read with the utmost facility some shorter of longer portion of a Greek or Latin author, and make it as much your own as a familiar selection from Macaulay or Cowper. After this initiation keep up the practice of reading in this rapid and cursory way several pages every week, of new or old matter, in order that the languages which you are to teach may become to yourself living forces instead of dry and dead traditions. Do not be content till some Greek and Latin author shall have ceased to be to you a stiff and swathed mummy, and shall have become a living and breathing man. In this there is nothing proposed which is extravagant or excessive; nothing which is not entirely within the reach of the most moderate abilities and scholarship.

The immediate effect would be as intimated, that the relations of these classic tongues to our own language would be appreciated by the teacher as never before. However carefully such a teacher may have been drilled in the grammar of his own language and that of Greek and Latin, he can never come to regard the dead language as a living language till he has learned to read it as he does his mother tongue, with rapid reading and in continuous discourse.

But suppose this is done and the impressions desired have been received, what ought to follow? I answer: something which does not always follow, even when the