

the study of Latin after all. Would that they were more common among those of our pedagogues who are anxious to have "the boys" think in Latin as well as write in it as a composition exercise. At a convention lately held in New England, Prof. Collar is reported to have said: "I felt last evening as I heard President Hyde's extravagant claims for Latin, that almost precisely the same claims that he made for the study of Latin now as a necessity might have been made two hundred years ago, but that they were not all appropriate now. Those claims ignore all that has been done in the study of Latin in two hundred years. Practically his remarks amount to this: If you want to know about Roman antiquities you must grope for your knowledge in Latin texts. If you want to know Roman history you must go to the original sources. But I think you will do better to go to Smith's dictionaries for the former, and to Ihne, Mommsen, and Gibbon for the latter. If you want to understand classical allusions, there are shorter and better ways than to rummage a great body of Latin literature.

"I suppose President Hyde would say: you ought to study Latin to get at the literature. Well, how many have got at Roman literature through Latin? Very few persons, indeed; there are most excellent translations of everything in Latin; and Latin literature is open to everybody who does not know a word of Latin. Certainly all knowledge can be translated; all ideas can be translated. What then would you lose in regard to Latin literature if you should get it in the best translations instead of in the original? Something is lost. But it would be difficult for all but a few, and those superior scholars, to say what. Now, we had better clear our minds of cant. Latin is useful to be studied for many reasons, and I myself don't see how a person can have a thoroughly inner knowledge of English without the study of Latin; but let us not study Latin because there are remains of Roman roads and bridges, nor to understand classical allusions, nor for a knowledge of Roman antiquities. Let us study Latin for good reasons, but not for the reasons urged. It is not necessary to set up any extraordinary claims for Latin."

And what is going to be said about the extraordinary claims that the University School Examiners of our Province are making for Latin? What about this folly of asking our boys and girls to read Latin at sight? Emerson has somewhere said that after he came to manhood's estate he never read a foreign book in the original if he could find an acceptable English translation. With Emerson and Collar on our side, we teachers of Quebec may surely demand that the study of Latin for its own sake should be abandoned in our province.

ACADEMICUS.

[We are very anxious that our teachers should take advantage of our Correspondence Department, and in preference to a repetition of what has already been said on this score, it may be well to quote the