

several seniors appear solicitous, almost anxious, about his future welfare. They have furniture, books, etc., to dispose of at an enormous reduction. Will he inspect them? He would inspect anything in those days, and he at once assents. Some of the articles are damaged or broken, but he is assured they are all the better for that, and he hears much talk about the venerable traditions attached to such and such things. So he pays for the traditions and obtains the article. After his room is furnished he is at liberty to look about him and to see how he can use his time to the best advantage, and it is at this point that many mistakes are made. For some immediately drop into an easy-going, indolent style of life, which they never entirely shake off during their university course. Sometime or other they will be compelled to make up for the time lost by the same hard work which they took so much trouble to avoid during their erratic career at college. Others fall into the opposite error, and strive, for the first month perhaps, to include the whole curriculum in their course of study. The result is that many of them become so disgusted with their want of success that they drop everything but what is strictly necessary. This is a case of misdirected enthusiasm, and consequently of violent reaction. One honor course is enough, aye, more than enough, for the great majority. Radical profundity can only be expected in one branch, but as a set-off to the exclusiveness of one line of study a student should join the literary society, an athletic club, and wield the pen on behalf of his college paper. If a student were to devote himself, as every loyal student should, to the literary society and the college paper, he would be surprised at his own facility in writing and speaking at the end of three years. The popularity of a student in a college is no more determined by his stand at the examinations than it is by the amount of money he possesses, but he is judged by his zeal and loyalty for college customs and institutions, by the social and literary qualities which he possesses, by the liberal distribution of his time and talents in the interest of his Alma Mater and fellow students. After all when a man leaves college it is not the stiff course which he has taken that will remain longest in the "invidious halls where memory dwells," but his fondest recollections will be of the literary institute with all its keen cross-firing and persiflage, its votes of censure and want of confidence.

ACHILLES' SHIELD.

It has before now been remarked by Homeric scholars that the description of Achilles' shield occupies a somewhat anomalous position in the "Iliad." Viewed on the one hand, it would seem as if the description were out of place—indeed, it might be looked upon as a complete poem in itself—whilst on the other, it is plain that Homer led up to a description of the shield by a series of intro-

ductory events. An argument commonly urged against the genuineness of the "shield" is founded on the length and stilted character of the description. Grote indeed admits the force of this argument, and concedes the possibility that the "Shield of Achilles" may be an interpolation—perhaps the work of another hand. That the length of the description should be an argument against the genuineness of the passage is not at all conclusive. Events have been hastening to a crisis up to the end of Book XVII., but this action is checked by the "*Oplopœia*" in Book XVIII. Yet it is quite in accordance with Homer's manner to introduce between two series of important events an interval of events wholly different in character from those of either series. This we notice in Books IX. and X. Here the appeal to Achilles and the night adventure of Diomed and Ulysses are interposed between the first great victory of the Trojans and the struggle in which Patroclus is slain and Agamemnon, Ulysses, Diomed and others wounded. Indeed in such an arrangement admirable taste and judgment is exhibited, and the contrast between action and inaction is conceived in the true poetic spirit. As a rule there is scarcely a noted author whose works do not afford instances of corresponding contrasts. How skillfully Shakespeare for example has interposed the "bald disjointed chat" of the sleepy porter between the conscience-wrought horror of Duncan's murderers and the "horror, horror, horror" which "tongue nor heart could not conceive nor name" of his followers. In Dickens' works the same thing is to be observed, and his contrasts between the humorous and pathetic are very effective.

Scarcely any one, I think, can read a description of the shield without wondering that Homer should describe the shield of a mortal hero as adorned with so many and such important objects. Amongst others we find the sun, moon, stars—objects better fitted to adorn the temple of a deity than the shield of a hero. Even on the *Ægis* of Zeus much less descriptive talent has been expended; indeed it is dismissed in five lines, while one hundred and thirty are employed in the description of the celestial and terrestrial objects depicted on the shield of Achilles.

Another circumstance which attracts notice is the disproportionate importance attached to the shield as compared to the rest of the armour, the description of which is disposed of in four lines. Undoubtedly the shield formed the principal portion of a hero's armour. Still that is not sufficient reason to account for such a disproportion in the description.

But apart from all this is the occurrence, in a poem ascribed to Hesiod, of the description of the "Shield of Hercules," which is undoubtedly only another version of the "Shield of Achilles." That this is not Hesiod's work there can be but little doubt, as it exhibits no trace of his dry, didactic style. Some have ascribed the "Shield of Hercules" to an imitator of Homer, but a comparison of the two descriptions shews us that in many places they