

stupid encounters with a few barbarians. The fiery eloquence of Cicero is gone from our schools, two pages of which eloquence, even though laboriously learned, is worth more as a literary training than a whole volume of Cæsar's inconsequential self-laudation. Homer is threatened and Virgil exists only sufferance. Truly our High Schools are becoming gymnasiums of the severest order. Mental athletes and linguistic giants are the ideal aimed at. But I fear we are helping to turn out a soulless, tasteless and untoward generation. To quote the words of a gentleman to whom the High Schools owe much: "The theory has been that the High Schools should supply the foundation of grammatical knowledge, on which the University is supposed to erect a literary edifice." Whether the University, in the department of classics, recognizes such ideals as would enable it to do what it ought towards erecting this literary edifice, it is not for me to say. However I hope to be pardoned if I express the opinion that in many University utterances on the subject there appears a tendency to adopt modern Language ideals with modern language attention to technical details and practical familiarity with the tongues as living mediums of communicating thought. Now Latin and Greek are dead, so far as communicating thought is concerned, and there is no use in trying to resurrect them. They live only as the embodiment of a literature, artistically perfect, and affording material for mental development and literary refinement. But I am discussing High School, not University, ideals. I would therefore remark that whatever be the success at present of the University in erecting a "literary edi-

fice" on the High School foundation (and looking back to some of the lectures I enjoyed as a student, I cannot but recognize that then the classics were treated as literature). I feel it my duty to point to the vast majority of our High School students with whom the University has no opportunity of erecting any kind of edifice at all, as I have already said.

We should not lose sight of these.

I believe increased attention to "methods" induced by our training institute system has been in classics not an unmixed blessing. It has, I fear, led to a cold, mechanical and intensely scientific mode of treating the study. There is a danger in overdoing "methods." To a dilettante in the art of teaching it is a most fascinating danger, but it is the danger of narrowing the attention down to the manner of doing, to the exclusion of that wider view which involves why we do. The more perfect the method the more mechanical becomes the art. Now in classics we want, above all things, soul. I would gladly content myself with a little less "method."

For the purpose of summarizing, I will embody the views set forth in this paper in the form of a resolution which at some convenient time I may submit to the vote of my classical brethren.

"That in the High School the study of classics should be treated more as a study of literature:

"That the aim should be to impress the youngest pupil with a lasting sense of the attractiveness of the literature, as an inspiration and model for literary excellence:

"That a course having this object in view should be arranged for our primary and junior leaving classes."