

nates in a desire to give scope to particular ability. So she decides a man may be dignified with the degree of B.A., an essentially literary degree, without knowing a word of either of these languages, which are the very foundation head of all modern literature.

Had Harvard decided to admit a man to the degree, say, of Bachelor of Science, without a knowledge of the Classics, we would not have seen anything to condemn; for that is a degree implying something radically different from the degree of B.A.

As regards Farrar, much of his great fame is traceable to his Classical attainments. We think he might have passed through the world unheard of had he lacked his knowledge of ancient languages. But Canon Farrar, we believe, never meant that the Classics should be removed from the list of necessary studies in the Arts curriculum, but simply that they should not monopolize the largest part of a student's time at college, so as to exclude other studies. Or, perhaps, his view is like that which we have pointed out as being the one held in Harvard. Of this, however, we have great doubts.

With this strong modern tendency we are little in sympathy. We oppose it from conviction, and we think it can without any very great difficulty be combatted.

The time was when Latin and Greek were essential to a college curriculum, but in due time Greek was made optional, and French and German allowed in its place. According to recent events even this was an insufficient innovation. Latin now is beginning to fare like Greek in one of the greatest seats of learning in the United States.

Now, we propose to deal with this subject in the following way:

*First*, to point out how in our opinion those two languages gained such a supremacy in seats of learning; *Secondly*, we hope to give a rapid sketch of the status of Classical learning in England from the time of the Reformation up to the present century; *Thirdly*, let us consider some of the objections made to Classical study; and *Lastly*, permit us to state a few reasons which seem to us sufficient to justify pursuing a course of study in these languages. First, then, how did they secure such a manifest supremacy in seats of learning?

This question will require a somewhat lengthy answer; but if space can be allowed in the JOURNAL, we shall strive to give our opinion on the subject.

Greece deserves to be considered first, because, though never reaching the height of power obtained by Rome, yet it is on Greek literature that Latin literature is based. Rome did transcend Greece in the extent of her material empire. Roman legions traversed Greece in triumph. But the intellectual empire belonged as indisputably to Greece as the material to Rome. Roman youths delighted to go to Athens, the greatest university of the time, and study the language of Homer, of Plato, and of Thucydides. The Romans themselves confess their indebtedness to the Greeks. In one field, however, they are

independent; and as one of them delighted to say,—"Satire is all our own." It is quite a remarkable phenomenon that the Greek language should have been retained in general use even after the civilized world was brought under Roman dominion. But so it was, and we think rightly.

The nature of our subject obliges us to give an outline of Greek literature from its origin to the Christian era. We begin with Homer, who probably lived about 850 B.C., in the so-called Mythical Age. He has bequeathed to us poems which by the most eminent scholars are regarded as master-pieces. We mention the honored names of the Iliad and Odyssey, besides which Homer wrote several hymns, among others hymns to Apollo, Hermes, etc. It would be unjust to thrust in here the question of the Homeric controversy of Wolff and of his school of criticism. These works form the grand starting point of Greek literature to us. No doubt there were many poems written by Greek bards prior to this time; but so far as we in the 19th century are concerned Homer's works must head the list. Then we come to Hesiod, whose *Works and Days*, and *Theogonia* are still extant, besides a short poem called the *Shield of Hercules*.

Let us hasten on, passing over the name of Anacreon, till we come to Pindar, the great lyric poet of Greece and Æschylus, the first and greatest of Greek tragedians. We have now reached the stirring times following the Persian wars.

From this time till the close of the Peloponnesian war, Greece did much in the literary line. The tragedians, Sophocles and Euripides, the comic poet Aristophanes, the historians Herodotus, Xenophon and Thucydides, and the philosopher Plato, are to be assigned to this period, or at any rate to a period immediately subsequent to this.

The glory of Athens no longer shone as a military power after the conclusion of the Peloponnesian war; but her literary dominion still continued to assert itself, and that triumphantly.

In our sketch we soon reach the names of the orators Demosthenes and Æschines, the former of whose speech *De Corona* Jebb calls the greatest ever uttered.

We must now mention the name of the philosopher Aristotle. We have now reached the conclusion of the 3rd century B.C. Probably about the year 280 B.C., the LXX. translation of the Old Testament was made at Alexandria, which shows how the Greek language had spread. It had been winning its way abroad, and serving in that age the purposes of French in the times of Charles the Second. We must mention two more names, which will bring our synopsis down to the time of the Advent of our Lord. Theocritus, the Bucolic poet, whom Virgil imitated in his Eclogues, flourished about 272 B.C., and Polybius the historian flourished about 167 B.C. We leave the Greek language with this rich literature, which has been the delight of all succeeding generations, and we pass to the Latin. A very few words will suffice, a ours