

destined for law or theology, who will need Latin and Greek, is much less than those whose object is simply a liberal culture, and very considerably less than the number of those pupils who can obtain only a portion of our secondary education. Moreover, the acquisition of a language for a practical purpose of this nature is a very different thing. It is not educational. If possible, we reside where the language we need is the only one spoken, we steep ourselves in its books and newspapers, and drink it in at every pore. If we cannot go to those who speak it, we undertake it in precisely the same spirit with which one would study shorthand, with the full knowledge, as Signor Mantelini would put it, that it is a "demmed horrid grind." The method we adopt in our schools is a compromise, and not better than a compromise must generally be. What a speaking knowledge of either language may be worth as an accomplishment, it is not needful to discuss. We have Marsh's word for it, that the strain on the memory is very serious, and Mr. Hamerton—no mean authority—affirms that no one has ever spoken two languages perfectly at the same time. It is at least a matter for consideration whether Latin should not be regarded as a necessary part of primary education, but I shall keep to our High School work. By a very simple example we can see the character of elementary training in Latin. Take a dog-eared copy of the great general's commentaries, our boys' first construing book, and open at random. The brave fellow who led the way by leaping from his ship on the first landing near Dover said, *Ego certe meum reipublicæ atque imperatori officium præstitero*. The sentence is as simple as one can easily find. The ordinary specimen of boy will set forth: "I certainly will do my duty to the republic and general." Then you begin, and he learns these lessons:

1. That in translating *præstitero* by "I will do," he overlooks the tense in the same way that has heretofore called down wrath upon him.

2. If this rouses him, and you force him to *think*, he observes that here is a superiority of Latin over English in the use of the tenses.

3. He may then notice the unusual appearance of *ego* and *meum*, and reason out that they are emphatic—another advantage of Latin, since italics alone will do this in English, an uninflected language.

4. Then, like Agassiz, in the famous story told of him, we wait for him to notice something else—that *meum* and *officium* are so far separated. He sees the advantage of this and the impossibility of it in English. Here is a valuable lesson in arrangement in English and Latin.

5. Then you ask him if *certainly* and *to* are the natural words, and if he is Macaulay's typical schoolboy he will give, without delay, "at any rate" and "by," and you probe him for the reason. By this time your boy might repress a yawn if part of his English study were not of the same nature and he did not see that the two were working together—a very important thing.

Then follows of course the usual memory-training in reviewing the accident of the sentence, and you might fire a parting shot at him by betraying him into retranslating *office* by *officium*. This is a fair sample of any day's lesson in the first term of translating. A Latin period would have occupied too much time. But here we have distinct training of accuracy, observation, practical logic, caution, taste and a valuable little lesson in English. Too much importance can hardly be attached to this comparative study of English and Latin. The opportunities of deducing and employing the great law of composition are countless. The very next sentence begins *Hoc quum*.