

himself with the tools for his own professional work which the progress of education and of modern thought, in every subject, imperatively demand that he should be supplied with. This is a matter that every true, conscientious teacher must debate with himself. In these days, however, it is a crime that any one should undertake the duties of an educator, and yet go on, from year to year, in absolute ignorance of the lights that break in upon every department of his work, as the result of the profound thought and the unwearying research of the age. What a man himself misses in keeping himself uninformed of the activities of the intellectual workers of the time, in every region in which modern thought is ceaselessly in operation, should be a matter of the keenest regret, but in his relation to his work, it is nothing short of calamitous that the great mass of the profession should content themselves with even the most liberal attainments of a bye-gone age while a new world of thought has been ushered in, in the past generation, the effect of which should be to make us all the humblest and most reverent of learners in the school of the new era that has dawned upon the race. But let us not be told that this revival of our student days is mainly a matter of expense for which teachers are not compensated by their employers. This is low ground to take in resisting the impelling motives to keep abreast with the thought of the time, which, if not undertaken for the love of knowledge, *per se*, is not worth the effort to acquire otherwise. The pecuniary rewards of the educator in Canada, we know, are not such as tend to the elevation of the teaching profession, but the allurements to learning are surely not those that are baited solely by the professional prizes in the hands of School Trustees. Even on this ground, however, pin-hole views of the professional equipment of the educator do not pay, and it would be well that this truth had its full weight upon the minds of those, particularly, who look to teaching as a life work.

discusses the question "Shall we Give up Greek?" in an article which is forcible and interesting, but which by no means shows a full appreciation of the real issues involved in the controversy concerning "classical training," a controversy, as he remarks, of periodical recurrence; and which a recent proposal to abandon Greek in some of the Cambridge examinations has brought once more into prominence in England. Mr. Freeman considers the question from a general point of view, and not in relation to the details of Cambridge work. But, even granting that, as Mr. Freeman says, in such a discussion "we come across the old facts and the old fallacies; the old arguments come forth again to be met by the old answers," he does not, in his article, touch upon those facts—old or new—which are really the vital ones, and which must weigh down the balance against ultra-classicism, unless met by something better than a re-statement of the "old answers" which have all the weakness, but little of the dignity of age. Mr. Freeman's arguments in favour of the study of the dead languages are valid enough as against the exclusive modernists; a school of extremists who merit the sympathy of moderate and reasonable thinkers almost (though not quite) as little as do the exclusive classicists. He urges a broader teaching of Greek and Latin, which shall place them in their proper philological connection with the modern languages, in lieu of the present narrow system which has erected artificially a "middle wall of partition which is against use" between "ancient" and "modern" tongues; which wall, as Mr. Freeman says, "it is the great object of the Comparative method to sweep away." He deprecates that pedantry which confines the study of the Greek and Latin literatures to certain stages in the development of each, which it dubs as exclusively "correct" and "classical," regarding other stages as unworthy of attention; and would have the ancient tongues studied intelligently and liberally in their relations to the general history of language and of mankind. Now, with Mr. Freeman's arguments, as far as they

---

EDWARD A. FREEMAN, the historian, in the February number of the *Fortnightly Review*,