

Yes, we have reason to complain of multiplicity of subjects. And yet we must face the fact, that owing to the wonderful progress made by science in recent years, subjects of study *must* increase in number. What is the conclusion? Are we to accept Mr. Welldon's verdict that the capacity of pupils is limited, and therefore we must sacrifice the old subjects for the new? And if so, must Greek go? Must Latin go? We need not fear such a calamity. When we read such testimony as the following, from a late Professor of Poetry at Oxford, we may be sure that Latin and Greek must stay:

"The thorough study of English literature . . . is hopeless unless based on an equally thorough study of the literatures of Greece and Rome."*

Not an easy thing is it to cut adrift from the past. As a veteran† in war and education alike has eloquently put it, "until we can disentangle from the growing structure of to-day the fibres of the far-off centuries, until we draw out from our own lives the warp of the 'loom of time,' we cannot attain to any high culture without an adequate knowledge of that world of the ancients to which we owe so much."

Assuming then that the classics must ever find a place in the curriculum of liberal studies, let us ask whether we teachers are satisfied with the results we secure to-day. If we are, then are we indeed in a sorry plight. Is there not a widespread feeling that only too seldom do we inspire in our pupils a love and appreciation for the great literatures of Rome and Greece? Nay, do we not often see that after all their years of training our pupils are scarcely able to translate correctly a page of Cæsar

or Xenophon, while greater writers are unknown to them? One need not be lynx-eyed to perceive this.

The fault lies in the methods employed. *Nos consules desumus*. We must so teach that we shall produce greater results. We must be progressive. The older methods were admirable under older conditions. When two-thirds of a school-boy's time was given to classics, when Latin was begun at the age of five, and Greek of seven, when boys had read all Virgil and Horace and Tacitus, the greater part of Homer and Sophocles and Demosthenes, before they entered college, then the old methods were reasonable enough.

But now we must economize time. Can we still secure thoroughness in teaching? Practical men say yes, and practical men have succeeded in the experiment. It is in the schools that improvement must begin, for in the colleges and universities the structure must be built up upon the foundation prepared, and where this is unsound or weak, that will be weak or unsound also.

Under the present system, then, we fail to give our students a reading power in Latin and Greek. As Professor Hale puts it, "What they get is not the power to read Latin—to confine what I have to say to that language—but the confirmed habit of attempting to 'dig out' the meaning by a slow, painful and dangerous process. We set our students to work at learning to read Latin by a method founded on unreason—a method very similar, except in its lack of the element of pleasurable success, to that by which Jack Horner, in the nursery rhyme, got the treasures of the pudding dish into his mouth—a method which refuses to think the thought as the Roman thought it, and substitutes instead a process of hunting up one thing, wherever it may be in the length and breadth of the sentence, and

* Palgrave, "Province and Study of Poetry."

† Dr. Gildersleeve, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University.