

life, the English higher secondary schools give a training which is universally admitted to be the best thing of its kind in existence. They train leaders of men. This is very largely due to two things: first, because they are chiefly boarding schools—and a big boarding house at an English public school is a miniature world, the boys at the top having duties of administration and of responsible oversight. Secondly, it depends a good deal on the tradition of organised school games. They teach a boy to think of his side rather than of himself: to clench his teeth and put the thing through.

In saying this, you will understand that I don't mean to advocate athleticism as the final cause of education. But athletic interests are valuable in their way, as the gentleman knew who put the advertisement in the *Church Times*:—"Little boy, whose cricket is promising, can be received at once in high class school in health resort for nominal fees."

(2) It should not be forgotten that, in former times, secondary education was only possible for the few, and that its curriculum had the special purpose of preparing boys for the more literary of the liberal professions.

This has left a very deep mark on the studies and traditions of our higher secondary schools.

An American writer gives it as his opinion that "the study of a dead language makes the student mentally, no less than physically, stoop-shouldered and short-sighted."

Of course (not to mince words) that is silly; but all the same we may question whether in some schools some other form of intellectual discipline might not be made as searching and found more appropriate. Personally, I think that for the highest grade of education, though there may be other things as good, there is nothing better as a basis than a really first rate classical training.

On this point, however, three provisos seem necessary.

(a) Classical education, as we know it at its best in England, is not undiluted Latin and Greek, but Latin and Greek language, history and literature, used as vehicles for general culture. You will remember Dr. Arnold's remark, that the 6th and 7th books of Thucydides are not ancient but modern history.

(b) In intellectual discipline, quality matters at least as much as subject matter. The substitute for a good classical education will have to be very good indeed. Slipshod French and inaccurate German won't do the same work that Latin and Greek do in a first grade higher school. And it is not easy to change a great educational tradition quickly. When you have a good teacher, of ripe experience and great influence, it would be madness to lose him. In all education quality matters, not quantity. And the higher the grade of education the truer this is.

(c) A great educational tradition is one of the most precious things in the world. It is the outcome of generations of hidden self-sacrifice. It is the living influence which makes a school great.

The history of education teaches no lesson so frankly as this—that reform is always possible, but that sudden revolution is always disastrous.

(3) There seem to be at least four main types of curriculum which are at present needed in secondary education—the fully classical, the semi-classical (i.e., Latin but no Greek), the predominantly scientific, and that which takes living languages alone, as the basis of a training based predominantly on linguistic discipline. All four, with some sub-varieties, seem indispensable. So long as all are made as good as brain, adequate equipment, and devoted service can make them, there is no cause to arrange them in a hierarchy of educational merit.

I would urge, however, that each alternative curriculum should have a distinct bias. If you give every sub-