

shall take all the precious time placed at our disposal for cultivating his heart and drawing out his imagination and spend it on teaching him the all-important intricacies of Attic prose idiom or setting him puzzles in elaborate drama. And that is the means by which we are going to pave the way for a national literature and a national taste for literature in Canada.

And now a word or two on another contention. "As things are at present Greek is not and cannot be taught properly in our High Schools. Hence drop Homer." It is asserted that Greek in the schools at present is a farce, for junior matriculants have no intelligent grasp of the simplest principles of Greek prose structure, let alone any appreciation or understanding of Homer's poetry.<sup>1</sup> I have heard this statement made by those who draw the conclusion that rather than see Greek continued on that basis they would prefer to see it banished altogether. Now, in the first place, I do not believe that Greek is taught in any such slipshod manner in our schools or in any considerable number of them. In the second place, supposing it is true, I do not regard that as a reason for banishing Greek, or even Homer. If it is true, is it not a reflection on our Universities and their examiners, who year after year have been passing as properly prepared candidates who know practically nothing about Greek? For my part I do not believe it. And if I did, I should urge as the remedy, not dropping Greek, but dropping the examiners. What are High School Inspectors for, what are test examinations for, if not to see that subjects considered necessary for the school programme shall be properly taught? If candidates are palming off translations which they have learnt from "cribs" and which they cannot construe, then I say it is time the examiners should see to it.

But, it is said, it is impossible to teach junior matriculants properly both Xenophon and Homer. If that is the case, there is good ground for proposing that Homer be deferred. However, I claim that it is possible, that there is ample time, provided there is the disposition and the ability. If there is any fault at all, it is not that too much is expected, but that what is expected is not satisfactorily attempted. One does not care to be personal, but there are questions where personal experience ought to have weight in support of one's arguments. The writer was ready to matriculate in Greek as young as any one ought to matriculate, and looking back now with his added experience he feels confident that when he began to study Homer his knowledge of one book of Xenophon was an adequately intelligent one. And that is all that ought to be required.

Now to summarize. The study of Greek in our schools ought to be made a study of literature, in its æsthetic as well as in its intellectual aspect. The minute acquaintance with the language and the facility in writing it ought to be left to the advanced studies of those who wish to become classical scholars. The intellectual side of Greek should be presented first, and emphasized sufficiently to give pupils an intelligent grasp of the accidence and syntax of the language, nothing more. Then the æsthetic side should be immediately brought forward and, with no more attention to grammatical forms than is absolutely necessary to ensure intelligent translation, should be treated in a manner calculated to leave an æsthetic impression deep and abiding on the pupil's mind. That this ought to be done surely no one will dispute. That it can be done I leave it to those who have had experience and have thought over the matter carefully to decide.