

ligion of the future, is new in the world. Nor would the Greeks—save only Socrates—have understood that comradeship of which Walt Whitman is the apostle. Terence had a “divine conceit of godlike amity” between all men when he wrote the noble line, *Homo sum: humani nihil a me alienum puto*. But this sympathy was, on the whole, born of the intellect, not of the heart. Their human interest was rather the interest of an intense intellectual curiosity. Of such sympathy as we have felt they, with the rest of the ancient world, knew little. Much less that rare human love which sees the face of a man—mar it as you will—transfigured. Thirdly, the classical literature lacks almost, if not entirely, one of the highest qualities of the imagination. There is in Northern literature a solemn grandeur of imagination which would have jarred strangely on the Greeks, and which the Romans would not have understood. Yet these three qualities belong to the man who is, in a true sense, liberally educated.

Let me, in conclusion, take up briefly some practical considerations. I have tried at some length to show that classics and English form the true philological basis of a liberal education. It follows at once from this that English and classics should be made to work together through our entire secondary and university education. The teacher of English and the teacher of classics should have a clear conception of the interrelation of their work, and should themselves work together. In truth the inter-dependence and specific efforts of the various educational subjects have as yet been scarcely considered.

This is not an occasion for treating of the university study of classics. What should be in the main the true course of classical study in higher education you will easily infer from

the foregoing, and the rest of my remarks must be confined to High School work. The real nature of classical training has already been discussed, and I think that many of you will agree with me that during the first three or four years it is identical with that of mathematics in one respect, namely, in the power they give of concentrating thought. From this arises the inevitable suggestion, Might not literature and science replace with benefit some of the mathematics? Sir Wm. Hamilton's famous words occur to many of you, “If we consult reason, experience, and the common testimony of ancient and modern times, none of our intellectual studies tend to cultivate a smaller number of the faculties in a more partial or feeble manner than mathematics.” If one's rash object were to attack this time-honoured study, he could finish himself with an unlimited supply of *ὠκεία βέλγη* without going farther than Sir William Hamilton's essay, wherein he collects the “common testimony of ancient and modern times.” I have no such wish but will simply say that when I reflect upon what is to be the future of most of our pupils, and what is the culture most needed by our elementary teachers, the amount of time given in the past to mathematics in comparison with literature and science seems to me, in the highest degree, unreasonable. The greater part of our High School work is practically the work of the German *real schools*. Yet in these German schools, where they do not study classics at all, you will find from the time table given by Mr. Bird that Euclid would not be taken up until a pupil would, with us, have spent perhaps a term or two in the High School, and Algebra not until two years later.

Perhaps no subject interests a teacher of classics when he begins