

understanding of previous lessons. Consequently the exercise of translation will afford the training of these two faculties.

Proceeding he will have to express in his own language the idea contained in the text. He will be obliged to revolve this idea in his mind, extract from the context its precise nature, and express it in exact words of his own. A study of his own words will be necessary that he may give an accurate expression, one containing "the precise shade of meaning," as our professor would say. As a result while engaged in translating, the student is also learning his own language, augmenting his vocabulary, and learning the divers meanings and groupings of words, figures of speech, etc. The rendition of the text should not be the servile task of a copyist or the process of lifting a veil from the face of a picture, but an exercise requiring the whole strength of the intellect and the originality of the student. It may be asked, can he not do as well by translating our modern writers? No, undoubtedly not. Because our modern European languages are too much allied and the genius of the dead languages differs so widely from that of the modern, that while a literal or almost literal translation of the latter will suffice, the same will not do for the former. The mental practice afforded by the translation of contemporary languages is insignificant compared with that of the ancient.

And, lastly, the notions acquired by thoughts inspired to an intelligent student by well selected extracts is of considerable importance. As an accompaniment to historical study familiarity with the ancients through translation is invaluable. The student is enabled to view these peoples, the sturdy Roman and polished Greek, in their homes, in their council-chambers and on their battle-fields, learn their customs and habits, hear them speak and think their thoughts, often grand and noble, all of which under a

competent teacher is bound to be of benefit to him. You may say that we should not seek to learn from pagans, but from the moderns who are Christians. When you eradicate all the paganism from modern writings you may claim the privilege of making this retort.

These are the reasons for our belief in the utility and necessity of classical study, and we think them good, all other arguments to the contrary.

But whence comes the cry for the substitution of the ancient by the modern classics? From the utilitarianism of the day. The advocates of the new method aver the greater utility of the modern languages. But we greatly question the greater utility of a knowledge of living languages, which the ordinary individual will never have a chance to speak, over the benefit of studying the ancient tongues. The principle implied in such contention is decidedly erroneous, for if we are to adjust our education to the standard daily used, the time will come when a commercial training will replace a liberal education. We are not all born to be master-merchants dealing with many nations and using many tongues. Let the ancient classics be retained, their study will obtain their appreciation, both on account of their own value and the utility of their study, and of those who appreciate them none will consent to their being cancelled from College work.

EXCHANGES.

The *De Pauw Record* says, in an editorial, that there is a re-action setting in in favor of the study of classics. That there should be any need of such a movement, is indeed greatly to be deplored. For the study of the ancient languages is, beyond doubt, a source of the highest mental culture. Experiments made in Germany to test which course better develops the intellect, showed clearly that the curriculum in which Latin and Greek