

ing the study of our native tongue more and more a delight, therefore more and more fascinating; and as an inevitable sequence, more and more profitable.

"It cannot be controverted that Latin, as some one has recently written, is the most valuable and loyal handmaid in securing that accurate and discriminating use of the English language which is the sign and seal of the educated and cultured. I therefore deprecate the force and fervor of that movement, now gathering strength, which will permit some modern language to usurp the place which rightly belongs to Latin, and for which there is no adequate alternative."

I may have laid myself open to the charge of evading the real question at issue, in what I have so far said, but I think I can justify myself, for in the answer I have tried to give to the question, "Why has Latin a place in the school curriculum?" lies the solution of the other problem, namely, the selection of a method of Latin pronunciation.

If we teach Latin on account of its influence on the development of our own language and because it is of incalculable value to the child in getting a thorough working mastery of his mother-tongue, then it is not hard to see which method of pronunciation is best adapted to the object in view. The *Roman* method is no doubt interesting—to the scholar, to the antiquarian, to the enthusiastic searcher after historical truth; and we owe a debt of gratitude to the men whose diligent labors have thus restored to us the pronunciation of the ancients. But will this improved method of sounding vowels and consonants in a way strange to English ears be of any assistance to us in making Latin the "handmaid" of English?

Even if it be not true that, as has

been remarked, the approach to the true pronunciation of Latin furnished by the Roman method is "so far away that were Cicero—I beg his pardon—were Kikero to come to life again and hear some of us at this *near* pronunciation, he would either not be able to understand us or immediately die of an apoplexy of chargin or laughter;" that the introduction of the Roman method into our schools would and could have no other effect than to uselessly disturb the existing condition of things; that there is an evident lack of internal uniformity in the pronunciation which results from an adoption of this method; that there is something in the rumor that some of the advocates of the Roman pronunciation have now an inclination to recede from the stand taken so confidently by them a few years ago; even if these things be *not* true, there is a better argument than is to be found in any of them against the use of the Roman method of pronunciation in our schools, and it is this: Will it help us to make the most educational capital possible out of the analogies between the two languages—Latin and English? Will the person who hears the English word *Ciceronian* understand its significance as well if he has been taught that the Roman orator was called *Kikero*, as he would if, like most of us here, he knew of him as Cicero? Will he as readily grasp the meaning of the expression, "So-and-so is a very Crœsus" if he has never heard of the Lydian king except as *Kroisoos*? Or take almost any word derived from the Latin. For instance, will the child who is acquainted with the Latin noun *vigil* or the one who has only heard of *wriggle* get the better conception of the English word *vigil*, or the more readily understand the poet when he says, "So they in heaven their odes and *vigils* tuned"?

My examples may not be the best