Chapter 1

The Justification of Latin as an Instrument of Secondary Education

Bibliography

[1] Page 6

- Laurie, S. S. Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method, Cambridge University Press. 1890. Chapter i. and particularly Chapter vii.
- Chapters on the Aims and Practice of Teaching, edited by Frederic Spencer. Cambridge University Press. 1897. Chapter ii., Latin, by W. L. Paton.
- Fouillee, Alfred. Education from a National Standpoint. London, Arnold. New York, Appleton. 1892.
- Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre fur hohere Schulen, herausgegeben von A. Baumeister. Munich. C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1898. Didaktik und Methodik ..er einzelnen Lehrfacher. III. Lateinisch, von P. Dettweiler.
- Boyesen, H.H.; Brandt, H. C. G.; Sachs, Julius; Mackenzie, James C.; and others, in Proceedings of the First Annual Convention (1893) of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland. Published for the Association. Philadelphia. 1894. pp. 38-64.
- Paulsen, Friedrich. Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitaten. Leipzig. 1885. Veit & Comp. Particularly Schlussbetrachtung." pp. 755-784.

[1] Only the more important recent literature is here cited.

- Harris, W. T. On the Function of the Study of Latin and Greek in Education. Journal of Social Science. 1885.
- Harris, W. T. A Brief for Latin. EDUCATIONAL REVIEW. April, 1899.
- Peck, Tracy. Discussion in SCHOOL REVIEW. 1893. pp. 593 ff. Shorey, Paul. Discipline vs. Dissipation. SCHOOL REVIEW. 1897. pp. 217 ff.
- Col1ar, W. C.; Burgess, Isaac; Manny, Frank. Proceedings of the National Educational Association. 1896. pp. 563 ff.
- Bennett, C. E. Latin in the Secondary School. SCHOOL REVIEW. May,1893.
- Spencer, Herbert. Education, Intellectual, Moral, and Physical. London, Williams & Norgate. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1861.
- Bain, Alexander. Education as a Science. London, Kegan Paul & Co. New York, D. Appleton & Co. 1881.
- Planck, H. Das Recht des Lateinlschen als wissenschaftllchen Bil. dungsmittel. Stuttgart. Schltlprogramm. 1888.
- Schmeding. Die klassische Blldung in der Gegenwart. Berlin. 1885.
- Frary,R. La Question du Latin. Paris. 1890.
- James, Professor Edmund J. The Classical Question in Germany. POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY. January,1884.
- Barnett, F. A. Common Sense In Education and Teaching. Chapter viii. London and New York. Longmans, Green, & Co. 1899.
- Jebb, R. C. Humanism in Education. (Romanes Lecture for 1899.) London. Macmillan & Co. 1899.
- Elliot, C. W. American Contributions to Civilization. New York. The Century Co. 1897.

Page 7

The Question before us.

THE question as to the educational worth of any study must always be a pertinent one. This is particularly true in the case of Latin, which has not only for generations occupied a commanding place in the curriculum of American secondary education, but in recent years has even been winning enormously increased favour among us. Despite the extensive literature on the subject, it has seemed necessary, at the beginning of this volume on the teaching of Latin in the secondary school, to examine afresh the title of Latin to the present respect it enjoys, and to state anew the reasons why it is of value in secondary education. Lest there be any misconception as to the subject of the chapter, it is desirable to emphasize at the outset that the value of Latin as a college study does not here enter into consideration, that question, interesting and important as it is, seems to me entirely distinct from the question as to the value of Latin in the

secondary school. At all events it is to the latter that the present discussion will be confined.

The fundamental importance of the examination proposed hardly needs to be urged. For obviously the general method of instruction to be followed in teaching Latin must depend largely upon the results that the study is capable Page 8
of achieving, and the teacher who fails clearly to apprehend the goal to be attained must necessarily pursue but a groping course in imparting instruction. The recent increase, too, in the number of pupils studying Latin in our secondary schools makes it of increasing importance to get clearly before our minds the functions and purpose of the study. The Statistics of the Commissioner of Education for the United States show that in the eight years prior to 1898 the number of pupils studying Latin in our secondary schools had increased 174 per cent, while the total enrolment of pupils in the secondary schools for the same period had increased but 84 per cent. In other words, the study of Latin has increased more than twice as rapidly as has the enrolment of the secondary school. No thoughtful person can fail to be impressed by these figures. If Latin is not of basal importance in the secondary curriculum, then large numbers of students are making a prodigious error in pursuing the subject ; and the sooner we understand this, the better for our civilization. If, on the other hand, the increase is the result of wise choice or even of wise instinct, we must, while rejoicing at the greater recognition Latin is securing, at the same time admit our own vastly increased responsibility for its wise direction and promotion.

Before considering the special reasons that exist in favor of studying Latin, let us first consider the function of language in general as an instrument of education.

Educational Function of Language in General.

The function of education is confessedly to prepare pupils to be useful members of society. To make them such, it is essential that they be taught to understand as fully as possible the nature and character of the national life – social, civil, political, religious -in which they are born or in which their lot is cast. To a certain extent, also, it is essential that they learn to apprehend the Page 9
nature and character of the larger life of the race.

What now is the instrument best adapted to the attainment of this end? It is language. As pointed out by Laurie (Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method, chapter i.), language is the supreme instrument in education, i. e. the higher education, because of its universal nature. It promotes intellectual discipline and brings intellectual power, because the study of language brings us at every turn face to face, as nothing else does, with subjects and questions of intellectual concern and intellectual interest. Language deals with ideas, it touches perpetually on problems of the relations of man to man, of man to society, of man to the State. Its analysis demands refinement and nicety of thinking. So long then as ideas are important, and so long as the underlying conceptions which reflect the national life of a people are important, the supreme value of the mastery of these through language study will continue to be recognised.

By the study of language is meant the study of one's own language; but, as will be pointed out later in this chapter, this study of one's own language is achieved incomparably better by the indirect method of studying another

language. Only so can the necessary processes of comparison be effectively instituted. To this it has often been objected that the Greeks, so conspicuous for their brilliant civilization and intellectual life of subsequent ages, studied no language but their own. An excited partisan[2], in the heat of discussion, once went so far as to assert, " Granting the unapproachable perfection of Greek literature, and that the Greeks surpassed the world in philosophical acuteness, the invincible fact remains that they expended no effort in the study of foreign languages, and common sense declares it was because of it." Obviously, if "common sense" declared anything so absurd, it should explain to us why the Hottentots or the Eskimos or the hordes of other barbarians who likewise know no language but their own, have not been similarly eminent for their contributions to human thought.

Significance of the Neglect of Language Study by the Greeks.

Page 10

As to the Greeks, it will probably always be impossible to account for the achievements of that wonderful people on the basis of their system of education. What they accomplished seems rather the result of an inexplicable national endowment. Their fine aesthetic sense, their keen speculative capacity, are as difficult to account for as the unique genius of the Romans for political organization, for government, and for law, or the profound sense of moral obligation to a higher power so impressively formulated by the Hebrews, - as difficult to explain as the rise of a Charlemagne in the eighth century or an Alfred in the ninth. Great as the Greeks were by endowment, they certainly were not great for their attainments. With all their highly developed aesthetic sense and their subtle speculative acumen, they were manifestly deficient in the capacities which it is the function of modern education to develop, namely, a just understanding of the problems of society, an understanding which shall secure and promote the stability of the social and political organism. Had the Greeks been as well educated as they were highly gifted, it is likely that their own national life would have run a longer and a more glorious course, and that their great legacy to posterity would thus have been immensely increased.

Page 11

At all events, the fact that the Greeks, despite their neglect of language study, nevertheless attained a certain national greatness in some directions, cannot be cited as disproving the educative value of such study for us to-day.

What, now, are the reasons for studying Latin in the secondary school? What are the effects of the study upon the pupil that are at present so potent not merely in maintaining its status but in extending its vogue? These reasons are several, and I shall enumerate them in what seems to me the order of their importance.

Reasons for Studying Latin.

First and foremost, I should say Latin is of value because it confers a mastery over the resources of one's mother tongue[3] This mastery comes as the direct and necessary result of careful daily translation, –a process involving on the one hand a careful consideration and analysis of the thought of the author read,

Training in the Vernacular

[2]Professor E. L. Youmans in the POPULAR SCIENCE MONTHLY for December, 1883, p. 270, b.

[3]This is not meant in the narrow sense of a mere understanding of the *meanings* of words; it is the mastery of ideas of which words are but the symbols, and the assimilation of these into one's own intellectual life, that I have in mind.

and on the other a severe and laborious comparison of the value of alternative English words, phrases, and sentences, with the consequent attainment of skill in making the same effective as vehicles of expression. No one, I think, will undertake to deny that the results here claimed are actual; and if actual, it can hardly be denied that they constitute an important justification for the study of Latin. Training in English, then, as the result of careful translation from Latin is here set down as the first and most important reason for studying Latin. To my own mind this reason weighs more than all others combined, though several other excellent reasons for the study of Latin will be discussed later.

Page 12

Let us examine more in detail how translation from Latin gives such admirable training in English. Translation is a severe exercise. The lexicon or vocabulary tell the meanings of words, and the grammar states the force of inflected forms; but it is only after the pupil, provided with this equipment, has attacked his Latin sentence with a view to translation that the real strugg1e begins. His vocabulary may have given him a dozen or even twenty meanings under a single verb or noun and the pupil must reflect and nicely discriminate before he can choose the right word, the one just suited to the context. Further, his Latin sentence may be long, complex, and periodic, entirely different in structure from anything we know in English; such a sentence must be broken up and so arranged as to conform to our English mode of expression; or the Latin sentence may have one of those Protean ablative absolutes, –an idiom that our English style practically abhors. Every such ablative absolute has to be examined with care prior to an English rendering. It may express time, cause, concession, condition, attendant circumstance, means, or what not, and must be rendered accordingly. Again the Latin sentence may secure by its arrangement of words certain effects of emphasis which English can bring out only by the employment of very different resources.

Analysis of the Process

For the purpose of further illustration, let us take the opening lines of Nepos's life of Miltiades, and note the problems that suggest themselves to the pupil's mind as he endeavours to secure a passable translation for the Latin. The text runs as follows: *Miltiades, Cimonis filius, Atheniensis, cum et antiquitate generis et gloria majorum et sua modestia unus omnium maxime floreret eaque esset aetate ut non jam solum de eo bene sperare, sed etiam confidere cives possent sui talem eum futurum qualem cognitum judicarunt, accidit ut Athenienses Chersonesumcolonos vellent mittere.*

Page 13

Probably the first stumbling-block to the pupil will be the proper rendering for *modestia*. The vocabulary gives 'moderation,' 'modesty,' 'temperance,' 'humility,' 'discretion,' and the questton is, which one of these represents the idea that Nepos is trying to convey. The pupil has to pause and consider. Reflection shows that 'humility' will not do, and 'modesty' is no better . These qualities hardly constitute a title to eminence. The pupil, therefore, turns to 'moderation' or 'temperance.' The latter of these will hardly answer his purpose; it has an unfortunate acquired connotation suggesting predominantly an abstinence from strong drink. Nor will 'moderation' satisfy the pupil's sense of the demands of his native tongue, for we hardly speak of a man eminent for his moderation. Of the five words given for *modestia*, therefore, the last

only, 'discretion,' will answer in the present passage. The pupil then passes to the following words: *unus omnium maxime*. Their literal translation is easy, 'alone of all especially;' but this is jargon, and clearly must be bettered in some way. By reflection, the pupil comes to see that 'alone of all' may be rendered by our 'beyond all others,' or some other equally idiomatic phrase. But here a new problem presents itself, how to join 'especially' with 'beyond all others.' Possibly after a few trials the boy hits upon the device of rendering 'far beyond all others.' Whether this phrase or another be chosen, however, may depend somewhat upon the rendering selected for *floreret*; in fact at each point in a translation the rendering must be regarded as possibly only temporary; one's
Page 14 selection of words and phrases will often require modification as a result of the rendering chosen for other parts of the same sentence. The pupil meets no further special difficulty until he comes to *qualem cognitum judicarunt*. Literally, 'such as they judged him known.' In and of itself, the participle may mean 'if known,' 'though known,' 'when known,' 'since known.' All these possibilities, however, must be weighed before a safe decision can be reached as to the actual meaning here.

But I need not dwell further on the details of the process we are considering. Every teacher knows what it is; he knows that it is serious work, often slow work, but he knows what it means to the pupil who submits to it. He knows that such a pupil is gaining a mastery over the resources of his mother tongue. Positive knowledge, except to a very limited degree, he is not gaining; but he is learning what words mean; he is learning to differentiate related concepts; he is acquiring sense for form and style, and if he be so fortunate as to be endowed with any native gifts of thought himself when he reaches maturer years, he has that indispensable equipment of the educated man, –the capacity to say what he says with directness, clearness, precision, and effect.

There has been a great outcry in recent years about the importance of English, and it has been one with which I think the body of thoughtful men have in large measure sympathized. All have cheerfully acknowedged the great importance of an ablity to use one's native idiom with skill and power. It is because I sympathize so heartily with this sentiment that I enter this defence of translation. It is because translation from Latin to English seems to me such a stimulating, vitalizing exercise, and so helpful to the student who would attain mastery of his own language, –it is because of this that I find full justification for the study of Latin.

Page 15 Perhaps I approach this subject with prejudice, but I can never forget the inspiration of my own early Latin training, nor ever fail in gratitude to the teacher who first suggested to me the boundless resources of our own language, who by his own happy and faithful renderings of Cicero and Virgil stimulated a little class of us to do our best to make our own translations show truth, and strength, and literary form. Can we afford to underrate the value of such discipline? How many a lad has felt his heart kindle and his ambition rise at some happy rendering by mate or teacher? And with what persistence these little niceties of phrase cling to us and influence us? Language is subtle. We cannot explain its charm by any philosophy. But it is the key to literature, and

our own language must ever be the best key to our own literature. How finely Barrie has put this in his story of Tommy! Who that has read that unique description of the essay-contest can have done so without feeling the profound truth it contains? You remember the scene in the old Scotch school-house, –how Tommy and young McLauchlan had been given paper and pen and set to work to write on " A Day in Church " in competition for the Blackadder Prize, and how at the end of the time allotted Tommy had brought himself to scorn for the lack of a word. "What word?" they asked him testily; but even now he could not tell. He had wanted a Scotch word that would signify how many people were in church and it was on the tip of his tongue, but would come no farther. "Puckle" was nearly the word, but it did not mean so many people as he meant. The hour had gone by like winking; he had forgotten all about time while searching his mind for the word. Then the friends who had been waiting in confident expectation of Tommy's victory begin their reproaches. His teacher, Cathro, is Page 16
the first. "What ailed you at 'manzy'?" he cries, "or"–. "I thought of 'manzy,"' replied Tommy, wofully, for he was ashamed of himself "but– but a manzy's a swarm. It would mean that the folk in the kirk were buzzing thegither like bees instead of sitting still."

"Even if it does mean that," says another friend "what was the sense of being so particular? Surely the art of es ay-writing consists in using the first word that comes and hurrying on."

"That's how I did," proudly says McLauchlan, the victorious competitor.

"I see," interposes another friend. "that McLauchlan speaks of there being a mask of people in the church. 'Mask' is a fine Scotch word."

"I thought of 'mask,"' says Tommy, ".but that would have meant the kirk was crammed, and I just meant it to be middling full."

"'Flow' would have done," suggested another .

"Flow"s but a handful."

"'Curran,' then, you jackanapes."

"Curran"s no enough."

The friends throw up their hands in despair.

"I wanted something between 'curran' and 'mask,"' said Tommy, dogged, yet almost at the crying.

Then Ogilvy, the master of the victorious McLauchlar but whose heart is secretly with Tommy, and who with difficulty has been hiding his admiration, spreads a net for him. "You said you wanted a word that meant middling full. Well, why did you not say 'middling full' or 'fell mask' ?"

"Yes, why not?" demanded the others.

"I wanted one word," said Tommy. " You jewel," muttered Ogilvy under his breath.

"It's so easy to find the right word," reproachfully adds another. Page 17

"It's no', it's as difficult as to hit a squirrel." Again Ogilvy nods approval. But Cathro, Tommy's master, can restrain himself no longer. In a burst of fury he seizes Tommy by the neck and runs him out of the parish school of Thrums. As the others offer their congratulations to Ogilvy, master of the victorious

McLauchlan, the school door opens from without, and the face of Tommy, tear-stained and excited, appears once more. "I ken the word now; it came to me a' at once; it is 'hantle."'

"Oh, the sumph!" exclaimed McLauchlan; "as if it mattered what the word is now."

But Ogilvy gives his McLauchlan a push that nearly sends him sprawling, saying in an ecstasy to himself: "He had to think of it till he got it; and he got it."

When Cathro savagely says, "I have one satisfaction ; I ran him out of my school," Ogilvy merely answers, "Who knows but what you may be proud to dust a chair for him when he comes back?"

How many of us know well this quest for the right word! How often we have struggled to find it when it wasn't 'puckle' and it wasn't 'manzy' nor 'mask,' nor 'flow,' nor 'curran,' but 'hantle'! Sometimes we have found it, sometimes we have missed it; but the quest has ever been honourable, and has helped us to find and know the way to truth. Cicero was well aware of the importance of what I am urging when he wrote those memorable words in his *de optimo genere oratorum*. Despite his thorough familiarity with Greek, he confesses that he found it a useful exercise to translate with care from Greek to Latin. In this way he prepared Latin versions of Demosthenes on the Crown and of Aeschines against Ctesiphon, not rendering word for word, but preserving the style and spirit of these two *orationenobilissimiae*, weighing their words, he adds, not counting them.

Cicero's Testimony

Page 18

Compare also what Lowell says. Speaking before the Modern Language Association in 1889 after a life of wide observation and careful reflection upon the problems of education, he says: "In reading such books as chiefly deserve to be read in any foreign language, it is wise to translate consciously and in words as we read. There is no such help to a fuller mastery of our vernacular. It compels us to such a choosing and testing, to so nice a discrimination of sound, propriety, position, and shade of meaning, that we now firsl learn the secret of the words we have been using or misusing all our lives, and are gradually made aware that to set forth even the plainest matter as it should be set forth is not only a very difficult thing, calling for thought and practice, but is an affair of conscience as well. Translation teaches, as nothing else can, not onl) that there is a best way, but that it is the only way. Those who have tried it know too well how easy it is to grasp the verbal meaning of a sentence or of a verse. That is the bird in the hand. The real meaning, the soul of it, that which makes it literature and not jargon, that is the bird in the bush, which tantalizes and stimulates with the vanishing glimpses we catch of it as it flits from one to another lurking-place:

Lowell

> Et fugit ad salices et se cupit ante videri.

Lowell may not have been a great teacher. His limtations in the class-room were probably very pronounced, but that, for all that, he possessed by nature and training a clear sense for what is vital and strengthening in education, I am thoroughly persuaded. At all events, the words I have quoted are the ones I

have always heard commended when mention has been made of the address in which they are found. Page 19

This transcendent importance of translation as bearing upon an increased mastery of one's vernacular is so generally recognised by educators that it seems worth while to cite a few further similar expressions of opinion as to its value. Thus we find Dettweiler declaring (Baumeister's *Handbuch der Erziehungs- und Unterrichtslehre, iii. Lateinish*, p. 22): "We must not forget that the real strength of Latin instruction lies in the recognition of the wide difference of ideas, which is brought out in the choice of words and phrases as one translates from Latin to German. ... These ends we must reach ... by *a constant comparison with the mother tongue*,[4] through the medium *of a much more extensive employment of translation*[5] than has heretofore prevailed." At a later point (pp. 54 ff.) Dettweiler dwells more fully upon this topic. After enumerating a number of special principles to be observed in translation, he goes on to say: "The proper treatment of these and many other points may exercise an absolutely enormous influence upon the pupil's German style. The Latin language in its means and modes of expression is so remote from our own, that the form of translation demands the exercise of a stylistic power the application of which to the pupil must in future constitute one of the noblest tasks of the teachers in our *Gymnasien*. The experience of other countries which is often cited with approval may be utilized in Germany too. In France and Belgium translations from Latin are regarded as an admirable exercise in expression. In England the superior style of the gentry is ascribed to extensive practice in translating, and it is well known how Cicero [see above, p. 17], that supreme stylist, formed his style by practising translation from the Greek. 'Translation from a foreign language,' says one of our most experienced school officials, 'is a lesson in German that cannot be too highly prized, and is, alas! too much neglected. By a good translation, one conforming to the genius of the German language, instruction in German is most effectively promoted.' " To a similar effect are the remarks of Isaac B. Burgess and W. C. Collar as given in the *Proceedings of the National Educational Association*, 1896, pp. 563 ff. ; also those of Laurie, *Lectures on Language and Linguistic Method*, p. 108; Paton, in Spencer's *Aims and Practice of Teaching*, p. 61 ; Shorey, "Discipline vs. Dissipation," in *The School Review*, 1897, p. 228: "Every hour spent by the student in improving the accuracy or elegance of his version is, apart from its practical service in mobilizing his English vocabulary, an unconscious philosophic discipline in the comparison of two sets of conceptual symbols and the measuring against each other of two parallel intellectual outgrowths of the one sensational root of all our knowledge. Every time the student is corrected for washing out in his translation some poetic image found in the original, he receives a lesson in the relation of the symbolizing imagination to thought. As often as he discusses with the teacher a word for which no apt English equivalent can be found, he acquires a new concept and a finer conception of nice distinctions. Whenever an apparently grotesque or Page 20 Dettweiler.

[4]The italics are Dettweiler's, i.e. they correspond to the spaced type of the German.

[5]It is noteworthy that the revised courses of study for the Prussian gymnasia promulgated in 1892 call for increased attention to translation from Latin into German.

senseless expression is elucidated by reference to the primitive or alien religious
Page 21 or ethical conception or institution that gives it meaning, he receives a simple, safe, and concrete lesson in comparative religion, ethics, folklore, anthropology , or institutional history, as the case may be. And as often as he is forced to reconsider, in the light of the context, the mechanically memorized meaning of a word or phrase, he has impressed upon his mind the truth which the student of the more rigid working formulas of the physical sciences is so apt to miss, that words are not unalterable talismans, but chameleon-hued symbols taking shape and color from their associates. The effect of this kind of discipline is unconscious, insensible, and cumulative. It cannot, of course, cancel the inequalities of natural parts; it cannot take the place of practical acquaintance with life and accurate knowledge of a special trade or profession. But pursued systematically through the plastic years of youth, it differentiates the mind subjected to it by a flexibility, delicacy, and nicety of intellectual perception which no other merely scholastic and class-room training can give in like measure."

Translation *vs.* Original Composition.

The English training derived from such careful translation as above described seems to me greatly superior to that gained by the usual methods of English composition. Original composition must necessarily deal only with the ideas already present in the pupil's mind. How elementary and crude these are in case of the pupils in our secondary schools, is a fact sufficiently familiar to us all. The reflective period has not usually begun at the age when the pupil enters upon the secondary education; he finds it difficult to write an English theme because he has nothing to write about. But set before him a passage of Latin, elevated in thought and well expressed, with the problem of putting this
Page 22 into the best English he can command; in the first place he is relieved of the necessity of hunting aimlessly about for ideas which do not exist in his brain; and in the second place he is raised above the plane of his ordinary thinking, and in this higher atmosphere grows familiar with concepts and ideas which might otherwise long remain foreign or at least vague to him. All things considered, I do not hesitate to say that I believe there is a considerable period in the secondary training when Latin translation if rightly conducted, may wisely be made practically the exclusive instrument of special instruction in Englist composition. This view, too, I find, is shared by many See the discussions in the *Proceedings of the National Educational Association*, 1896, p. 563 ff., especially p. 570. Probably no teacher who has ever systematically instituted this experiment of written translation has failed to regard the time it demanded as wisely expended. I have said above that this training in English seems to me

Other Effects of Latin.

to form a larger part of the advantages of Latin study than all others together. Yet the other advantages are by no means insignificant. They are now to be considered. Discussing with his usual sober thoughtfulness and lucidity of exposition the question: Wherein Popular Education has Failed,[6] President Eliot lays down the four essential educational processes which should be involved in any rational and effective system of instruction. These are:

[6] American Contributions to Civilization, p. 203 ff.

1. The process of "observation; that is to say, the alert, intent, and accurate use of all the senses. Whc ever wishes to ascertain a present fact must do it through the exercise of this power of observation . . . Facts, diligently sought for and firmly est blished, are the only foundations of sound reasoning." Page 23

2. " The next function, process, or operation which education should develop in the individual is the function of making a correct record of things observed. The record may be mental only, that is, stamped on the memory, or it may be reduced to writing or print. . . . This power of accurate description or recording is identical in all fields of inquiry."

3. "The next mental function which education should develop, if it is to increase reasoning power and general intelligence, is the faculty of drawing correct inferences from recorded observations. This faculty is almost identical with the faculty of grouping or coordinating kindred facts, comparing one group with another or with all the others, and then drawing an inference which is sure in proportion to the number of cases, instances, or experiences on which it is based. This power is developed by practice in induction."

4. "Fourthly, education should cultivate the power of expressing one's thoughts clearly, concisely, and cogently."

These, according to President Eliot, are the four essential processes of the educated mind: observing accurately; recording correctly; comparing, grouping, and inferring justly; and expressing the result of these operations with clearness and force.

Now it is precisely these four processes or operations which the study of Latin, when well taught, promotes in an eminent degree :

1. The study of Latin trains the observing faculty. To fathom the meaning of a Latin sentence requires a whole series of accurate observations. Thus the pupil sees the word *egissent* in a sentence; he observes that the word is a form of *ago*; he takes note of the voice, mood, tense, person, and number; he observes its position; he may make other observations. Or he is reading poetry and comes to the line *Si qua fata sinant, jam tum tenditque fovetque.* The second word puzzles him at first; to the eye, it may be either a nominative plural neuter or an ablative singular feminine used adverbially. Observation (scansion of the line) teaches him that the latter conclusion is the true one. Observation. Page 24

2. Little of this observation is recorded in speech or writing in the preparation of a lesson, but *it is recorded mentally*, which according to President Eliot is entirely adequate. Moreover the process is constant. It is necessarily so. No lesson in a Latin author can be adequately prepared without sustained and repeated observing and recording from beginning to end. Recording.

3. The study also necessitates the most thorough and rigid processes of reasoning. The pupil has observed that a certain word is in the dative case, or in the subjunctive mood, and has made also a mental record of the fact. He now proceeds to determine the relationship of the dative or subjunctive to other words in the sentence. This demands as severe an exercise the reasoning powers as anything I know. The first combination the pupil tries may be found to be grammatically impossible; it offends against his conscioness of linguistic usage. Or it may be grammatically correct and yet be flatly absurd in point of meaning. Reasoning.

Or it may make only a half satisfactory sense, somewhat inconsistent with the context. Every consci endeavour, however, rightly to combine and accurately to interpret the words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs of any passage of a Latin author is an exercise of the reason. It is not, to be sure, an exercise of
Page 25 the kind expressly mentioned by President Eliot in his allusions to the process of reasoning as one of the indispensable results of a rational education. He
Induction not the only Mode of Reasoning. mentions only inductive processes as entitled to recognition in this sphere, and by implication excludes all recognition of deductive reasoning. This seems to me extremely unfortunate and unjust. Both processes are legitimate in education; neither is to be disparaged. President Eliot's position seems to be that only the inductive reasoning of the observational sciences is reasoning properly so-called. Yet of the popular fallacies and delusions which President Eliot enumerates (p. 224 f.), and which he justly deplores, few, when evaded by intelligent and educated men, are evaded by processes of inductive reasoning. How many of the intelligent men who opposed the free- silver heresy in this country in 1896 did so as the result of inductive reasoning? Any such reasoning faintly deserving the name would be simply impossible for the average educated man. The process by which opinions must be formed by most men on such matters is one of deductive reasoning. Only the specialist can reason inductively on such great questions, where honest settlement by inductive processes demands almost infinite time and pains, not to speak of special training. The minds of the great majority of thoughtful men must work otherwise. Faith in the honesty, intelligence, and patriotism of others is probably the major premise in the minds of most of us in determining our attitude on large questions. The minor premise is the view of some earnest, trained, and sagacious statesman or student of affairs in whom we trust. Our conclusion, therefore, represents the view of another person, logically made our own by deductive process. Oftener perhaps our own views
Page 26 on such matters are formed as a result of comparing the views of many others rather than by adopting the view of any individual. In such cases we adopt the preponderance of authority or the preponderance of evidence furnished by others and assumed by us to be fairly complete. But the process is still deductive. So in most of the serious things of life: our choice of a vocation, our preparation for its duties, our diet and recreation, the education of our children, our social, religious, and political affiliations, –all these must of necessity be determined by deductive processes of reason, so far as they are determined by reason at all. I cannot help thinking, therefore, that President Eliot attributes too important an educational function to processes of inductive reasoning, and allows such processes a much larger play than they can, under any conceivable conditions, ever have in the practical life of any individual. At all events, I think it proper to insist on a recognition of the part which deductive reasoning must always play in nine tenths of the lives of the most conscientious of us, and to urge this fact as of importance in estimating rightly the value of the deductive reasoning so inevitably associated with the study of Latin and other languages.

4. Lastly, the study of Latin involves in translation constant practice in expressing the results of one's observing, recording, and reasoning. Whether
Expression. this be clear, concise, and cogent, as President Eliot would have it, is a matter

entirely within the power of the teacher to determine. But I am confident that no teacher fit to be intrusted with giving Latin instruction, or in fact any instruction, will neglect this most important and crowning feature of Latin study. Latin, then, would seem fairly to fulfil all the important functions demanded by President Eliot as essential in a rational system of teaching. Yet he himself is inclined to look askance at the present predominance of Latin and other lan- Page 27
guage studies in the curricula of our secondary schools. Though not specifically declaring it, he implies his distrust in the efficacy of language study to achieve any of the results which must be admitted by all to be so eminently important.

To me all these results seem to flow of necessity from the study of Latin. Even with poor teaching, observing, recording, reasoning, and expressing are necessary daily processes of the pupil's intellectual life. This may explain why even poor Latin teaching often seems to have an educative influence. Where the teaching is of first-rate quality, the processes referred to are naturally given an accuracy, a power, and clearness of form, which cannot fail to prove of the highest educative power.

It is, of course, manifest that the foregoing arguments in favour of studying Latin, if valid, apply at least in some measure to other languages than Latin, and Latin *vs.* Modern Languages
many persons doubtless will be inclined to advocate the advantages of French or German, as superior to those of Latin. While not denying the usefulness of both those languages when taught with discrimination, yet, *if one language only can be studied*, I see two reasons for giving Latin a decided preference to either French or German. In the first place the concepts and ideas of the Latin language are much remoter from those of English than are those of the modern languages. All modern thought is essentially kindred. The same intellectual elements, so to speak, are common to all civilized nations, –particularly to nations so closely in touch as the English, French, and German. This is not true when we come to study either of the ancient languages. The ultimate elements of the thought, *i. e.* the language of the Greeks and Romans; are as different from our own as is their entire civilization. It is precisely this fundamental difference which Page 28
makes either of the classical languages of such invaluable discipline. At every stage of study we are brought in contact with new phases of thought, new ideas; –the intellectual horizon is continually widening. The modern languages, on the other hand; suggest relatively much less that is new. Both the matter and the manner of expression are so directly in the line of our ordinary knowledge and speech, as to give much less occasion to processes of comparison or to that stimulating intellectual grapple which is essential to mental growth. This is particularly true of French, whose thought-forms are so closely kindred to our own. It is less true of German, though even that language suggests vastly fewer differences in ideas –and consequently vastly fewer opportunities for comparison – than does either Greek or Latin.

There is yet another reason which I should urge in favour of Latin as compared with either of the modern languages, and that is that Latin has supplied us with so large a share of our own vocabulary. Just what the exact percentage of such words in English is, I do not know. Nor is it material. The number, at any rate, is very large, and covers every department of thought. For this rea-

son no educated person can safely undertake to dispense with a knowledge of the root words of the Latin language. I mean no such knowledge as comes from memorizing a list ot the commoner roots and suffixes along with their meanings, but a knowledge at first hand, and sufficiently comprehensive and thorough to enable one to *feel* the full significance of the primary words of the Latin, a knowledge which reveals at once the full value of such English words as *Conotation, speciousness, integrity, desultory. temperance, induction, deduction, abstract,*
Page 29 *ingenuous, absolute*, and scores of others whose precise apprehension marks the educated man. This point has been strongly though briefly emphasized by the Commissioner of Education, W. T . Harris, in "A Brief for Latin," *Educational Review*, April, 1899. See also Paton, in Spencer, *Aims and Practice of Teaching*, p. 41 f.

To the two foregoing theoretical reasons for preferring Latin to French or German as an instrument of secondary education, must be added a third reason,
Testimony of Experience. more cogent even than those already emphasized, namely, experience. I believe it well within the limits of accuracy to assert that no one who has had actual experience with the teaching of either of the modern languages to pupils of the same age and intellectual power will for a moment venture to compare the intellectual profit attained from French or German with that derived from Latin. In fact, so far as we have any testimony on this point, there is a striking unanimity of judgment in favour of Latin. Speaking at the first annual meeting of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland (Proceedings, 1893, p. 59), Principal Mackenzie, discussing the question, "Will any kind or amount of instruction in modern languages make them satisfactory substitutes for Greek or Latin as constituents of a liberal education?" said: "Twenty-three years ago, ,vhen I was a school-boy at one of our foremost academies, there was no scientific or English [7] course, – no course, that is, without Latin. Those who know the history of that school for the century closing in the seventies, know her brilliant achievements in developing mental
Page 30 power with Latin as the staff of the pupil's mental life. Meantime, in company with all our fitting schools, she, too, has established an English side without Latin. I could give no umbrage nor be chargeable with indelicacy were I to repeat the statements made to me by her teachers as to the unfavourable change in the intellectual tone and character of the institution. There are in this Association an earnest, skilful, experienced body of teachers connected with our high-schools and other schools of secondary grade; I have yet to meet one such teacher who, administering courses of study both with and without one or two of the classical languages, does not, however reluctantly, affirm that satisfactory scholarship is found only on the so-called classical side, and that, therefore, no satisfactory substitute for Greek and Latin has yet been found." Subsequently President B. I. Wheeler, then Professor of Greek at Cornell, declared it his conviction that French and German cannot compare with the classics as effective instruments of secondary education, "simply because they don't." These positive assertions

[7] The scientific or English courses regularly omit Latin, and include either French or German, or both French and German.

based on experience went absolutely unchallenged in the protracted discussion of the question which followed. Compare also the testimony of an English educator, Mr. Paton, in Spencer, *Aims and Practice of Teaching*, p. 44: "Many argue that French and German would be just as efficient [as Latin], but their contention has never been practically demonstrated. Similar testimony comes from Germany, France, and Belgium, to the effect that those boys who have received a classical training are on the whole superior to those who have received a training only in the modern languages (Fouillee, *Education from a National Standpoint*, p. 167). Fouillee (ibid., footnote) adds: "One of our most eminent critics [Ferdinand Brunetiere], before his connection with the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, was on the staff of the *Ecole Normale Superieure*, and taught French literature to the pupils Page 31
at the College Chaptal, and at the same time to the mathematical students at the Lycee Louis-le-Grand and the College Sainte-Barbe. At Chaptal almost every boy passed through his hands, as he took each class some time or other during the week, and in this way he knew the boys in six classes, of course of varying ages. Now, says M. Brunetiere, 'I feel, after this experience gained under exceptional conditions, that for opening the mind and for general development, for a knowledge of our own tongue, and for literary skill, the boys who instead of a classical training have received a purely French education, with the addition of modern languages, are at least two and perhaps three years behind their fellows.' At Louis-le-Grand and Sainte-Barbe, M. Brunetiere's pupils had done Latin and Greek grammar only, and had never had a thorough grounding in that, intending to devote themselves at an early period exclusively to mathematics. Here again the superiority of even a little classical training was equally marked. These observations," adds Fouillee, "agree with my own while I was engaged in teaching." Such testimony might be multiplied almost indefinitely.

From this verdict of experience we can hardly venture to appeal, until experience has new and different contributions with which to support the claims of the equality of the modern languages with Latin as educational instruments. The position of those who have advocated the equality of French or German on theoretical grounds is well represented by the late Professor Boyesen. In his remarks before the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland (*Proceedings*, 1893, p. 38 ff.), he lays stress on the admirable quality of the French and German literatures, comparing them Page 32
favourably with the classical masterpieces. But the training of the secondary pupil who is studying a foreign language, as was shown above, is primarily linguistic, not literary. Literary study enters in to some extent, to be sure, but the *main* benefit of the study must come after all from the minute study of the elements of the thought, not from the contemplation of its larger literary aspects. And it is precisely on this linguistic side that French and German exhibit, as compared with Latin, such a striking lack of adaptation to the ends of a truly liberal training.

It is for the foregoing reasons that I feel justified in urging the superiority of Latin to either of the modern languages as an educational instrument in our secondary schools. Experience may ultimately prove French and German entitled to relatively greater consideration than we can at present concede to

them, though the theoretical grounds against any such eventual result seem very strong.

As to Greek, for the pupil of the secondary school I am reluctantly forced to give it a place second to Latin. I do this chiefly because Greek has contributed so much less to our own English vocabulary than has Latin. These estimates of educational values, however, by no means imply that one or even more of the other languages mentioned may not wisely be added to Latin in the secondary school. I most certainly believe that this should be done wherever practicable, and would advocate the combination of two languages, as, for example, Latin and Greek, Latin and German, or Latin and French. Latin, however, I should insist upon as the basal study for all pupils of the secondary school who are capable of pursuing it. More than two languages (Latin for four years and Greek,
Page 33 German, or French for three years), I should not suggest for an individual pupil, though I am well aware that the colleges are enforcing demands in this direction. With all the advantages and allurements of language study, I feel that we can easily go too far, and may do damage by neglecting other sides of the pupil's intellect.

I have enlarged sufficiently upon what seem to me the primary ends of Latin study in the secondary school, namely, the power of accurate observation, the development of the reasoning faculties, and the superior facilities it affords for training in our own language, by which, as I explained, is meant not merely the apprehension of words, but the assimilation of ideas for which the words are merely symbols. Incidentally, too, we considered the fact that the study of Latin gives us the needed insight into the precise meaning of a vast number of English words derived from Latin, and that, by taking us out of ourselves, the study of Roman life and thought gives us a broader view of the significance of ideas and institutions, –what Laurie calls the "universal," as opposed to the merely "national" point of view (*Language and Linguistic Method*, p. 3 f.).

There are yet other humanizing influences of the study, which, though of
Historical Training less importance, yet deserve to be emphasized. Among these must be reckoned the *positive knowledge* of Roman history, thought, and institutions which comes from the study of Latin. No one can get so good a view of the personality of that great organizer Julius Ccesar, as the intelligent reader of Caesar's own narrative; no one can so appreciate the constitution and workings of the Roman republic as the pupil who reads the pages of Sallust's *Jugurtha* and *Catiline* or Cicero's
Page 34 *Orations and Letters*; no one can so appreciate the one dominant principle of all Roman civilization, –the power of organization and administration combined with a sense of imperial destiny, –as he who comes face to face with that sentiment in the Latin authors. These are examples merely of the almost infinite suggestiveness of Latin study along historical and institutional lines; –not that the study of Latin should or can replace a formal study of Roman history and institutions, but it can and should serve to supplement such study.

I shall venture to emphasize also the value of the training of the resthetic
Aesthetic Training and moral sense which must come to every mind of ordinary endowment by contact with the masterpieces of Latin writing usually read in our secondary schools. Here again I shall quote the words of Professor Shorey ("Discipline

vs. Dissipation," *School Review*, 1897, p. 228 f.), "This scholastic study of language, through the carefu interpretation of selected literary masterpieces, is a totally different thing both from mere gerund-grinding and the acquisition by conversational methods of the courier's polyglot facility. It is essentially a study o literature, –a fact overlooked by those who declaim against language while protesting their devotion to literature; and it is the only form in which literature can be taught to young students that offers serious guarantees of the indispensable accompanying discpline. It trains the intellect in close association with the sense for beauty and the sense for conduct as no other studies can. ... The iridescent threads of cultivated and flexible aeesthetic and ethical institutions must be shot through the intellectual warp of the mind at the loom. They cannot be laid on the finished fabric like an external coat of paint. The student who between the years of twelve and twenty has thrilled at the eloquence of Cicero or Demosthenes, has threaded the mazes of the Platonic dialectic, has laughed with Aristophanes, has pored over the picturesque page of Livy. or apprehended the sagacious analysis of Thucydides, has learned to enjoy the curious felicity of Horace and the supreme elegance and tender melancholy of Virgil, has trembled before the clash of destiny and human will in the drama of Aeschylus and Sophocles, has been cradled in the ocean of Homeric song, or attuned his ear to the stately harmonies of Pindar, –the student, I say, who has received this or a like discipline in the great languages and literatures of the world. has insensibly acquired the elementary materials, the essential methods, and the finer intuitive perceptions of the things of the spirit, on which all more systematic study of the mental and moral sciences must depend."

Page 35

We have dwelt sufficiently upon the various reasons for studying Latin in the secondary school. It remains to discuss briefly some of the objections which have been urged against the study at against this stage of education.[8] In 1861 Herbert Spencer published his work on *Education: Intellectual, Moral, and Physical*, consisting of a series of four essays which had previously appeared in various English Reviews. I shall not have the presumption to question the importance and value of these essays as permanent contributions to the discussion of educational problems. Yet with regard to the value of at least one classical language in any adequate scheme of secondary education, Spencer is singularly unjust. The title of the first essay is: "What knowledge is of most worth?" In discussing this question no attempt at a comparatitive estimate of the educational value of different studies is instituted. On page 23, Spencer observes: " If we inquire into the real motive for giving boys a classical education, we find it to be simply conformity to public opinion. ... As the Orinoco Indian puts on his paint before leaving his hut, not with a view to any direct benefit, but because he would be ashamed to be seen without it, so a boy's drilling in Latin and Greek is insisted on, not because of their intrinsic value, but that he may not be disgraced by being found ignorant of them." This is the sum and substance of Spencer's examination of the worth of the pursuit of either Latin or Greek. The

Objections Urged against Latin. Herbert Spencer

Page 36

[8]It is impracticable here to discuss any utterances except those of a few representative thoughtful students of education.

bulk of this first essay, the title of which assumes at least an honest attempt to institute a candid inquiry concerning the relative value of different subjects, is devoted to an exposition of the thesis that the study of science is of *some* worth to *some* people, –nothing more. Granting for the sake of argument that this thesis is adequately established, it by no means follows that other subjects are of less worth or that Latin is of no worth. Herbert Spencer has often, and with great acumen, justly convicted other thinkers of unwarranted assumptions and bad logic, but in the present instance he seems to cap the climax in his absolute begging of the question at issue. The value of Latin can never be proved or disproved by discussing the value of something else, nor can it be proved or disproved by passionate declarations of its worth or worthlessness. Spencer unfortunately has not attempted to go beyond these methods; and it is doubly unfortunate that this attitude has been assumed by a thinker who usually exhibits such exceptional seriousness, candour, and intellectual integrity , and the influence of whose utterances must inevitably be so great.

Page 37

Much more commendabie is the procedure of Alexander Bain in *Education as a Science* (London and New York, 1881): In chapter x., "Value of the Classics," Bain seriously undertakes . to estimate the worth of Latin and Greek. Unfortunately he does not limit the question to any period of education, nor does he seem to recognise that the question of the study of Latin alone is a radically different question from the study of Latin and Greek. His discussion, however, is one that commands our attention. Bain first sets forth the alleged advantages of studying the classics, and then the drawbacks. His conclusion is that the latter decidedly outweigh the former. It is impossible here to take up his arguments in detail, but it is to be noted that, among the advantages of the study, Bain practically ignores the transcendent value of the increased intellectual power derived from the study of the classics, and the mastery acquired over the resources of one's mother tongue, i. e., over the ideas which form the highest intellectual elements of our national life, –the very things which we set down above as constituting the prime reason for studying Latin. Of the other assumed advantages of the study of the classics, Bain finds no one of sufficient weight to be entitled to great respect. On the other hand he enumerates four positive objections to the study: I. The cost is great. 2. The mixture of conflicting studies distracts the learner. 3. The study is devoid of interest. 4. The classics inculcate the evil of pandering to authority.

Bain.

His Objections.

As to the cost, it must be admitted that Latin does cost. It takes time and labour. If pursued as a daily study in our American schools for four years, it claims one-third of the entire secondary-school curriculum. The real question for us, however, and the question which Bain professes to be examining, is the question of *value*. To the discussion of that question the consideration of cost is irrelevant. When we have determined the value of Latin, the question of cost may properly influence the pupil's choice in individual cases, but it cannot affect the question of value any more than the length of one's purse determines the value of a fine watch.

38

That the study of Latin is devoid of interest (Bain's third objection), or that it inspires a blind pandering to authority (his fourth objection), is contrary to

my own experience, and I believe to that of teachers in this country. I can only conclude that Bain is here advancing arguments which, if valid, are so only in Great Britain.

More importance attaches to Bain's second objection, which I intentionally reserve till the last. The mixture of conflicting purposes, he adds, distracts the learner, i. e. he would contend that it is distracting to the pupil of Latin to be gaining in intellectual grip and breadth of vision, to be mastering the resources of his mother tongue (i. e. the higher elements of the national life of which he is a member), to be gaining a profounder insight into the thought, life, and institutions of the Romans, to be advancing in the cultivation of the resthetic and moral senses, –to be doing all these at one and the same time. I see no answer to make to this objection beyond declaring that experience does not seem to me to bear out its truth, any more than experience shows that the study of Latin is devoid of interest or that it inculcates a blind respect for authority. On the other hand, experience seems to me to show, and to show abundantly, that all the results whose contemporaneous realization Bain declares to be so distracting, do actually flow from the study of Latin. The reason they do flow Page 39
is, in my judgment, due to the fact that they are not consciously sought by either pupil or teacher. Were such the case, I am quite prepared to believe that the joint quest would prove distracting and even futile. Fortunately, however, the valuable results of studying Latin are indirect results, while Bain's objection seems to have been formulated as a result of the erroneous conviction that the valuable ends of Latin study are always present to the pupil's consciousness. It is really their absence from his consciousness which is the salvation of the study.

Less radical in his attitude toward the value of Latin in secondary education is Friedrich Paulsen, who in 1885 published his important *Geschichte des* Paulsen.
gelehrten Unterrichts auf den deutschen Schulen und Universitaten vom Ausgang des Mittelalters bis zur Gegenwart mit besondererRucksicht auf den klassischen Unterricht. Paulsen's criticisms upon classical education as at present organized and conducted in German secondary schools (Gymnasien and Realschulen) are embodied in his concluding chapter. Before proceeding to their consideration, however, it will be necessary to get clearly before our minds the status of classical education in Germany. In the *Gymnasien* and *Realgymnasien* Latin is studied for nine years, –from about the tenth year to the nineteenth; while in the *Gymnasien* Greek also is studied for six years, –from about the thirteenth year to the nineteenth. A total of fifteen years of study is therefore regularly devoted to the classics in the *Gymnasien.* Another element that enters into the situation is that the amount of work in classics and other branches combined has long been something enormous for the student of the *Gymnasien.* For two generations the *Ueberburdungsfrage* has been one uppermost in edu- Page 40
cational discussion. Accordingly when Paulsen undertakes to show the evils of existing conditions, and when he urges earnestly and cogently the dropping of Greek and the radical retrenchment of Latin, we must be exceedingly cautious what conclusions we draw from his observations for the study of Latin in the secondary schools of the United States. The time now spent on Latin in a German *Gymnasium* or *Realgymnasium* is more than equal to that spent by most

graduates of our American colleges who have pur- sued Latin continuously from the lowest grade of the high school to the termination of their college course. A retrenchment of Latin in the German *Gymnasien*, therefore, may be entirely compatible with the maintenance of the existing attention given to Latin in this country, or even with its extension.

Paulsen nowhere goes so far as to advocate the abandonment of Latin as an instrument of German secondary education. His attitude on this point I believe has largely been misunderstood in this country, owing mainly to the prevalent incapacity of many minds to dissociate Latin and Greek. Paulsen's attitude as regards Greek is practically uncompromising. For the great body of students he is convinced it would better be abandoned, but as regards Latin, he nowhere goes beyond the demand for retrenchment. Thus on p. 762, while declaring positively that the present ideal of classical education in Germany must pass away, he unhesitatingly asserts his belief that Latin must continue to be indispensable. As to the amount of time to be devoted to the study we get an expression of opinion on p. 774, where Paulsen thinks that the study may profitably be pursued through the lower and middle classes, –presumably to the end of *Obertertia*, or five years in all. On p. 782 he even goes so far as to admit that experience may show that for certain classes of students the traditional classical course will still be necessary. But in the main Paulsen's estimate of the value of the classics, Latin as well as Greek, is an exceedingly low one. Let us briefly consider his reasons.

Believes in Retaining Latin.

41

First, he complains that classical training as pursued in Germany does not exert any marked influence upon the pupils' German style. In fact he goes so far as to assert that men who have enjoyed the classical training are conspicuously lacking in any sense for form, an the typical scholar is nothing less than a laughing-stock, –a handy conventional figure largely utilized in popular comedy to provoke merriment. This indictment is severe, and if well grounded certainly constitutes a weighty argument against the pursuit of Latin. But Paulsen's testimony is contradicted by his own countrymen, e. g. by Dettweiler, quoted above, p. 18 f. It is, I believe, contradicted also by the impressions received by most Americans in their contact with German gymnasial graduates frequenting the German universities. However, for us Americans the question is not one to be settled by the experience of Germany. The question for us is, whether Latin produces certain results upon our own pupils.

Alleged Defective Results of Latin Study.

Another of Paulsen's arguments is to the effect that, after all, vital results in education emanate from the personality of the teacher, not from the subject. Certainly there can be no underrating of the effect of personality in the teaching of any branch; but that fact has nothing whatever to do with the large question, whether there are not vast differences between the educational values of different subjects. Until experience faintly demonstrates the contrary, we must believe such differences exist; and so long as they do, the influence of personality Page 42 in teaching can hardly be considered as bearing upon the question at issue. Even Paulsen himself, by the way, candidly admits that the ancient classics do afford an unusual opportunity for the effective exercise of personal influence, or at least that they would, were it not that inability to understand the language

in which they are written constitutes an impassable barrier between teacher and pupil. But it is difficult for an American who has witnessed the brilliant interpretations of the classics in the upper forms of the Gymnasien to credit the general existence of any such barrier.

Paulsen passes on to urge that the pursuit of the classics does not tend to promote that sympathy, charity, and brotherly love which might be expected from the humanities. But certainly Paulsen's own volume teaches us most clearly that tbe humanities (*studia humaniora*) were never so designated because they were supposed to make men humane, in the sense of sympathetic and charitable. Humanism was but the revolt from scholasticism: the one made God the exclusive object of speculation; the new tendency emphasized man, his achievements, capacities, and aspirations. The implication, therefore, that the classics are specially under obligations to make men kindly and charitable is one hardly justified by the designation 'humanities,' nor has it ever been the professed ideal of these studies. But let us look at the facts adduced by Paulsen in support of his charge that the study of the classics promotes strife, hatred, pride, and all uncharitableness. He cites a letter of Jakob Grimm, in which complaint is made that of all branches of knowledge none is more arrogant, more contentious, and less indulgent toward the shortcomings of others than philology. Goethe also writes in a similar strain to Knebel. But philology is not confined to the classics; it includes the modern languages as well, even German, which, as we shall later see, is specially recommended by Paulsen to take the place of Greek and Latin in the reformed program. Goethe's indictment a1so is not directed against the classics, but against liberal studies in general. But neither of these men was considering the effects of any of these studies upon pupils. They were obviously alluding to the exhibitions of jealousy and rivalry manifested between scholars of eminence. Such exhibitions must always be a more or less frequent result of keen intellectual competition. They are no more frequent in classical philology than in other departments. Nothing can exceed the virulence of some of the recent polemical literature evoked in Germany by the higher criticism of the Scriptures. Even philosophy (another subject which Paulsen cordially endorses as a substitute for the classics) is not without its amenities, and I vividly recall the polemic of a leading German investigator in this field, in which words were used that English literature has not tolerated since the days of Swift. Natural science, too, has not been exempt, –a study which Grimm and Goethe seemed to think more adapted to the development of a "sweet reasonableness." Such may have been the case in Germany at the beginning of the century. It may still be so. But certainly in the United States there are many exceptions to this rule, and one of my clearest boyhood recollections is of the vehement personal invectives hurled against each other by two eminent paleontologists.

Moral Influence.

Page 43

Paulsen will attach no weight to the fact that men, even professional men, who have, enjoyed the severe classical training of the *Gymnasien*, are practically a unit in their advocacy of retaining this instruction in its present form. These men, he asserts, are actuated not by any educational considerations, they are not impressed with any sense of the value of the training they have received. What actuates them is social pride, an aristocratic sense of the recognised superiority

Social Phases.

Page 44

which their education has conferred. They wish to perpetuate the caste in all its glory. How just this imputation of motives is, it is oJ course impossible for us to determine, but one hesitates to believe it well founded. At all events, in this country no one will charge the existence of such sentiments as a factor in the adjustment of educational problems.

Tendency of the Times.

Paulsen's last argument is based upon the observable educational tendencies of the last four centuries. Ever since the Renaissance and the Reformation the relative importance of the classics has been diminishing. There was a time early in the sixteenth century when these studies practically monopolized the field of learning. Each succeeding century has seen their relative importance diminish. Paulsen's reasoning is that ultimately their place must vanish, and that that era has in fact arrived. But any such argument based upon the operation of a tendency is likely to be fallacious. No one can say with certainty how long a given tendency may operate. The record of the American trotting horse has been reduced in the last twenty-five years from two minutes seventeen and one-quarter seconds to a fraction over two minutes. But he would be bold who should predict that this tendency will go on without limit. Similarly, educational policies can hardly be determined on the basis of observed tendencies. They must be settled rather in the light of existing conditions.

Page 45

Proposed Substitutes.

As substitutes for Greek and for so much of Latin as it is proposed to banish, Paulsen suggests the introduction of philosophy and German. We hardly need to discuss the value of the former of these studies. If introduced into the *Gymnasien*, it is obvious that philosophy could be intended only for the two higher classes of the Gymlzasium, a department of education lying beyond what we designate as secondary, and corresponding rather to the lower years of our American colleges. But the proposition to introduce German as a substitute for the classics invites our careful attention, for if it is sound for Germany, it is also sound for us to replace the study of either or both the classical languages by the study of English. My reasons for questioning the soundness of the general principle involved are two :

Inadequacy of a study of the Vernacular.

I. Experience has never shown that any study of the vernacular is capable of yielding results in any way com- parable with those secured from the study of other languages. In fact experience has so frequently illustrated the reverse as practically to have demonstrated the impossibility of securing such results. 2. Reflection, too, reveals adequate grounds for believing that the study of the vernacular never can prove of any very high educative value. The case has been so well stated by Fouillee, *Education from a National Standpoint*, p. 108, that I quote his words: "From the point of view of individual development, the study of the mother tongue is only sufficient in the case of exceptionally gifted minds. Secondary education should be regulated according to the average, and not according to exceptional students. Now, on the average, to the culture essential to the humanities, the study of a tongue other than the mother tongue is the shortest and surest method. A Frenchman, for instance, has a quick mind and a versatile intellect; but the very facility with which he uses his intellect does not leave him enough time for reflection.

Page 46

When a French boy is reading a French book, unless he enjoys unusual

reflective faculties, his mind is carried away by the general sense, and the details and shade of expression escape him. As M. Rabier says, 'A French child reading a page of Pascal or Bossuet does not fully grasp it, *i. e.* only half grasps it.' Exercises and translations force the child to weigh every word, ascertain its exact meaning, to find its equivalent; he must also consider the inter-relations of *the ideas and words* in order to fix the sense concealed in the text; finally, he must transpose the whole from one language to another, just as a musician transposes an air. The final result is that he has repeated for himself the labou of the thinker and writer; he has re-thought the thoughts, and has revived the living form which was organic to the writer's thought. He has had to reproduce a work of art. A cursory perusal of works in the mother tongue is rather like a stroll through a museum; translation from one language to another is like copying a picture; the one makes amateurs, the other artists. In this way the sense of depth and form are simultatl ously acquired." My own experience confirms this view. For some years I was connected with one of our large universities, in which there was an "English" course. The preparation for admission to this course included neither classics nor modern languages, but was based primarily upon English itself. For years the students who presented themselves for admission with this English preparation were recognised as the most deficient in intellectual strength and training of any who came up to the University. Nothing, I believe, but the desire to give the experiment the fairest possible tria1 prevented the early abolition of that course.

In conclusion, Paulsen calls for the exercise of more common sense in the organization of education, particularly in the establishment of the curriculum. Page 47
Common sense, he adds, suggests that languages are learned to be understood, and the inference is that, if understanding them is not obviously of transcendent value, then their study is profitless. All the fine phrases about the discipline and culture, he adds, supposed to result from language study are likely to make no appeal to sturdy common sense. If by sturdy common sense is meant the instinctive conclusion of the common man who has given no serious thought to the problems of education, Paulsen is probably right, but can we safely intrust the interests of our higher education to such hands ?

Such are Paulsen's arguments against the study of Greek and Latin in the German secondary schools, and such are the substitutes he proposes. I have considered them partly because they represent the concuslons of an eminent thinker and earnest student of educational problems, partly because by many in this country Paulsen is popularly supposed to have demonstrated finally the absolute lack of any *raison d' etre* for the study of either of the classical languages. Our examination of his arguments shows, I think, that they are very far from justifying the radical changes which he proposes in German secondary education. Much less do they warrant a lack of confidence in the pursuit of the classics as pursued in this country; while, as regards Latin, Paulsen expressly recognises the justification of retaining quite as much as is ordinarily pursued in American secondary schools. Review of Paulsen's Objections.

In conclusion we may state the case for Latin briefly as follows:

Page 48 Summary.

Reason and experience show that Latin in secondary education is capable of producing intellectual results of great positive value, practically indispensable to the educated man. Experience has not yet shown that any other subject (excepting possibly Greek) is capable of producing equally good results. Theorists have often asserted the equal value of other subjects, or at least have asserted the capacity of other subjects to yield as good results. Some of these theories, *e. g.* that in favour of the study of modern languages, that in favour of the study of the vernacular, we subjected to criticism with a view to showing their defects. Still the empirical argument must ever be the stronger, and, say what one may, the stubborn fact remains of the unique educational influence exercised by Latin. By this it is not for a moment meant to disparage the legitimate functions of a single other study. Their special value is ungrudgingly conceded. But in the light of our present knowledge, it seems a plain educational duty to adhere to Latin as admirably meeting a distinct educational need which is not met by any of the other subjects with which we are so often urged to replace it.

A Possible Danger.

At present, however, the danger seems to be not that too few will study Latin, but rather too many. Latin is a difficult subject, and the peculiar educative power it possesses is not capable of being exercised upon all minds, –only upon those of a certain natural endowment. In our intense democracy we are perhaps at times inclined to forget that no constitutional declarations of *civil* equality can ever make, or were ever intended to recognise, an *intellectual* equality between the individual members of the nation. Latin is good for those whose gifts enable them to profit by its study. It is not, however, capable of popular distribution like so much flour or sugar. Because Latin is a highly effective instrument for thc training of certain minds, we must not think that

Page 49

the efficiency is contained in the subject *per se*; there must exist in the pupil the mental endowment requisite to profit by Latin; else the time spent upon the study is worse than wasted. Observation convinces me that many parents and pupils labour from a serious misconception on this point, and that many are ambitious to study Latin whom nature has not endowed with the capacity to benefit by its pursuit.

The present enormous increase in the number of Latin pupils in our American secondary schools seems to justify calling attention to possible dangers in this direction.