

overflowed from the region of politics into education; whatever subject claims more than equality is assumed to be in some way connected with aristocratic privilege, caste tyranny, mediævalism, and Oxford, and to be *ipso facto* condemned; or perhaps it would be more correct to say that this is the assumption made when the claim to more than equality is advanced in favour of a long established department of education; when, on the contrary, the claim is made by a new department, it is readily conceded: "is not one subject as good as another? faith, and a deal better, too!" seems to be the line of argument. Surely it should not be necessary to point out that "equality" of subjects, as used in reference to the education of schoolboys or undergraduates, has, generally speaking, no bearing whatever upon the intrinsic interest and intrinsic importance of the subject *per se*, still less upon the dignity and honourable standing of its teacher. Mathematics, *e.g.*, is an obligatory department of study which no student can escape, and about the importance of which there can be no controversy. Yet to a very large number of minds its intrinsic interest and importance is infinitesimal. When it is said therefore that Greek is equal to French with German, and should not be treated as though it were only equal to French or German, nothing whatever is said or assumed regarding the intrinsic superiority of Greek literature to either French or German literature, still less regarding the intrinsic superiority in university standing of the teacher of Greek to the teacher of French or of German. So far as persons are concerned "the republic of letters" is a phrase capable of rigid application to the members of the faculty in any reasonably-constituted university. *Cæteris paribus*, the professor of Chinese, is on a level with the professor of Latin, and

this, though in this case neither the educational nor the intrinsic value of the two subjects are equal. But I need not enlarge on this point since I had occasion some years ago to prove the sincerity of my convictions. It is obvious that the meaning of "equality" in an undergraduate course is yet further narrowed; when it is said that Greek is equal to French with German, nothing is said or necessarily assumed regarding the inferiority, even from the mere educational point of view of either French or German to Greek. Many persons, it is true, conceive that the languages of Greece and Rome are better educational instruments for English-speaking undergraduates than French or German, and this not merely for an intrinsic quality of Greek and Latin, their synthetic and inflectional character (the large number of different moods and tenses, *e.g.*, in their verbs and the employment of these various moods and tenses according to more or less logical and exact rules, to master which alone is in itself a liberal education or thought-training, such as cannot be found to the same degree in our own or any kindred slipshod modern language), but also for the mere accident, so to speak, that our undergraduates are not ancient Greeks or Romans; had they been born so, the "cruces" of the Latin subjunctive, *e.g.*, or the Greek optative would have been imbibed by them with their mother's milk, and the educational training thereof would have been lost to them; they would have spoken correct or incorrect Latin, as we now speak correct or incorrect English, by the power of habit chiefly and without reflection. And so just because modern French, and, in a less degree, modern German, are so much nearer our own tongue, just because the habits and usages of speech which we have derived from our own tongue carry us