

And every line rings out the determined faithfulness which was the ruling principle of Luther's life. He is a captious critic, who will ask, if, in the accomplishing of this result, Dr. Hedge was anxiously regardful of Luther's adjectives! So long as one can "reconstruct," the nature of the poet and revivify his creations, we have no right to ask that his hat and shoes be exposed to public view.

The demand for "accurate renderings" is badly seconded by the complaint that, when the right of judgment is conceded, translations may borrow the character of imitations. Liberty, in this particular, has seldom, almost never, given way to license. The translator who works *con amore*—and work undertaken in any other spirit cannot serve as the standard—must realize that he owes somewhat to the originator and to himself. The more earnest is his appreciation, the more profound will be his reverence, and the more of loving conscientiousness will inspire his work.

Nothing, it would seem, could be more clearly apparent than is this oft-disputed statement: the translation which "does justice to" an author must hint the personality of the translator, who must be in full sympathy with the author. Each, in a certain sense, may be an originator; and the translator, who, like the author similarly circumstanced, is least tempered by tradition and prejudice, will achieve the most satisfactory results.

W. L. S.

### FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS OF THE MCGILL COLLEGE QUESTION.

It is not every day that the readers of the public press are treated to an official utterance from McGill College. Secrecy has been its motto. Whatever is done is done, and the least said about it the better. But in THE WEEK of July 19th a new era is inaugurated, and the diversified ground covered by the letter tempts us to take a second look at it.

First, there is a definition of what a Governor is. But we cannot linger over that. It is natural that men, when driven into a strait, should look about for any comfort they can derive from contemplating the monopoly of the wisdom, distinction and observation of the country granted unto them by Royal Charter. But if one kind of logic secures, in a line or two, all necessary praise to the "standing" of the College, it is evidently quite a different kind which demands more than a column to pay a similar compliment to the administration.

Then we have the official explanation of their proverbial "unity." It "is strength," and "action to be efficient and produce lasting results must be in unison;" the board is "not a debating society," and "some boards went through a long period of years without a single division taking place, and in every instance there followed growth, prosperity and usefulness." One must therefore suppose that what the letter calls the "present agitation"—the "hubbub"—is part of the efficiency and lasting results produced by the action in unison; and that the expenditure of \$50,000, afterwards increased to \$120,000, upon separate classes for women, is proof of "not a bad investment ever having been made," or "a dollar of endowment lost."

Next we have the announcement of the general fact that there are two sides to every question, followed by a confession that co-education has been made an exception. "It (the general question of co-education or separate classes) is not a matter of reason on the one side against prejudice on the other. It is a matter of reason and argument on both sides, with the important addition, however, that as far as the circle of McGill is concerned, those who have had the most experience of the world, and whose observation embraces the widest circle of the affairs of life, were almost wholly against it." That is, against the general question, because it had two sides. There is something unfortunate in this passage. Let us on to the next.

Then we have the standard by which a university should be estimated—"the property," "the endowments," "the finances," "the investments," "the benefactors," "the benefactions," "not a bad investment," "not a dollar of its endowment lost," "the remuneration therefor," "the emoluments connected therewith." A knowledge of things higher than gold may be summed up in "a given number of students of equal (!) ability," "a given number of men of equal (!) educational power," and "such subjects as logic and mental philosophy" are less difficult than classics and mathematics."

We have next an utterance on Liberty. "A professor is not at liberty, that is, it is not reasonable (for rational liberty and true reason are inseparable) to tell the students that the mode of teaching adopted by the University is a ridiculous farce; he is not at liberty, for it is not reasonable, to make speeches at undergraduate dinners, of the same character," etc., etc., "so long as he is receiving the emoluments of the University." How much "emolument" entails this irrational slavery and false reason which are inseparable? And would a professor enjoy the "liberty" of expressing an opinion on an academic policy if, having seriously increased his work for four years in order to give the greatest possible chance of success to a scheme to which he was conscientiously opposed, he had received no emolument? We trust Dr. Murray will pardon us for considering anything so sordid as money in connection with his name, or in connection with the sort of endowment which he has given to the separate classes. But this repeated flaunting of "emoluments" in Mr. Hague's letter has aroused our curiosity as to actual fact. We find that the emolument (!) is at the rate of one hundred dollars a year for one lecture a week, including examinations, essays, and other class work, not to talk of the breaking up of time and the irksome repetition. Roughly speaking *two dollars a week!* Emoluments!! Most of us pay much higher emoluments to have our coals shovelled in.

We need hardly say that *this* is not in the Calendar. The Calendar is for the public.

Then we have the utterance on what the letter calls "this hubbub." It is merely a repetition of the official utterance of the Principal in May last, and, like it, furnished an opportunity for Mr. Hague's Latin about a suppression of the truth being a suggestion of the false. The question is not whether the board has accepted an Endowment for separate Education. We all know that. The question is, *Was the board justified in accepting the money for such a superfluous scheme?* A division of income for a division of classes strikes us as a strange example of the union-is-strength doctrine. To be sure the idiosyncrasies of benefactors ought to be respected so long as they do not interfere with any great principle of economy. A board may be at liberty to accept dictation, as, for example, in the choice of a fresh and unoccupied channel for what is known as *liberality*. But will Mr. Hague tell us what he will propose to do if a benefactor should offer an endowment for co-education? We cannot believe that the keen and successful financier whose name is attached to his endowment is responsible for the restriction accompanying it. And we may express the hope that when Mr. Hague establishes in the Merchants' Bank separate entrances, tellers, accountants, etc. for his lady patrons he will succeed in securing some shoulders broad enough to bear the *financial* prestige. The insinuations thrown out as to the necessity for "care and parental responsibility" and "the settled opinion of the law of God" cannot be discussed here. If there be any necessity of that kind in McGill, Mr. Hague's time would have been better spent in remedying it than in talking about it. The insult to the young men and women of Montreal, and to their parents and guardians, is only equalled by the coolness with which he assumes their approval of his championship.

We now come to the latter part of this important utterance,—the part it plays regarding a Professor of the College, who is well-known to differ from the administration on the co-education question. We shall give the utterance first; then the facts. "This mode of teaching has been held up to ridicule and contempt by some who have agreed to carry it on, and who are in receipt of remuneration therefor. It has been described in a letter to the public press as a farce, and the work imposed by it as an intolerable burden. Not only so, there has been good reason to believe that it has been held up to scorn and ridicule before the very ladies who have been studying under its provisions, and before other bodies of University students. This was so obviously to impair the discipline of the call, that the Principal, acting under a high sense of duty and responsibility, unpleasant though it was, felt himself compelled to notice it. Hence all this hubbub. The action of the Governors has been to sustain the Principal in his wise and judicious upholding of the rules of the College, and in his determination that, so long as they exist, they shall not be held up to ridicule before the students."

These are grave assertions,—much too grave for the flippant tone in which they are expressed. If there is a Governor of the College who believes them to be true, has he not failed in his duty to the College and to the Public in that he has not insisted upon an immediate proof? Why do three months go by without the slightest attempt at testimony? Out of several hundred students could *one* not be found who had heard the scorn, and contempt, and ridicule? Out of over a hundred ladies in the Donalda course, could not *one* be produced as witness? Where are the "two judges of the superior Courts," and the "two eminent members of the bar of the Province of Quebec" that they accept "a good reason to believe" as the basis of a libellous accusation? Where is the Principal's "high sense of duty and responsibility, unpleasant though it be" when Mr. Hague, not satisfying himself with attacking rules and regulations, reaches boldly forth and grasps the most sacred and inviolable possession a man has,—his personal and professional character—and holds it up to scorn, contempt, and ridicule? Not a "good reason to believe;" there it stands in black and white, sent over the whole country. Verily, as Mr. Hague's letter says, the board "is occupied in forming judgments upon the character of men." Ah! champions of discipline! Ah! models of morals! It was easier, Mr. Hague, to put the knowledge of Holy Scripture into Greek than into practice.

The facts of the case are briefly these: The annual University dinner took place on Monday the 30th of April, in the Windsor Hotel, at which were present men representing the education and refinement of the country, graduates from every Faculty and Province, and gentlemen interested in University work. The occasion is the event of the year at McGill, and *not* the hole-in-a-corner affair implied in Mr. Hague's words "under-graduate dinners." The *Witness* of May 1st, says: "It was an unusually interesting one. Of course the great event of the day—the graduation of the ladies—was in everybody's mind, and the shape in which it came out was a demonstration in favour of co-education of the sexes, and every reference to that proposal was enthusiastically cheered." An enumeration of those present contains the names of Dr. Stewart, Mr. Selkirk Cross and Mr. Alex. Robertson, as chairman, Principal McVicar, Principal Henderson, Dr. Heneker, Chancellor of Bishop's College, etc., etc., and gentlemen who had that day received the highest honour the University can bestow—the honorary degree of LL.D. This "demonstration" and "enthusiastic cheering" naturally caused some anxiety in the mind of the Principal regarding the "unity" existing beyond the "circle" of McGill, and being filled with a wise and judicious dread he vented his wrath upon the only man he supposed to be within his power, Prof. Murray, whose speech the *Witness* says, was received with "cheering to the echo," and concluded amid "great cheering." Sir William Dawson immediately drew up a formal accusation against Prof. Murray, of *subverting the discipline and morals of the students*, and laid it before the Board. Observe, this is what Mr. Hague calls "noticing." The Principal's intention was evident, and