

"history, archæology," or any of the other foolish expedients which he suggests; and moreover, if he attempts to re-impose what has been discarded after a long struggle as useless he will meet with the opposition of modern language men at least.

As an illustration of the fact that it is possible to make a French or a German course equal to one in Greek without the above devices, I would refer Professor Hutton to the practice in Harvard University. If it is possible to establish such an equality there it is possible here. At Harvard, as "advanced subjects" (part of the matriculation test), Latin, Greek, French, German are on a footing of perfect equality. I quote here an explanatory remark from a speech by President Eliot. He says: "We require for admission to Harvard College, besides a knowledge of certain elementary subjects, the passing of examinations in at least two advanced subjects. Now the advanced subjects used to be . . . only Latin, Greek, Mathematics, but in 1887 we put French and German on a perfect equality." Comment is needless. I will only add that many years ago a pass-man in the University of Toronto also was allowed in the third and fourth year an option between Latin and Greek on the one hand, and French and German on the other, and that without the extraneous matter aforesaid.

The friends of pass Greek appear to have thought that the 1890-95 curriculum struck a terrible blow at Greek. Professor Hutton alludes to the "abstract injustice and practical mischief" of the changes made. He says again, "the last curriculum (1885-90) made their yoke easy, and the new curriculum has diminished their yoke." Mr. Cody, too, owing to an ignorance of the curriculum, which is perhaps pardonable in a gentleman of his inexperience, is quite

sure that certain very baneful effects are directly traceable to the new curriculum. These false impressions, under which doubtless many others labour, are worth correcting. Professor Hutton's whole article indeed was founded on a false impression. He starts out by assuming that the old curriculum (1885-90) said: "pass Greek is equal to pass French *and* pass German, plus a little more." I observe that he has since then stated in *The Mail* that this was a misconception, as indeed it was, and a very gross one. If he had read the 1885-90 curriculum beforehand, or better still, if he had understood it, all this expenditure of printer's ink might have been spared. Now, what did the 1885-90 curriculum really say? It said in effect, though the wording was somewhat obscure: "Pass-men must take, in the first and second years, any two of the three languages (Greek, French, German), and in the third and fourth years, Greek *or* French + German." The new curriculum said in effect: "Pass-men must take in all four years any *two* of the three (Greek, French, German)." With this statement of the facts before us, what becomes of the supposed ill effects upon Greek in the schools? A high school boy asking in 1885-90, "Can I get my B.A. degree with Latin, French and German and without Greek?" is answered by the curriculum, "Yes." Precisely the same answer is given to precisely the same question by the curriculum of 1890-95. The new curriculum did little else than re-state the requirements in other words, but in words which deprived pass Greek of its certificate to a superiority which does not actually exist. The loss of this certificate is, I fancy, the chief grievance of the champions of pass Greek. Surely they will not argue now that a boy in the schools will be turned away from Greek to French and Ger-