

tive to but one type of mind. It has but little claim upon undergraduates but it may be confidently recommended to elderly gentlemen with a little money, no occupation, virtuous habits, a sanguine temperament and a judgment not too exact or too exacting in the measurement of evidence. If then, I repeat, the pass course in moderns were to be made difficult by philology (and it is not easy to see how it could be made very difficult, except by some branch of philology or something even still more irrelevant and foreign) its usefulness and its value—especially its educational value—would be greatly diminished. Another alternative for increasing the difficulty of the course, the addition of strings of authors to be referred to and books to be read, the exaction in fact from the student not so much of fresh principles as of a very much more elaborate vocabulary, seems equally ill-fitted for enhancing either the attractiveness or the educational value of the course. He was a wise man who told the undergraduates of his college to spend but half their work-time or less turning over the pages of their authors and their dictionaries, and the other half in chewing the cud of reflection and sifting and digesting and cross-questioning the author's thoughts and their own.

Finally it would be possible to increase the difficulty of the pass course in modern languages by the addition of the higher criticism; by lectures on the style and the art, the melody and the diction of the great French and German poets: of Corneille and Victor Hugo, of Schiller and Goethe, or again by lectures on the moral political and religious atmosphere which clothes their poems. The objections to the other changes have no application to this; on the contrary, of course, the degree to which an intelligent comprehension of the higher

criticism can be developed is the measure of the lecturer's ability to place his subject on the highest educational plane and make it most fruitful, but such an experiment with pass classes is always open to grave difficulties. If it be true even of the honour man that the deepest and truest beauty of ancient or modern literature falls upon ears unappreciative and wakes a full echo in his heart or mind only at a later date; only when age and experience have made all his authors new to him, have opened his eyes and intellect and made him, in some degree, like the genius whose words he had heard without hearkening and seen without perceiving "a spectator of all time and all existence," if this be true even of the honour man of all undergraduate universities, it is doubly true and more of the pass man, and to cast the pass lectures into the tone of the higher criticism is to lecture above the heads of the class, to say nothing of the difficulty of examining from this point of view; and examinations—whatever objections may be urged against them in connection with honour men—cannot legitimately be overlooked in the pass course.

In short, it seems to me that even were there any reason for adding work more or less extraneous to the pass course in moderns—and there is none—such additions would be detrimental to the usefulness of the course. A tolerable working knowledge of the Latin, Greek, French or German language is, or should be, the aim of the pass man, just as a good working knowledge of Latin, Greek, French and German literature is, or should be, the aim of the honour man. If nature or circumstances have so constituted us that this working knowledge of language or literature be more speedily acquired in one department than in another, then the balance of the time unnecessary for