

who feel that in the tongue learned at their mothers' knees they have the better medium of expression. "Why should this bilingual condition be allowed to persist? Why should we be forced into the straight-jacket of an artificial language?" One would rather expect the students to be in sympathy with such a movement, and we come finally to ask the meaning of their conservative attitude.

Krumbacher interprets it as follows: Among the unconfessed reasons is a certain vanity, which causes the educated Greek to say, "We are the only people who can read the New Testament in the language in which it was written. Let us not lose this distinction. Our language, purified of its foreign elements, is a demonstration to the outside world that we are in reality the descendants of the ancient Greeks." In forming these ideas they have not been uninfluenced by the prevailing ideas in the West as to the barbarous nature of their popular tongue. They have winced under the gibes of the professor who has no respect for a language in which *ἀπό* governs the accusative, although his own English tongue may have undergone precisely similar changes from the old English to which it owes its origin.

Of course, there are other alleged reasons, the barbarous and vulgar character of the popular tongue, its inaccuracies, want of syntactical method, poverty in vocabulary, presence of foreign words, and, above all, want of unity. They forget that a language is what the history of the people has made it.

So, as the influence of church and state is directed to the encouragement of the artificial language, and its supporters are prepared to shed blood as well as ink in its defence, considerable amount of courage is required to come forward as a champion of the vulgar tongue. One of its most valiant champions is Psichari, Professor of Neo-Hellenic Studies in Paris, who, with Krumbacher, looks forward to a time in the near future when a new literary tongue will arise in Greece, born of the spoken language, and which will carry education to the masses, develop national spirit, and raise the Greeks to a far more important position in Eastern Europe than they at present have.

THE INTER-COLLEGE DEBATE WITH TRINITY.

Trinity representatives secured the decision of the judges in the University College-Trinity debate on Tuesday, Dec. 1st, in the Students' Union. Trinity had the affirmative of the resolution, "Resolved, that the Government's policy in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is not conducive to the best interests of Canada."

Mr. S. J. Arnott, in a deliberate address, endeavored to show that the Government, for selfish reasons, had acted rashly and without a sufficiently searching investigation of the whole problem; that the Quebec-Winnipeg section is useless for grain carrying; that the Moncton-Quebec section would destroy the Intercolonial.

Mr. W. A. McTaggart showed that the Government had accurate knowledge of the question and route; that the present facilities are wholly inadequate; that most fertile tracts would be opened up by the new line, and that a great transcontinental road was a necessity for adequate settlement and transportation. Mr. McTaggart made an effective speech, which was somewhat marred, however, by undue haste.

Mr. H. F. D. Woodcock, M.A., traversed much ground

already covered regarding the necessity, cost and advantage of the various sections, and quoted figures greatly at variance with those of the previous speaker. Mr. Woodcock repeated certain phrases very frequently, but withal is an impressive speaker.

Mr. A. P. Gundry made what was probably the most effective address in the debate. He pointed out some discrepancies in the figures of his opponents, the danger of bonding privileges legislation, the fact that other products than grain must soon be transported by rail, and that the estimated cost by rail was as cheap as by water.

Mr. Arnott, in reply, corrected a few misapprehensions caused by the previous speaker, but accomplished little in his five minutes. The judges, Professors McKay and McFadden, and J. A. Cooper, gave the decision to Trinity on the count of style, declaring both sides equal in matter. We did not see it this way, but we were not judges.

Miss Love and Mr. Earp sang in pleasing style, and Miss Steele played acceptably. Dr. W. P. Thompson presided. Trinity was well represented, a number of St. Hilda's College girls being among the number. There was a fair representation of Arts students present.

THE UNION DANCE.

On Monday evening, November 30th, the University of Toronto Union held one of their ever popular receptions. The guests were received in the cozy club-rooms, where they spent a bright half hour of small exchanges, such as Freshette introductions and dance numbers. There was the usual unique charm of a Union dance, in that there was a jolly college atmosphere, while at the same time there was a variety of faces on account of each of the several faculties sending their own little coterie of dancing enthusiasts. A forcible crush was avoided, for about 9 o'clock many hurried along the colonnade, which had been thoroughly enclosed to keep out the cold blast to the West Hall, where Glionna's goading two-steps kept fast and furious after many frisky feet. Plenty of floor space, somewhat smoother than the dining-room floor of last year, a long round-about promenade from dancing hall to supper room, and many very cozy corners, all contributed to the general success. Apparently there were many quiet but doubtless happy diversions for the non-dancers in billiard-room and reading-room. Supper was served from prettily decorated tables in the upper rooms of the Union. Everything sped merrily, and even the clock, with questionable sympathy, moved forward an hour or two.

There were girls galore—college girls and out-of-college girls, sisters and sweethearts, and they all seemed necessary. What prettier screen for the orchestra than a bevy of pretty girls! The Freshettes worked their traditional havoc; the Seniors dispelled their fear of waning popularity, while Sophomores and Juniors went all unnoticed, but took advantage of that very opportunity. Someone said that rivalries arose between the third and fourth year girls, and someone else said that the faculty were to blame. The President, Prof. McGregor Young, and the Secretary, Mr. Robert Baird, were most attentive hosts. Among those present were: Mrs. Loudon, Miss Salter, Prof. Ramsay Wright and Mrs. Wright, Dr. Wilmot and Mrs. Wilmot, Dr. Morley Wickett.