

department is fully equipped as to teaching power, and hence it is to be presumed that all the lectures necessary are given. French and German are but poorly equipped, and more lectures are needed but cannot be given. If Greek requires as much labour as French and German put together, by what sort of pedagogical magic do the instructors in that branch crowd into five lectures the work for which eighteen are admittedly insufficient in French and German. As to the nature of this mysterious process I refer my readers to the opinions of Messrs. Fairclough and Robertson (p. 168 of this article).

Moreover, if Professor Hutton's equation is right and the curriculum wrong, we should expect to find the percentage of failures greater in pass Greek than in French or German. Here, too, the facts are against his equation and in favour of the curriculum. At the last annual examination, 1890, the failures in pass classics were: first year, 53 out of 173; second year, 36 out of 112. In French, first year, 35 out of 79; second year, 41 out of 77. German, first year, 20 out of 79. Previous records perished in the fire last year, but would tell a similar story.

A consideration of the actual demands of the curriculum and of the above facts and figures ought to have led Professor Hutton to suspect that there was something wrong with his supposed equation and that the curriculum was right after all in putting these subjects on a footing of equality. But, judging from his article, it appears very doubtful whether he considered either the curriculum or the facts, for, inspired by his belief in the importance of his translating power in French and German, picked up at odd moments, he waxes still more enthusiastic and declares that pass French or pass German can only be made an equivalent to pass Greek on

the curriculum by resorting to certain extraordinary and ingenious expedients, for some of which, as far as I know, he may fairly claim patent right, to wit: the addition of "history, archæology . . . strings of authors to be referred to and books to be read . . . the higher criticism." Having set up these very gruesome looking men of straw, he proceeds to knock them down one after another in the following style: He says of philology, for example, "from the educational side philology has no practical value . . . 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 exacting in the measurement of evidence." I confess I thought at first sight that this description of a philologist was intended for a joke, or was meant for a philanthropist of the Pickwickian type, but as there is but one professor of philology in Ontario, and as Professor Hutton is particularly well acquainted with him, we must, I suppose, accept the description as authentic, only lamenting the fact that one who fills the philologist's chair should express such contempt for the science he is paid to teach. But to return, who has ever proposed to make the pass French or German course difficult by this method? As a member of Senate, Professor Hutton must know that after years of effort honour modern languages have only just succeeded in getting rid of such extraneous matter as honour History and Ethnology, and that the courses now (both pass and honour) demand almost nothing beyond a knowledge of the language itself. To come to facts, I ask him to point out to the educational public which of the requirements of either the pass or honour courses in French and German he objects to on pedagogical principles. He will look in vain for