

A SWEET GIRL, GRADUATE.

HYPATIA Higgins was wondrous fair ;
 With her violet eyes and golden hair,
 And her cheek like a peach on a sunny wall,
 She was queen of the girls at our Country Ball.

Before her beauty I bowed my head :
 " This measure with me wilt please to tread ?"
 Softly her rosy lips she stirred ;
 " *Cui bono*, sir ?" were the words I heard.

I rallied my wits to the charge again :
 " A glass, fair maid, of the good champagne
 Will be *bonum* for both," I smiling cried,
 " *Ariston men hutor*," the nymph replied.

" The night breeze sleeps, and the moon shines fair—
 Will tempt with me, maiden, the balmy air ?"
 And, O, the light of her lustrous eye,
 As " *Nux Trillistos*," I heard her sigh.

" O, little my Latin and less my Greek :
 I prithee, sweet lady, deign to speak
 In the vulgar tongue, to a plain young man,"
 " *Quousque tandem*"—the pair began.

The Fair began, but I heeded not,
 As I turned, and fled that accursed spot :
 Six tumblers I drank of the good champagne,
 And straight proposed to my cousin Jane.

Of wisdom or beauty Jane makes no boast,
 But she's pretty as many, and wise as most ;
 She lights my cigar, and she laughs at my jest,
 And she gives me the dinners I love the best.

And—the heavens be praised!—she has never heard
 Of Greek or Latin a single word ;
 And she knows no more than her baby's nuss
 Of the Differential Calculus,

Many a varied year has flown
 Since I left that lovely Muse alone ;
 And many a Jack has found his Jill,
 But Hypatia Higgins is Higgins still.

The light of her violet eyes is dim,
 And the waist that was is not now so slim ;
 And her cheek has deepened its dainty pink,
 Till Jane and I are disposed to think
 That *hutor* is not her only drink.

And still must she flirt with the men of old,
 For the men of today are deaf and cold ;
 There's none to whisper *sas agapo*
 And the only lover she e'er will know,
 Is the Wooden Spoon of her long ago."

✻ **CONTRIBUTED.** ✻

. We wish it to be distinctly understood that the JOURNAL does not commit itself in any way to the sentiments which may be expressed in this department.

**THE CLASSICAL CURRICULUM IN
 QUEEN'S COLLEGE.**

IN the JOURNAL for March 9th, their appeared an article under the above heading, signed by "G," the opinions of which I don't agree with and would like to answer. "G" wants the curriculum which applies to Honour Classics altered so that more works should be read before

the candidate goes up for examination. He thinks that the more works that are read the higher will be the standard for Honours, and that unless a voluminous amount of reading be done a knowledge of the Classics must be imperfect ; in fact he makes a plea for *quantitas si non qualitas* ; for that it seems to me is what it amounts to. As "G" says, it has always been the boast of Queen's that it is not so much quantity but quality of work done she aims at. The framers of her Curriculum evidently thought that a thorough knowledge of a few typical works would stand the student in better stead than a superficial knowledge of many. This idea strikes me as very reasonable.

A college can really only begin a man's education ; and in the study of the Classics is it not a better way to do this, to instil him with the principles of philology, which will enable him to bring out the full power of an author's expression ; and to so acquaint him with the niceties of construction that he may better appreciate an author's meaning, and thus to set him on the right path, as it were, than to require so much mere translation that he must either slur over little shades of meaning or construction or be unable to overtake the work set before him.

"G" says that ten times "as much" honour work is prescribed in some colleges as in Queen's. Let us suppose the figures are correct. Now, let us take two men, equal in ability and with an equal amount of time at their disposal * and with no assistance (for there is very little professional supervision over honour work). Give one a few typical works to read and the other six times as many and let them spend the same amount of time at them ; does "G" mean to say that the latter will acquire as accurate a knowledge of the classical languages as the man who gives his undivided attention to the few ? It seems to me that his knowledge must necessarily be more or less superficial. It is impossible that he can have time to pay attention to philology and construction, which are indispensable to an accurate knowledge of a language and without which a man might better read a good translation of the original work. But the other having mastered a few is well prepared to overtake the many, if he so desire. There are men in Queen's College now who can read Latin and Greek with ease and with little or no help from lexicon or translation. But I doubt much if they would have been able to do so if they had been compelled to *translate* a vast quantity of classical work, without being able to pay proper attention to philological aspects, &c. Everyone knows what a fanning-mill is. Suppose two men are given defective mills to work with. The one, looking at the amount of work before him, feels that he has no time to lose, and starts to work with his machine as it stands ; the other makes his machine efficient for the work to be done and then is ready for any amount of it. In the same length of time the former will undoubtedly fan more wheat than the other, but will it

* In looking over the Calendar I see that no one has taken first-class honours until the end of his third year, and I suppose it is the same elsewhere.