

duced from the sphere of politics, and arising from a two-fold confusion, partly between the intrinsic and educational value of the subject taught and the dignity of the teacher teaching it." (I do not profess to understand this fully, and must leave my readers to wrestle with it.) For my part, however, I feel disposed to favour the alternative explanation which Professor Hutton thinks may possibly account for the demand for equality, viz., that the Senate actually thought that it would take as much labour on the part of the student to obtain thirty-three per cent. of either the prescribed French or the German course, as of the Greek. A glance at the requirements of the curriculum ought to convince any one that the inherent probability that this actually is the case is very great. Such a glance will also exhibit incidentally the difference between classical and modern language ideals with respect to language study. The main object of the pass Greek course is to enable the student to turn prescribed Greek texts into English with grammar and dictionary—the so-called "working knowledge" of Greek. Now, it is undeniable that the translating of the few texts prescribed may be done, and commonly is done, with the help of "cribs," and thus degenerates into a mere process of memory, combined with the mechanical matching of the words in the "crib" with those in the text. It is also a fact that it has heretofore been possible to pass in Greek on translation alone. Observe too that the easy sight Greek is rendered a farce by the help of vocabularies. The above, with the grammar, has been heretofore the sum and substance, the beginning and the ending of pass Greek in the University. In 1890, however, an elementary prose exercise-book was added—an important change, and, as I take it, a concession to modern language meth-

ods. But as this little book is spread over four years, it can hardly be a very serious addition to the labours of the student, especially as it forms, I understand, but one year's work for boys in the higher forms of our collegiate institutes.

As to the nature of the tests imposed in them, the courses in French and German really begin where the course in Greek leaves off. Texts are assigned, to be sure, but they are not the *pièce de résistance* at examination as in Greek. In French, for example, in addition to grammar, the candidate must read at sight any modern French (without vocabularies); he must also be able to use the language both to express his own thought in original composition and to translate any kind of English into French; further, he must understand the language when it is read to him. Not only are these tests vastly higher in their scope than those imposed in Greek, but more useful to the student, for, as every real teacher of language knows, even the paltry accomplishment of turning either Greek or French into English will not be permanent if the learner has not got beyond the mere grammar and dictionary stage at which the teaching of pass Greek practically stops.

If Professor Hutton's equation of Greek = French + German is right, and the 1890-95 curriculum wrong, we should expect to find that the work of preparing the students for examination is much greater in pass Greek than in either French or German. Hence, we should expect to find that the number of lectures to pass Greek men in University College is equal to that given in French and German together. Now what are the facts? The sum total of pass lectures in Greek in all four years is *five*; in French and German together it is *eighteen*. It must be noted too that the Greek