

French and dictation? It is hardly likely that he will do so. Even if he will and can, the argument is none the less irrelevant. I fear that this discussion must prove largely fruitless until the friends of pass Greek try to realize the vast difference which exists between their definition of proficiency in a language and the one upon which modern language men insist. We are talking about power to use a language to express thought: they are talking about power to translate it into English, with helps. (3) Professor Fletcher opines that one can become more proficient in French and German in a given time than in Greek alone. Presupposing the methods at present in vogue in each respectively, this is precisely my own belief, but that proves nothing with regard to the relative difficulty of passing the tests prescribed by the curriculum, which is the question we are discussing. Besides it shows incidentally that the pass-man in French and German is much more likely to have some permanent knowledge at the end of his course, while the Greek man is extremely likely to have nothing for his labour (and no one would admit this more readily than Professor Hutton under ordinary circumstances). (4) Mr. Cody's summing up needs only to be stated in order that it may condemn itself. He says, "the pass French course simply cannot be made hard . . . it is a mere matter of time to accomplish it." I might remind him, however, that whatever fine distinctions may exist in his own mind between "time" and "hardness," yet there are only twenty-four hours in the pass-man's day, and, as he will presently see, the want of a longer day seems to prove uncommonly fatal to success in pass French and German. The number of witnesses called by Professor Hutton for the prosecution is surprisingly small, and, as I have shown, the testimony

does not touch the question except in the vaguest way. Some of the more prominent classical scholars in Ontario, and among them those who are at the same time ripe scholars in modern languages, are conspicuously and ominously absent. (5) There is still a further argument which for *naïveté* deserves to be placed by itself. "Would it not be easy," says Professor Hutton, "to construct whole sentences of intelligible rational French, which could be translated by an intelligent, well-read Englishman, whose knowledge of French was acquired in a dozen lessons; *simply owing to the very large number of words common (except for a letter of two) to the two languages?*" (Italics mine.) My fellow-teachers of modern languages will recognize in this an extreme re-statement of that venerable and vulgar error, common to the elementary pupil in French, which it is our first business and care as teachers to eradicate. To find it used here as an argument makes one fear greatly for the alleged knowledge of the person who advances it.

Since the discussion is based on the revision of the curriculum for 1890-95, I must in the next place explain what that document prescribes as to the relation of French and German to Greek. The pass-man is told in effect with reference to his foreign languages: "You must take Latin and any two of the following three: Greek, French, German." Hence this curriculum says, "Greek is equal to French or German." Now what could have induced the Senate to make a prescription of this kind? The Senate, when it framed the above clause, was probably not aware of the appalling politico-metaphysical complexity of its own motive in so doing. Here is the motive in all its horror, as given by Professor Hutton (p. 45): "The demand (for equality) then, is partly a confusion of thought intro-