

Reader appeared about five months thereafter. He concludes thus: "That must have been a strong and urgent resolution, the Department must have been unusually susceptible to public opinion, such as it was, and those editors and publishers who then received the mandate must have been 'hustlers.'"

Now what is the fact? No such resolution as he describes was passed at the meeting of the Association in 1900, and the matter was not even discussed, nor indeed was any such resolution passed at any previous meeting. I think it necessary to give his imaginary account of what happened an explicit denial, because his alleged facts constitute the fundamental part of the article, in so far at least as malicious imputation is concerned. The intelligent reader will form his own opinion as to the recklessness of a writer who ventures to make a statement so utterly at variance with fact, and also as to the value of any conclusions resting on such a basis.

It is noteworthy that your critic singles out the French book alone for attack. He ignores the fact that this work is merely one out of five of a similar character. Was he not aware that a Greek book, two Latin books, a German book and a French book, all on essentially the same model, had been provided for, and that four out of these five are already in use in the schools? If he was aware of this, it was scarcely ingenuous on his part, to put it mildly, to ignore the actual situation. And yet the existence of five such books is of the very essence of the case, in fair argument. It confines him to the alternative either of admitting that the plan of these books is the result of a settled policy of the Senate and the Department in dealing with the foreign languages, or else it puts on him the burden of proving a

somewhat extensive, and I might add, somewhat improbable, conspiracy, between the Senate, the Department and the publishers. Professor Young, in his article, in the same number of the magazine, takes the former view, and discusses the policy temperately on its merits. I should like to ask your critic which alternative he is disposed, on further consideration, to accept.

The sweeping denunciation of the plan and execution of the book contained in the article I am naturally not disposed to accept without protest. It is hardly safe to deal with a working book, such as this is, on abstract theories resting on no firmer basis than the *ipse dixit* of the writer, who, I fear, is in this case, not even a modern language expert. The familiar adage that "the proof of the pudding is in the eating" applies with unusual force here, and I for one shall be quite satisfied to accept the verdict of my fellow-teachers, when they shall have used the book a reasonable time in their classes. It is well in this connection to explain, however, that the revision of the book is quite in accordance with the expressed wishes of the teachers in the High Schools. Curiously enough, some of the very features which your critic condemns most strongly, are those on the necessity of which the teachers have long been insisting. Especially as regards the adoption of easy fixed extracts for linguistic drill, I may remark that I have in my possession more than twenty letters from leading High School teachers, who almost unanimously approve this principle. As to the amount of exercises, I may add that for years the teachers have been urging the very increase which your critic with superior theoretic wisdom condemns.

I am sorry that the "absurd sys-