dundancies, tautologies, confused thinking or expression, and pleonasms; and nearly everybody thought he had proved his case. Addison, be it remembered, was a product of the public schools, and a graduate of Oxford University.

—Even Professors!—

"Speaking of Matthew Arnold reminds one that he recognised a use for words, apart altogether from their sense or their value as conveying statements of fact. He said one did not require to understand obscure passages in Isaiah—the mere declamation of the not understood words gave the impression the prophet probably meant to convey. Again, Mephistopheles advises the prospective student of theology regarding common present-day methods of study and practice:—'As a broad principle, hold on By words, words, words! . . . Nothing suits So well as matter for disputes.' And it would be absurd, said the devil in the guise of professor, to feel too much concern as to whether the words had any meaning or not. Even professors have proved the truth of Spencer's contention that a classical education does not help one to write good English! One, a master of criticism, published some of the best-known standard books on Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic. In a critical biography he wrote about a well-known philosopher's methods of living:—'Considering that he was at work from about 6 in the morning, with only half an hour for breakfast, he should clearly have had between one and two a cessation of several hours, extending over dinner, especially as he gave up the evening to his hardest subjects.' Even in the borrowed or reflected light of a Daylight Saving Act, it has not been found an easy task to provide for a cessation of several hours between one and two, no matter what sort of dinner was eaten in the interval. How did this passage pass the printer's reader?

—Criticism Begins at Home.—

"In criticising John Stuart Mill's 'St. Andrew's Address' (we ought, adopting Professor Darnley Naylor's model of chaste English, to call it 'Rectorial Address at the University of St. Andrew's'), a professor of literature at another university, with a wider practical knowledge of universities than Mill had ever the opportunity of acquiring, said that if Mill had known more 'he would have been more careful in his statements as to the Greek and Latin languages. He would not have put these languages as synonymous with literature. . . . He would have found that at the present day (this was in 1882) we have other methods of correcting the tendency to mistake words for things than learning any two or three additional languages.' But why should a stylist or a critic be bound by possibilities, especially if he or she be a professor in a university? To attempt to see things as they are (notwithstanding that philosophers say we never do and never can so see them), to think accurately, not in 'henids,' as Professor Weininger says that young and old women of both sexes do; and to write truly what is seen and thought—all this may be the business of scientific men; but men of the universities and schools, be they dons or duffers, are not and should not be trammelled by any such considerations. Let criticism, like charity, begin at home, even if it needs not (is 'needs' hyper-stylish) stay there. A clear thinker, omitting to allow for the poetical licence incident to, or inseparable from, university culture (the culture acquired by attending a university)—again following the Professor's model—would conclude that the citizen whose memory is honoured by a statue near to the entrance to the pile of learning in Adelaide might have made his money in the iron industry. At any rate, he was one of the founders to the University. What use has the institution for cast iron?

—Slaying the Slain.—

"There are functions of a university that are not included in Newman's dreams—in fact, it is hinted that in these times the gatherers of the taxes on amusements might profitably widen their sphere to their activities and their patronage. Men like Mercier, who have little faith in the length of the 'public memory' will continue to slay the slain by saying that a college education (an education at a college, again following, &c.) does not tend to produce accurate thinking and good writing, and college men (men trained in a college), (again following, &c.), and even university professors (professors in universities, again following, &c.), will be found denying the assertion, and proving the fact in the very process and progress of denial. For example. Take a paragraph. Professor Darnley Naylor speaks of 'such expressions as lead the reader on a false scent.' Now, what would 'Paddy Glynn,' as man of law and huntsman, not as a university man (a man who attended a university, again following, &c., say about such a figure of speech? That a man, or a dog, may be 'led' to a scent, or 'by' a scent; but that leading a man or a dog, by a leash or otherwise, once 'on' a scent would be a supererogation of ciceroneship; 'Paddy' might risk the hybrid.

—Nouns and Adjectives.—

"Or again, Professor Darnley Naylor complains that Dr. Mercier put him on a false scent, or led him to a false scent, or led him on a false scent—any of the expressions will do—by making him think in terms of nouns, and then making him turn the words into adjectives, much to his disgust. The Greek professor's (the professor of Greek's again following, &c.) classical standards will not allow the terms 'public school man' or 'university man' in a critical popular article in a people's paper; and he puts Dr. Mercier's thought into what may be presumed to be classical English of the sort that would possibly be acceptable at a university examination (an examination at a university) or in a newspaper article (an article in a newspaper). But—'tell it not in Gath'—the professor himself, in his third sentence following, uses the term 'science student,' not quotationally, but off his own bat. Perhaps this language may be intelligible to 'varsity men (men educated at a 'varsity). If the term 'university man' is damnable (in the classical English sense) the doctor might well say to the professor, as the pot said to the kettle, 'Is it in mourning ye are?' For presumably 'science' is a noun—unless, like politics, it is a disease!

—Criticising the Critics.—

"I have no wish to criticise either of the critics, for I sympathize too much with both; but I confess to a desire for a love of relaxation in the sense of Aristotle's 'katharsis' (pardon a Greek word). One day a woman and her boy entered a railway carriage. She held a package of sandwiches towards the boy, who said, 'Are they 'am?' Said she, 'You shouldn't say 'am; you should say 'am.' A fellow-traveller guffawed, winked at his companions, and said, 'Both of them thinks they're sayin' 'am.' Whether I am boy, woman, or man I claim a right to say 'am.'"

Register 19.3.18

UNIVERSITY OF ADELAIDE.

SUPPLEMENTARY EXAMINATION FOR B.E. DEGREE.

—Mathematics and Physics (Second Year).—Passed.—Gillman, Sherlock Hill Marshall.

—Special Examination for Intending Medical Students.—

Pass List.—Biology.—Gilbert, Duncan Thomas; Quinn, Thomas Vincent; Tassie, Thomas Wilson.

Chemistry.—Adams, Dorothy Sorby; Leditschke, Freidrich Berthold; Solomons, Isaac Barnet.

Physics.—Cramp, John Francis; Leditschke, Friedrich Berthold; Solomons, Isaac Barnet; Tassie, Thomas Wilson; Welch, Arthur Walter Sydney James.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD. MARCH SPECIAL SENIOR EXAMINATION.

—Pass List.—

English literature, Eg; modern history, Mh; Greek, Gk; Latin, L; French, F; German, Gn; arithmetic and algebra, AA; Geometry, Gt; trigonometry, Tg; physics, Pc; inorganic chemistry, C.; physiology, Pl; physical geography and geology, Pg; drawing, D. An asterisk denotes credit.

Angus, William Roy, L; Appleby, Arthur George, L, AA*; Bulbeck, Philip Denis, Pg; Clark, John Francis, Eg, L; Cowell, Geoffrey Reginald, Gt; Cowling, Lionel Deucalion, Gn; Cramp, John Francis, Eg, F; Davey, Roy Herbert, Gt; Dridan, Julian Randal, Gt; Edwards, Coral Gwendolyn, D; Evans, Wilfred Robert, Gt; Featherstone, Dora Bewley, Gk; Ford, James Albert, Gt; Fox, Robert Owen, L; Hannan, Clare, L, Pc; Hennessy, Arthur Henry, Eg, L, Pc*, C; Hylton, Rex, F; Jay, Jack Melville, L, Tg; Jeffrey, George Hamilton, AA; Johnston, Benjamin George, Gn; Kelly, Patrick Joseph, Eg; Kentish, Dorothy Grace, Gk; Lewis, Reginald William Frederick, Gt; McCabe, James, L; McLachlan, Byron Hugh, Eg, AA, Gt, Tg, Pc, C; Matthison, Certrude Havvell, Gt; Mitchell, Joanna Roberta, Gt; Northey, James Douglas, Gt; Petery, Geoffrey Ernest, Gt, Pc; Pomroy, Richard Osborne, L; Rayner, Margaret Grace, Pl; Rees, Harold Mitchell, L; Rooney, Patrick William, L; Schafer, Max Ernest Hammsford, Gt; Stockbridge, Ronald Keith, L, AA; Tilemann, Carl Norboy, Gn; Tostevin, Alfred Ladyman, L; Wald, Irvine Dale, Mh, C; Wells, Hill Gillman, F; Weston, Allan Campbell, Eg, L, F, AA, Gt, Pc, C; Wicks, Frederick Ralph, Eg*, Mh, L, Gt, C; Wright, Sydney Charles Greaville, L; Zadow, Herbert Otto, Gn*, AA, Tg, Pc; Ziegler, Oswald Leopold, Eg, L.

Register, 20.3.18

JAPANESE IN AUSTRALIAN SCHOOLS.

The introduction of Japanese into the curriculum of our secondary schools and university is a valuable addition to the State educational system (says The Sydney Daily Telegraph). A time is coming when the westernizing of the Asiatic races will open up a new field of commercial enterprise, in which competition is sure to be of the most strenuous nature. Australia's geographical position and its enormous capacity for producing the commodities which this trade will require give us an advantage that promises a great future if we prove equal to our opportunity. This is what makes the learning of Japanese and Chinese by our rising generation of such exceptional importance. There are hundreds of millions of legs in China and Japan that have never yet had a woollen trouser on them. The signs of the times, however, point to a general adoption of European garments in the more progressive countries of the East. What that alone means to the greatest wool-producing country of the world has only to be visualized to make plain the value of Japanese and Chinese to the Australian commercial man of the coming generation.

Register, 20.3.18

CLASSICS, OR WHAT?

A VITAL EDUCATIONAL QUESTION.

[Contributed.]

I cannot but smile to think how I have paid myself in showing the foppery of this kind of learning, who myself am so manifest an example; for, do I not the same thing throughout almost this whole composition?—Montaigne.

—Classics, or What?—

What is best, or good, as a means of producing good citizens is certain to be the vital question as soon as the war is over, if not before. A matter which affects national and international well-being, and even the existence of the race itself, should not be complicated by side issues. The necessity for leaving no single point indefinite or obscure is so urgent that a contribution to the subject, even if not comprehensive, may be pardoned. The teaching of the classics in schools and Universities is nowadays usually defended, or urged, on the ground that it trains men and women in correct thinking and accurate expression. Objectors say—(1) that it does not do so; (2) that, even if it did, it is a wasteful method and means of education for the general mass of the student population, as compared with a training in science, literature, and other subjects. The arguments advanced for or against those views need not be enumerated, since they do not come within the scope of my present task. I am here concerned primarily with the logic of the position.

—Logic of the Position.—

This, as set forth in the recent articles in The Register, may, I think, be stated generally, but correctly, as follows:—1. Dr. Mercier asserted that a classical education did not help men to think accurately and to write correctly. For the purposes of formal logic this may be stated thus:—"A is not B," or "meat is not cheap." This contention of Dr. Mercier's is "Thesis A." 2. Dr. Mercier does not set forth any evidence for his assertion; he makes no attempt to prove his thesis. 3. He does not say what does help, but he may be said to lead one to infer that science does. Professor Darnley Naylor apparently holds, although somewhat strangely he nowhere says so, that a classical education does help, and that Dr. Mercier is wrong in saying that it does not—or, to put it formally, that Dr. Mercier is wrong in saying that "A is not B," or that "meat is not cheap." 2. The professor does not set forth any evidence for his belief; but, being himself a product of classical education, and known as such to your readers, he incidentally supplies facts that might be regarded as evidence in support of Dr. Mercier's thesis. 3. The professor asserts that Dr. Mercier himself does not think accurately and write correctly—stated formally, that "X is not Y," or that "Charles is not a butcher." This is "thesis B," the professor's own thesis. The professor sets forth quotations from Dr. Mercier's article as evidence in support of this thesis that he brings forward, and he proves his contention—provided, of course, that we accept the standards of accuracy in thinking and correctness in writing which he sets up.

—A is not B.—

It will be observed that the professor does not touch thesis A—that "A is not B," or "meat is not cheap"—which was the origin of the discussion, and which demands a settlement at the earliest possible moment. Instead of dealing with Dr. Mercier's thesis he sets up a thesis of his own, that "X is not Y," or that "Charles is not a butcher," which let us say, he proves. He says nothing at all about A and B or the price of meat, but proves that "X is not Y," that "Charles

is not a butcher;" and he leads his hearers to imagine that by proving that "X is no Y," that "Charles is not a butcher," he (the professor) has disproved the statement that "A is not B," that "meat is no cheap," and has thus conclusively established the fact that meat "is" cheap. This is an ancient and also a modern, method of argument; and, when cleverly employed (and the Greeks of old new how to employ it cleverly) it is calculated to deceive even the elect. It is not good logic; it is not logic at all; but it is recognised as the best argument in a bad case or a lost cause. In formal logic this argument is known as the fallacy of "ignoratio elenchi," or "irrelevant conclusion." In ordinary life it masquerades under a variety of disguises. In Parliamentary palaver it is the argument of "you're another;" in some social strata it is "blackguard his mother;" in the Law Courts it is "abuse the plaintiff's attorney." In church circles (please pardon this expression—I acquired a headache in the effort of thinking how to phrase this and similar expressions containing "adjectival" nouns so as to please the professor and convey my meaning, or express my conceptions, to your readers) it is "let us pray;" in streets and park demonstrations it is "let the band strike up;" in "the most distressful country" it is "just tramp on the tail of my coat, will ye?" and among "good fellows" it is "come and have a drink."

—Educational Practices.—

These are some of the human, and sometimes humane, ways in which arguments may be met, and either ended or continued. These methods are all illogical, but some of them are very convenient—an abomination to the logician, but a very present help in time of trouble. If Dr. Mercier's English had been the subject of debate, Professor Darnley Naylor might have urged that Dr. Mercier's bad English was due to lack of a classical education; and Dr. Mercier might have retorted and proved that, on the contrary, his defects were due to a twist that a classical education had so effectively imposed on him that he had not been able to undo it. The evidence for or against might have been a real contribution to the subject of education and the educational curriculum. In fact, Dr. Mercier's phrase "other things equal," to which Professor Darnley Naylor takes exception, would suggest that Dr. Mercier knew the Latin phrase "ceteris paribus," and translated it literally, not idiomatically. But is it not possible that, if he had never heard the Latin words, he would have used the idiomatic phrase of his mother tongue—"other things being equal"? Some one may say that Dr. Mercier is as guileless as was the boy who translated "Mea mater est mala sus" by the—to him—obvious words—"My mother is an evil sow," instead of by the more cryptical rendering, "Run, mother, the sow is at the apples." Latin, be it remembered, is advocated on the ground that it obviates ambiguity and helps correct thinking and accurate expression. Educational practices do change.

—Most Beneficial Curriculum.—

The use of the globes was once thought to be an essential part of the curriculum of seminaries for young ladies. The reasons for this have been forgotten; or else, such as they were, they do not appear to be cogent in present times. The question of what sort of curriculum will allow of or help the production of the largest number of useful citizens will not be settled by referring to the results of the training undergone by individuals like Darwin, who during his whole life was singularly incapable of mastering any language, and who hated the medical course, and afterwards excelled in science; Spencer, who knew nothing of classics in the original, but usually thought correctly, or confessed when he found he had erred, and wrote good English; J. S. Mill, who had read a vast amount of Greek and Latin before the end of his tenth year, but whose English was often poor and crude; Renan, who dearly loved science, but who held a fine passage ten times more precious than the discovery of a fact or the rectification of a date; or Stevenson, whose style is a model of good English, but who owed nothing in respect to its excellent qualities to his attendance on (he calls it truancy from) the Latin and Greek classes, or to his training as a lawyer or a civil engineer. An enumeration or a consideration of isolated instances of one class or the other will not supply knowledge. Even a simple question, such as whether families are larger now than they were a hundred years ago, is not decided by scattered instances of families of 20 children, or none at all; but by statistics founded on millions of observations. Facts bearing on the various subjects of study that have given the best results in the training of millions of individuals, with infinite variations in temperament and ability, will be discovered presumably in a similar way. In 1677 (it is well to verify references) an Englishman, Nathaniel Lee, wrote—"When Greeks joined Greeks then was the tug of war." One may interpret this as meaning that when trained, intelligent, patriotic men set to work with a common purpose, then something definite was done, something was shifted—they "got right there."