

Dec. 6, 1884.

foreign skeleton and appears before us the instant we approach it. English life is concealed in the foreign form, and nothing more. Is this a knowledge of a foreign language? It would almost be uncharitable not to call it such, for where is the graduate of our University who has advanced much beyond this stage even in modern languages? But knowledge of a foreign language it cannot be.

Viewed in this light then, the third object becomes rather visionary. Enjoying the literature may be a worthy object, but there is only one way to accomplish it; and it would seem that the young ladies are not so far wrong as to the proper starting point; experience is their basis of language, only they fail to carry their method far enough. We can understand a work of literature only when we thoroughly understand the common every-day forms of expression. The people's—the so-called vulgar idiom—is the vital part of language. It is not only the root which nourishes, but the solid trunk which raises and supports the graceful branches and the splendid blossoms and foliage of literature. Pluck the blossoms and they wither; transplant the root and in due time it will bring forth leaves and blossoms. It is quite possible to appropriate a few colloquial French expressions and still have a very imperfect knowledge of French; but the man is yet to be found who has a profound or even a satisfactory working knowledge of French without the colloquial.

The study of language now begins to assume gigantic proportions; it is not merely a learning of new word-forms, but implies a readjustment of the whole mental vision. Time—an almost unlimited time—it must take. Only as we live our experiences over again in connection with a foreign language does our knowledge of that language grow; and when our circle of such experiences widens until its circumference coincides with that of our English circle, we shall be justified in comparing our knowledge of that language with our knowledge of English. We do not wish to be understood to say it will require as many years to obtain such a round of foreign experiences as it has taken to form our English circle. The student, in the light of his past experiences, could place himself so favourably, and so control circumstances that a few years would suffice to repeat the experiences of a lifetime, if our University encouraged him to do so; but unfortunately it discourages true language study. Nor do we wish to say that books—grammars, dictionaries and texts—are not to be used. What we do say is that they are aids to study—but aids only. The living, spoken language is the grand stand-by. Books suggest or confirm, but we *learn and grow* in the presence of the living.

Need we now ask whether the study of languages affords opportunity for mental training? Who will presume to set bounds to its possibilities when every new form is necessarily a subject for comparison? and what faculty of man is too high to find unbounded room for play, and the most exquisite enjoyment in learning to distinguish innumerable tints before unknown to him? Not only is the course of study we have indicated the only possible one with the literary object in view, but it is emphatically the one which affords real mental culture. *Mental change of standpoint with regard to every thought and feeling is the one essential in language study; and it is by virtue of this circumstance alone that the study of language constitutes a real study.* Miss this entirely, as we have done in the past, and what do we gain? Little wonder the study of language is regarded as a narrow one!

Classical students are fond of emphasizing the benefit to be derived from constant comparison and transference of thought, and rightly so; but would some classical specialist kindly inform us wherein German is inferior in this respect to Greek? For our own part we are firmly persuaded that German properly studied is superior to Greek or another dead language, inasmuch as the light and atmosphere peculiar to Greek are not available to the same extent that those peculiar to German are. In other words, it is next to impossible to place ourselves at the precise standpoints from which the Greek regarded his language-forms.

In next issue we shall discuss the *fourth* object of Modern Language study—the scientific aspect of the question.

THE NATURAL SCIENCES COURSE.

The letters which have appeared recently in our columns on this subject have attracted considerable attention, particularly from the students pursuing the course in Science. As these communications express, we believe, the sentiments of a large and important body of our undergraduates, we desire to direct particular attention to the subject.

The question in discussion really resolves itself into this: Is it desirable to introduce further specialization into our curriculum? Is it advisable to allow students to take an Arts degree without having a comparatively intimate acquaintance with all the important branches of Science? We propose to answer these queries fairly and with a due regard for the maintenance of a high standard in the Arts course.

In this connection the question naturally arises: Is Science *per se* properly a department of the Arts course? We cannot think that it is. But of this more will be said presently. We venture to surmise that to a large number of people the term 'Arts Course' conveys the idea of a groundwork of Classics, a dash of Mathematics, a smattering of Mental and Moral Philosophy, a superficial knowledge of the Modern Languages, and a fact or two about the general principles of Science. This impression is in some respects correct. Our pass course for a degree would bear out such a conception. To obtain such a degree requires, in reality, little more than a general acquaintance with those branches of learning which are usually considered worthy of study in order to justify a claim to rank as an educated man. That a successful passing of the four annual pass examinations entitles one to rank as an educated man, does not of necessity, follow. It depends—as does the successful acquirement of any knowledge—upon the personal application and devotion of the individual student during his undergraduate days.

Can we say, then, that a student who graduates in any one of our specialized honor departments can lay claim to the same distinction as an ordinary pass student who has touched—though lightly it is true—upon all the branches of polite learning? The Senate by prescribing certain of the pass subjects which must be taken in addition to his honor work, virtually says, Yes. The general consensus of opinion, with which we cordially agree, is in the affirmative. It is taken for granted that students have supplemented their own specialized reading by acquainting themselves with current thought on the principal branches of learning which go to make up what is usually called a liberal education. It is recognized that general proficiency—in its widest and most comprehensive sense—is impossible; and that to succeed in life one must be a specialist. This is, we think, conceded by all. If we admit the justice and force of the principle of specialization at all, we should admit it universally.

We have gone over these generalizations because we believe them to be essential in the discussion which has arisen in regard to our Science course. We are assured our readers will grant the correctness of our views thus far. Now, if we agree to the principle of specialization, we must, to be consistent, follow it out to its natural conclusion. The Senate permitted the old department of Mathematics to be divided into the two sub-departments of Pure Mathematics and Physics. The wisdom of this course cannot be doubted. Who can, or will, have the courage to say that Biology, Chemistry, and Geology, are not as vast and important branches of Science, as Pure Mathematics and Physics, are of the general subject which we vaguely call mathematics. We feel inclined to say that the study of any one of the three sub-departments of Science which we have indicated is of much greater importance, and of more surpassing interest, than is the exclusive study of transcendental Mathematics. This is, of course, a matter of opinion. Then, if Biology, Chemistry, and Geology, are as important relatively as Pure Mathematics, and Physics, why let a student graduate in either of the latter and deny him a similar privilege as regards the former? To adopt the one and to reject the other principle seems to us to be illogical in the extreme. In the first few years after the sub-division of the department of the Natural Sciences, there might be a paucity of students in each of the branches. But this would only be temporary. As the advantages and attractions