

graduate may be brilliant in her scholarship, yet very defective in her womanhood and rude and repulsive in her manners. All mere academic attainments shrink into insignificance when compared with an intelligent, capable, cultured womanhood.

Our late beloved Queen comes to our mind as our model. She was prepared to be not only Queen of

the kingdom, but Queen of the home. Her intellect was trained, her knowledge ample, her culture varied, her womanly instincts and tact developed in the highest degree. She reigned as a strong, wise, cultured Christian woman. The schools that aim at similar all-round development of womanhood are the schools that will succeed in the 20th century.

## FRENCH SYNTAX.

PROF. W. F. C. STOCKLEY, M.A.

**M** BRUNETIÈRE, the editor of *La Revue des Deux Mondes*, the literary review with the greatest world prestige, has protested against an act of the present instruction régime in France.

What is this act?

It is an act for the simplification of French syntax, by which, if I understand rightly, you are henceforth at liberty, in school and out, to follow the established forms of French, for agreement of past participles, and plurals of compound nouns, or not to follow the same. In other words, the battle is declared lost, against those who find difficulty in the delicacy or the intricacy of a language's little idiosyncrasies, be they reasonable or unreasonable.

Certainly this is a very interesting act, and a literally extraordinary one, not to say unique. That French should have done the deed, and not individualistic English, is enough to rouse the late Mr. Matthew Arnold to come back and declare that the language whose chief newspaper spelt *diocess* for a time is avenged. Fancy, he said, the French doing such a thing; with their reverence for their well-studied language. But that was before 1900. And fate has

spared such confusion to the old age of the critic, had he happily lived.

That a great language—and French!—should say, “Oh, well, one will do as well as the other; what the man in the street says, or finds easy to say, is a pretty good rule; and the Academy may put up its shutters; we are going in for popular rule; and what any fellow writes can be understood as well as the choice talk of Racine, Fénelon, Chateaubriand, or Renan.”

That is certainly wonderful.

Now, it may be fairly admitted (a) that some forms of speech are allowable, together with other forms of saying the same thing; and (b) that some grammatical and syntactical questions are puzzles.

For instance (a) in English, “whom we give it to” is often as good, not to say better than, “to whom we give it”—whatever pedantry may say. And, further, one is preferable at one moment, the other at another—for the sake of emphasis, or of rhythm; or because it pleases the speaker; and he is not bound for his reasons. Again (b) you may say *sick* and *sicker*; you may not say *ill* and *illier*—whatever bad Americanism may do.

And, as the dying French, gram-