

worry of maintaining discipline, which is more exhausting to most natures than teaching. Encouraged by the success which followed the adoption of this system, the authorities of the Iowa State University have made even a more radical change in the same direction. They have abolished the committee, and have substituted self-government by the individual student for self-government by the students as a body. Each student is to be a law unto himself. In the new order of things the trustees of the University do not announce any formal code to be submitted to by the students, but confine themselves to making a few "suggestions" and "specifications." The system was introduced by the following remarks: "Instructors are provided that their whole strength may be spent in instruction and friendly conference with the students. It is wrong to all students, to the trustees and faculty, when a few divert the time and care of instructors to matters of discipline. It is expected that every student of Iowa College will govern himself in conformity with the intent of its founders and guardians, and so secure the greatest good to himself and all concerned, and the highest honors to the College." According to the college paper the results are so far entirely satisfactory. The present success of the plan will depend very largely on the personal influence of the professors, and if serious difficulties are not encountered before the system receives the strong sanction of custom, there is every reason to believe that it will be permanently successful. Certainly the authorities of Iowa College deserve great credit for inaugurating a scheme so entirely in accord with the true principles of moral education, which require the development of an internal restraint, rather than coercion by external powers.

We fear a very serious mistake was made by the Senate in voting down the motion brought before it by Mr. Houston for the abolition of scholarships in the faculties of Law and Medicine. This motion was in its nature supplementary to the scheme which was recently submitted to the Senate by Professor Loudon, and which was accepted by that body and is now about to come into operation. As is well known, this scheme involves, among other things, the abolition of scholarships and medals in the second, third, and fourth years of the Arts course. The views of Messrs. Loudon and Houston on this question are quite in accord with the most advanced ideas of our time. The tendency everywhere among all first-class institutions of liberal education is to eliminate as much as possible all personal conflict and unhealthy rivalry from among the students. A great change in this direction has been made at Oxford, and it was only a week ago that the old grading system in Princeton was abolished by the trustees. The action of the Senate in abolishing scholarships in Arts and retaining them in Law and Medicine appears to us to be exceedingly inconsistent. If scholarships are to be given in any course, most certainly it should be to those persons who are seeking a liberal rather than a professional education. It cannot be maintained to be the business of a state university to fit men for the professions or to hold out any special inducements to those entering them. But this is precisely what our University is doing. Practically speaking, bonuses are being given to the learned professions. Or, to look at the matter in another way, the University is paying money to induce men to enter certain professions, and the Law Society and the Medical Council are charging them excessively high fees to keep them out, and thus the University is impoverishing herself for the benefit of the latter corporations. Moreover, it is but reasonable that the saving which will be effected by the reduction of scholarships in the faculty of Arts should be expended in much needed improvements in that faculty, and should not be diverted to other faculties. The library and laboratories are sadly lacking in their equipment, and all the scholarship money would be much more advantageously employed if it were transferred to them. Thus for many reasons it is greatly to be regretted that the motion referred to did not receive a more favorable consideration from the Senate.

A Miss Stevens is Professor of Greek in Kansas University.

#### MODERN LANGUAGES AND THEIR NARROWNESS.

The course in Modern Languages has from the first been regarded by the majority of our educationists as the least important of the five honor departments of our University curriculum. It has been scarcely supposed that any student of good parts would devote his four years to this course specially, for the simple reason that it does not offer sufficient matter for such a prolonged period of study. The assumption has obviously been that very little intellectual profit is to be derived from the study of Modern Languages, as such. They form an excellent subsidiary course for the classical or the metaphysical specialist—a delightful kind of recreation after the severe mental strain incident to his own proper study; but the student who finds himself capable of taking Modern Languages only is not entitled to much respect, and it is quite absurd for him to ask for the removal of History as one of his sub-departments; for, as the course now stands, History is the one subject which affords room for intellectual play.

In view of these misconceptions, and of the persistence and frequency with which the objection of narrowness is urged against a course purely linguistic and literary, even by those who admit that there is much in Modern Languages to claim the attention of the earnest student, we find it necessary to consider the question somewhat in detail in this and subsequent issues.

A student has one or more than one of four objects in view in commencing the study of Modern Languages. He finds, as do many of our science students, that some other people than his own is taking the lead in that particular department of knowledge in which he is specially interested, and accordingly he studies the language of that particular people sufficiently to obtain access to results otherwise inaccessible. He is searching for facts—simple, unadorned facts.

The strange language he regards as an unavoidable obstacle merely, and he would, confessedly, prefer readable translations at all times. The books he worries are almost beyond the range of true literature. Of the real literature itself he knows and probably wishes to know nothing. He never dreams of reading a high-class literary production for pleasure. This species of language-study has undoubtedly been more or less necessary in the past, but in this book and periodical-producing generation no one needs wait many days for new results to appear in his own language wherever they may have been wrought out.

If knowledge of facts *simply* is the student's object he will probably soon discover that his time and energies might be more advantageously directed. In any case he cannot be called a student of *language*.

Let us then pass over this elementary stage of linguistic knowledge and consider the second object—the young ladies' object many call it—viz.: to gain a facility in the practical, everyday use of language. The attention is directed primarily to the conversational—the social phase of language, and through that to the literary. This is certainly more worthy of the name of linguistic study than our first object; and there are those who assert that this, be it ultimate object or not, is nevertheless the one thing needful—the essential in all language-study—with how much reason we shall have occasion to see in discussing the third object, with the consideration of which we shall first reach the core of our subject.

This third object seems perhaps to the majority of students to be the most plausible of all objects in studying a foreign language, and nineteen-twentieths of those having such an object in view would state it much as follows:—I wish to obtain a knowledge of German (*e.g.*) sufficient to enable me thoroughly to enjoy the literature of Germany. I have no desire to waste my time in the attempt to write and speak German, for I probably shall never have occasion to use it." "Then," he adds with a smile, "if at any time I should find myself boss of a gang of German navvies, or thrown into German society of any kind, it would be but a trifling matter to acquire the practical after having learned the theoretical and acquired an extensive vocabulary."

Let us examine this view, which, it will be noticed, differs