

dreds of years, but the study of modern literature has many and special advantages. Not only does it, as your editorial points out, enable us to assimilate the thoughts of the greatest minds; but even if they fail to do this, the mere contact with such minds is a powerful stimulus to our own. The training it affords may not be as systematic as that of science, may not train the thinking faculties so *regularly*, but it stimulates them more powerfully. There is more human interest in it; it brings one abreast of modern thought, makes us men of the present, broadens our sympathies, makes us see that there are people on the other side of the mountain, and disabuses our minds of the narrow prejudice that all excellence, earnestness, wisdom, resides eternally in one literature, our own. Besides, though I would not urge this point, modern languages have a practical value to any student or professional man. Much of modern science, theology, criticism are locked up in French and German. The knowledge of the languages is indispensable, for language is the key of literature. Let us have one course in the college that will be distinctly literary, that will give some scope for originality, independent study and enthusiasm: that will give men a good knowledge of English and teach them to express themselves readily in it. Let it not be encumbered with what is useless, but let its aims be clear and well-defined; and its motto, simplicity, efficiency thoroughness.

To attain these ends more men and therefore more money is needed. We must have a chair in German and one in the Romance Languages. But in the meantime much might be done without any expenditure of money at all. The requirements might be different. The place where most reform is needed is in the curriculum and the examinations.

What the curriculum might do. It might do away with, first, the absurdity of having History and Ethnology on the course, and, second, the acquiring knowledge of literature second-hand through such media as 'Gostwick and Harrison,' 'Demogeot,' and 'Craik.' It might make the student devote himself more to the indispensable thing, learning the language. This is not to be done by translating alone, or by reading of works on philology, but by study and the practical using of the language in the classroom in reading, writing, and speaking. One famous remark of our professor of Metaphysics applies here: 'A man learns to play on the harp by playing on the harp.' Man learns French and German by reading, writing, and speaking French and German. This cannot be too often repeated or enforced. The curriculum might emphasize the value of prose by requiring a greater quantity, and perhaps exercises in different styles, as letters, essays, articles. In the upper years all texts might be taken off, so that the student may be untrammelled in his course of reading. The student would then be supposed to have a working knowledge of the languages, and sufficient enthusiasm and desire to study literature, and to read the standard works of each country. At the same time he would continue the study of the language on its practical side. More attention should also be paid to our own language and literature, especially in the much neglected department of composition. Would it not be well if this were encouraged by prizes, or by some distinction on the class-lists, such as honorable mention? Might not there be compulsory exercises throughout the year?

What the professors might do. Under this new state of affairs, with special professors to give all their time to their own department, we would of course have more enthusiasm, more life, more teaching. We could have lectures on the literatures delivered in the language to which they belong, as they do at London. With a different curriculum, and a different standard of examination, the nature of the lectures would of course be different.

What examiners and examinations might do. By all means let us have fewer of them, and let them set up a different standard. Let more emphasis be laid on practical knowledge. The honors might be given exclusively on prose. In English an original thesis on some literary subject might be required for a B.A. More importance might be attached to accurate finished literary translation into English. Examinations on literature might give more scope for a student's originality by requiring his views on particular periods, authors, or celebrated works.

With such a course as this, there is no reason why a student after four years should not leave the College able to read and write French and German with ease, with an English literary style, and with a wide and sympathetic knowledge of the best of modern literature. Such an education seems to me a thing to be desired.

I cannot close without saying how I regret that the 'VARSITY' in its comments upon my former letter should have so completely

mistaken its very obvious meaning, and imputed to me views which I hope I have shown I am very far from holding.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN.

CO-EDUCATION.

To the Editor of the 'VARSITY.

DEAR SIR,—Your admirable editorial criticized so calmly and logically the opinions expressed by Messrs. Houston and Stevenson, that any observations by me may seem superfluous. Yet, there are a few points in their letters I wish to refer to.

Mr. Houston says: 'The question is.....not whether women and men shall be educated at Universities together, but whether women shall be allowed to have a University education at all.' And, then, he points out that many who favor co-education 'would rather have a separate institution of the same kind for women, but until such an institution is provided, or, at least, until there is some chance of getting one, they resent the injustice inflicted on those who are desirous of obtaining a University education and cannot get it.'

Very good. But, have these gentlemen who 'would rather have a separate institution of the same kind for women,' and, yet, who are bitterly ardent in their advocacy for co-education, considered that by such a course as they adopt they are greatly lessening the chances of getting such a separate institution as they say they prefer? If they are so very anxious, as their writings seem to indicate, to provide means for the higher education of the women of the Province, how does it come that they do not, at least, attempt to petition the Legislature for a separate institution instead of clamoring for what is, at least, but a mere social experiment? If a prominent member of the government stated that the higher education of women should not be disposed of on the ground of economy by the 'rich and prosperous Province of Ontario,' and that a higher and broader view should be taken of the matter, is there not room to hope that a petition such as I have referred to might receive the consideration of the House, although the State aid question was left over for another session?

But you answer: there is a present need. We agree. A present need, let us remind you, of a separate institution, for we know four ladies who are desirous of obtaining a University education, and yet who, on principle, would not enter University College if its doors were thrown open at once. Will those *just* men who advocate co-education for University College see any 'flagrant injustice' to these 'few sufferers?' Is there not actually more injustice done to these ladies, forasmuch as the introduction of co-education will, though plainly unsuccessful, put further back than ever the chances of getting a separate institution that will fairly and equally meet the wants of all the ladies of the Province desiring a higher education? We mention only four ladies to whom injustice would be done, but we have good reason to think that the majority of the ladies who matriculated and whose feelings and opinions ought to be consulted would be treated in a similar manner.

And yet, to listen to the violent denunciations of their opponents by co-educationists it might be fancied that these individuals were the only true champions of the cause of the higher education of women in this Province.

A word about Mr. Stevenson's 'numerous statistics' and 'overwhelming array of evidence!' He speaks, Mr. Editor, of the coolness of some of your assumptions as being unparalleled, and yet in the next sentence he has the coolest audacity to quote as part (and doubtless the main part) of his 'overwhelming array of evidence' the names of Drs. White, Fairchild and Grant. As some of your readers may not know some facts in connection with co-education in Cornell, we will state them. In the first place, the Sage endowment necessitated the establishment and continuance of co-education. Secondly, Dr. Wilson points out in his open letter to the Minister of Education that 'President White since the introduction of co-education at Cornell, has been to a large extent precluded from personal observation. He has accepted diplomatic appointments; was ambassador at Berlin for upwards of two years; and subsequently engaged in other political missions: in addition to which, on the ground of health he has for long periods been absent from the University.' These statements have been recently and publicly corroborated by one of the Professors of Cornell itself.

The name of Dr. Fairchild as an authority must provoke a smile, especially from those who are conversant with his 'gratuitous assertion' *anent* the grand time the boys and girls have at his institution, and, moreover, when they remember that Dr.