

Trinity College

Trinity College Digital Repository

Trinity College Bulletins and Catalogues (1824 - present) Trinity Publications (Newspapers, Yearbooks, Catalogs, etc.)

8-28-1938

Trinity College Bulletin, 1937-1938 (Linguistics Course Report)

Trinity College

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/bulletin>

Recommended Citation

Trinity College, "Trinity College Bulletin, 1937-1938 (Linguistics Course Report)" (1938). *Trinity College Bulletins and Catalogues (1824 - present)*. 200.

<https://digitalrepository.trincoll.edu/bulletin/200>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Trinity Publications (Newspapers, Yearbooks, Catalogs, etc.) at Trinity College Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Trinity College Bulletins and Catalogues (1824 - present) by an authorized administrator of Trinity College Digital Repository.

Trinity College
HARTFORD CONNECTICUT

A COURSE IN LINGUISTICS

TRINITY COLLEGE
Hartford, Connecticut
1938

INTRODUCTION

DURING the academic year 1936-37 an experimental course in Linguistics for a small group of students at Trinity College was established. The success of this enterprise was so obvious that during the next year Professor E. D. Myers (A.B. Roanoke, Ph.D. Princeton) was engaged to carry on the course in four sections with approximately ten Freshmen in each. So much interest in this course has been shown by teachers elsewhere, as well as by persons connected with Trinity College, that we are printing certain reports on the project.

It should be borne in mind that this is not a course in Linguistics for graduate students or for those specializing in language study. On the contrary, the norm of the course is a freshman who enters college with two years of Latin and needs the cultural background of proper language study. Trinity College is grateful to the Carnegie Corporation for a grant which has made it possible to undertake this task in proper fashion. Professor Myers is admirably equipped for this work, and we hope that in due course a text book on Linguistics for college freshmen will appear as a result of his efforts.

R. B. OGILBY,
President.

REPORT TO THE CARNEGIE CORPORATION

ON THE

COURSE IN LINGUISTICS AT TRINITY COLLEGE

PROFESSOR EDWARD D. MYERS

The course this year enrolls 46 students, of whom 40 are Freshmen, the other 6 being divided equally among the three upper classes. It was divided into four classes, or sections, designated "A" with 18 students, "B" with 7 students, "C" with 10 students and "D" with 11 students. Thus, four separate experiments were conducted to determine how such an introductory course might best be taught.

All four sections were assigned term papers of from three to five thousand words in the "History of the English Language" using for source material the following books: L. P. Smith, "The English Language"; A. C. Baugh, "A History of the English Language"; O. F. Emerson, "A History of the English Language"; Otto Jespersen, "The Growth and Structure of the English Language"; M. S. Serjeantson, "A History of Foreign Words in English"; H. C. Wyld, "A History of the English Language"; and H. C. Wyld, "Historical Study of the Mother Tongue". The readings were supplemented by lectures and class discussion.

Also, to all four sections reading assignments were made in Greenough & Kittredge, "Words and Their Ways in English Speech"; A. P. Herbert, "What A Word!"; H. W. Fowler, "The King's English"; H. W. Fowler, "Modern English Usage"; H. L. Menken, "The American Language"; and Otto Jespersen, "Language". Lectures were given on the origin of writing, the alphabet, various definitions of language, Jespersen's theory of the origin of language, the Aryan family of languages, together with covering readings in the reference material. This is a brief summary of the material common to all four of the sections.

Section "A" included those students who had entered College with no Latin credits. To this section, for an average of one of the three class hours per week, was taught beginning Latin. The text used was Carr & Hadzits's first book "The Living Language" (Heath 1933). It has been obvious from the response of the students in this section and from

the various separate problems that have arisen in dealing with those who have offered no Latin as an entrance requirement into Trinity College, that further and more extensive investigation into the problem of how best to deal with them will be required. It may be of some interest to you to note that their offerings in languages tabulate as follows:

Those who have had	no Latin	7
“ “ “ “	some Latin	11
“ “ “ “	some Greek	1
“ “ “ “	some French	12
“ “ “ “	some Spanish	4
“ “ “ “	some German	6

To Section “B”, all the members of which had offered at least two years of high school Latin or their equivalent, was taught a somewhat more advanced Latin from Hadzits’s second book “The Living Language” (Heath 1934). In addition to the Latin assignments, this section was also taught, for fourteen consecutive class hours, introductory Greek. The text used was W. L. Donaldson’s “First Greek Course” (Cambridge 1933). At the end of the four weeks of Greek the class was given a sight reading test, which consisted of the First Chapter of the Gospel According to St. John. All seven students successfully passed the test, and the average grade of the class was better than 80. To Section “C”, in addition to the Latin, was taught also one month of Greek, using Crosby & Schaeffer’s “Introduction to Greek” (Allen & Bacon 1928), with the same sight reading test and with even more gratifying success. To Section “D” was taught a still more advanced Latin, which has included selections from Livy, although from the same text as that used in Section “B”.

Thus, all four sections are equipped to study English derivations from Latin and have studied the presentation in E. L. Johnson’s “Latin Words of Common English” (Heath 1931), and Sections “B” and “C”, in addition to the Latin, are further equipped to study also Greek derivatives, a scheme of which I am at present devising. All sections were given lectures and reading on Grimm’s Law and Cognates.

The entire course is still in an experimental stage. From the work done this year certain conclusions are gradually emerging: first, that the most important basis for study, and the one to be dealt with first in such a course, is the history of the English language; secondly, that an acquaintance with Greek vocabulary forms and syntax can be acquired in a painless and fruitful fashion, although, admittedly, such an acquaintance would be with only a minimum amount of material; thirdly, that Latin can be reviewed in such a fashion as to give some understanding of what might be called the genus of the language and its contribution to English; and, finally, the importance of these studies, when accompanied by an adequate illustration in the lectures, can be made apparent to college freshmen, and the fundamental interest of these studies can be made stimulating and fruitful.

The conclusions arrived at by an analysis of the work of the entire year are, in general: First, the presentation of the history of the English language should include an analysis of the historical development of English grammar; secondly, such an analysis should be made on the comparative method, that is, in such a way as to demonstrate clearly the similarities and, thereby also, the differences between the grammatical structure of English and that of Latin and Greek. This will greatly facilitate the subsequent presentation of Greek and Latin and the presentation of many of the particular classes of words derived from Latin and Greek. Thirdly, it has become quite clear that students who offer no Latin for entrance must be treated in an altogether different fashion from those who have. They are not equipped to receive either as much material or the same kind of presentation of material as those who do offer Latin, even though it be as little as one year. Consequently, the preparation of material for such students amounts virtually to the preparation of a second course. No complete or adequate program has as yet been worked out.

On the other hand, a program for the students who offer Latin for entrance has been worked out, that is, an outline of complete lectures, assignments and supplementary readings for the whole of the first semester is now ready. A complete typescript of what will amount to half a textbook will be ready by the end of the summer.

The next academic year will see the program tested and proved with another class of students.

TRINITY COLLEGE PROGRAM BROADCAST OVER WTHH

DR. EDWARD D. MYERS, *Professor of Linguistics*

That Trinity College is a pioneer in the work of establishing an undergraduate course in Linguistics is owing to the imagination, foresight and energy of its President, Dr. Remsen B. Ogilby. His imagination, working on the reluctance or refusal of the high school graduate to study Latin and Greek, perceived the necessity of some discipline to offset the lack of that of the Classics. His foresight into the progress of ideas in higher education saw that some such offsetting discipline must, inevitably, be produced. His energy transformed these fruits of imagination and foresight into fact.

The fact is the present course in Linguistics at Trinity College. That the need for some such course is exerting increasing pressure on college faculties is proved by the many requests for information about it which have come in from all parts of the country, and by the recent decisions of several college administrations to establish such a course. That the venture, although only experimental at its present stage, has the approval of unprejudiced but interested judges of academic needs is proved by the generous grant of the Carnegie Corporation of New York of \$10,000 to Trinity for the sole purpose of conducting the course.

So much is necessary to tell the *why* of the Linguistics course. The *what* of the course—that is, its aims and subject matter—I shall try to make clear in these next few minutes.

In the first place—first chronologically and in importance—is the purpose of giving to the student an understanding of the structure, history, possibilities and beauties of the English language. The history of the language, beginning with the first influx of our Anglo-Saxon forebears into the British Isles 1400 years ago and continuing up to the present, offers some of the most interesting possible material for study. The structure of the language, both in its own idioms and in comparison with that of other languages, offers a rich field for imaginative investigation. And the vocabulary, drawing so largely on Latin, Greek, Anglo-Saxon, and, in varying degree, on all the other languages of the world, offers a variety and flexibility of expression unparalleled among historic and living tongues.

The second object of the course is derived directly from the first and may be said to be the purpose of giving to the student a “feeling” for English words. Admittedly, the best way to engender such a feeling is to induce the student to read widely and voluminously in the best English

authors; but a more direct, and in some respects more fruitful, way is to have the student learn about the make-up and history of particular words and of classes of words.

Further, by the process of working through English back to the Latin, from which so much English is derived, and then to a more intimate study of Latin itself, we are led to the third purpose of the course, namely, that of salvaging what Latin the student may have learned two or three or four years earlier in his high school course.

This, then, is the *what* of the course. The *how* of it, namely, the means to achieving these ends, is in process of being worked out. The process in this early experimental stage offers some extremely subtle and interesting subsidiary problems.

The first of these problems is that of preventing the teaching technique from slipping into the dull and somewhat machine-like methods which are—all too frequently—employed in the teaching of languages. The solution to this problem has not been difficult, because so many English words contain in themselves and in their relatives the most astonishing developments in meaning and changes in sound. For example, the student is almost invariably entertained by a demonstration that the same Latin word gives *veal* and *violin* and *veteran* and *vellum* and *fiddle*; or that the same Greek word gives *agony* and *antagonist* and *synagogue*.

But perhaps the responses of the student can more accurately be suggested by reproducing some of the give-and-take of an actual class-room scene. One of the sections of the course has only seven students. One of these students is Mr. Joseph B. Weimert.

Myers—Mr. Weimert—may I ask you—do you remember the Latin word which gives all those English words?

Weimert—Yes, Mr. Myers, I think so. It is the ancient word *vetus*, which means “old”, or “of years”, and which itself derives from an even more ancient word: *vetos*, meaning “year”.

Myers—But how does the word for “year” come to mean “violin”?

Weimert—Well, once upon a time an enterprising Roman invented the rude, primitive musical instrument which was the grandfather of the modern violin. This instrument, having just come into being, naturally was nameless. In casting about for a name, he bethought himself of the animal which was in spirit like the kind of music his instrument made, that is, frisky and playful. The animal, of course, was a calf, or yearling, and we all know how those same animals are wont to frisk and gambol on the green hillside. The Latin name for the animal was *vitula*, which, on getting into Italian, was softened and became *viula*, or *viola*, which went into French as *violin* and thence into English as *violin*.

Myers—And the same Latin word, *vitula*, on going into German was roughened instead of softened and became *fidulla*, which came over into English as *fiddle*. *Vellum* obviously derives from the same Latin

vitula through the French. But, Mr. Weimert, how is that word related to veteran?

Weimert—The Latin *vitula* is apparently the word *vetos*, which means “year”, plus the *ulla* ending, which makes a diminutive of it, and the word *vetus* plus another ending—*anus*—gives the Latin *veteranus*, from which comes the English *veteran*, which means one who has served for many years.

Myers—And as I have told you several times before, a knowledge of the origin of words is not only interesting but may, in many cases, restrain you from the pitfalls into which the untutored and the careless are so liable to fall.

Weimert—Yes, I anticipated some help of that sort from the course when I signed up for it last fall.

Myers—No-no-no-no.....that use of the word “anticipate” is one of those very pitfalls. What you really meant was that you “expected” some such help from the course.

Weimert—Oh, I see—“expect” means simply “to expect”, while “anticipate” means mmmmm.....ah.....perhaps to do something about it in advance.

Myers—Exactly so, and if you don’t believe it’s a sin to use the one word when you mean the other, just look at these two sentences. “John and Mary expected to be married.” But: “John and Mary anticipated marriage.”

Weimert—(he chuckles) Oh,—now I really do see, and now I remember that example: it is from A. P. Herbert’s book “What a Word!”

Myers—Right!—It *is* from Herbert. But, can you tell me what you really mean by “really”?

Weimert—You can’t stick me on that one. It’s from an adjectival form of the Latin word *res* meaning “thing” or “fact”, and so I mean that I see the *thing*, that is, the *difference*—itself.

Myers—And where do we get that word “fact”?

Weimert—It’s from a form of the Latin word *facio* meaning “to do” or “to make” so that when, a few minutes ago, you said Dr. Ogilby had transformed his ideas about this course into fact, you were saying his ideas were now turned into a “thing done” or a “thing accomplished”.

Myers—That’s right, Mr. Weimert. And tell me what are some of the items in this course that you have found to be interesting.

Weimert—I think, Mr. Myers, that the way in which something of the history of nations is suggested by the history of the language is one of the most entertaining things we have studied.

Myers—Give me some examples, please.

Weimert—Well, take the presence of so many Italian words in the English musical vocabulary,—words like *piano*, *soprano*, *opera*, *libretto*, *tempo*, all of which are straight from Italian;—if there were no historical records of any other sort, the very presence of these Italian words in English would prove beyond question that there had been some communication between Italy and England at the time when English music was being developed.

Myers—Yes, it cannot be doubted that linguistic history reflects political history. But does not the history of words throw light also on the development of thought? I mean this:—when you know its make-up, does not the word “disaster”, for example, suggest more than merely “calamity” or “something ruinous or distressing”?

Weimert—Yes, it does. “Disaster” is from the Latin prefix *dis* plus *aster*, which means “star”, and *dis* means “away from” or “contrary”; so that “disaster” means, literally, “with a contrary or opposing star”.

Myers—Right you are. And the word came into use when people still believed in the superstition of astrology,—believed that certain stars have an evil influence on men’s destinies as others have a good influence.

Weimert—Thus, although the superstition is exploded, the word it gave is still in use.

Myers—Yes. And there are many other words with similar histories. For example, the ancient physiologists thought that the human body had in it four kinds of liquids. These liquids they called “humors” since “humor” is the Latin word for “liquid”. The four liquids were thought to be blood, phlegm, bile and black bile. They believed further that good health consisted in an even balance between these four liquids.

Weimert—I see,—and good health, since it was this balance or mixture must have been a man’s “temperament” because “temperament” means “mixture”.

Myers—Yes. Also the word “complexion”, which, in Latin, meant “combination”,—complexion or combination, that is, of these “humors” or “liquids”.

Weimert—And the word “bilious”—since it means “having bile”—must have meant, for the ancient doctors, that in a man the bile was out of proportion to the other liquids.

Myers—Yes. And “sanguine”, which is “bloody”, meant there was too much blood.

Weimert—Extremely interesting. But the most interesting word of the group is the word “humor” itself, because some time later, the adjective “humorous” meant “having too much of one humor or another” and so “eccentric”. A “humorous” man was what we call a “crank”.

Myers—Right. And then, from this, “humor” came to mean a perception of the peculiar or odd and so on to its present meaning. But tell me, Mr. Weimert, have you found the necessary work you have done in Greek and Latin to be dull, or to be sheer drudgery?

Weimert—Quite the contrary. It was an eye-opener to me to find that after a single month of studying Greek I was able actually to read some of the Greek of St. John’s Gospel. You see, I had always had the impression that to learn Greek would take years of drudgery.

Myers—Well, really to learn Greek does take years of work.

Weimert—Yes, but even that month of it gave me enough to do some easy Greek and has also given me enough so that I can, in a great many instances, recognize the Greek in the English words; when I do recognize it, the English word always takes on more and richer meanings.

Myers—I am glad to hear you say so. Your response to the bit of Greek I gave you was quick and very gratifying. And I did not think it was at all a painful dose,—was it?

Weimert—Well, it may have been a more painful dose than *you* thought,—*you* weren’t taking it. And certainly we were all,—or at least I am sure I was—at the outset rather sceptical both of the difficulty of it and of its being any use; yet it really was *not* so painful and now we are all grateful for having had it. And, as I said, we find that it *is* useful.

Myers—Again: I am glad to hear you say so. My hope for the course is that all of the material in it may be useful; that it may be not merely something which you can bone up for the examination and then enjoy forgetting as soon as you have passed the examination.

Weimert—It would be hard to forget many or most of the things we have learned because we use them every time we speak a sentence or read a page. All the material you have given us has to do with words and, after all, words are the tools of every man no matter what his trade may be.

Myers—Yes. And another aspect of words is that they are like proverbs. It were too much to say that single words contain in them the distilled wisdom of whole proverbs,—most proverbs are, by definition, already highly distilled. But, just as proverbs record either an observation or a habit or custom, so also do many words. The record is in many cases so complete that earlier meanings or earlier forms of some words give information about matters on which history is silent.

Weimert—Our word *book*, for example. There are not in existence any examples of the earliest use of the bark of the beech tree as a writing surface. Yet an application of the laws of sound-changes proves that our modern word *book* is derived from the same ancient root-word as is the word *beech*, and a further application of other laws shows

that *book*, or the older word from which it came, must have meant the beech tree, or a thin slab of beech-wood, or the beech-bark. We may thence conclude that when our earliest Anglo-Saxon or Teutonic forefathers first began to write, they used the bark of the beech tree as a surface to write on. There is also a second, and obvious, conclusion that they must have been living in a region where beech trees grew.

Myers—But we have not finished with the word *book*, which in its oldest form would be also the word *beech*. Curiously enough, it has relatives—brothers and sisters and uncles and aunts—in many other languages. Let me try to make clear what I mean by saying that it has relatives in other languages. In your study of German you have found that the German word for book is *Buch*, spelled B-u-c-h; also you have noticed that a great many other common words in English and German are remarkably similar. As examples, the German words *Vater* for *father*; *Mutter* for *mother*; *Schwester* for *sister*; *Haus* for *house*; *Schiff* for *ship*. These resemblances—and there are many more—are astonishing, and surely they at once caught your eye and ear. Further, if you have read in earlier English literature, that of the 13th, 12th or 10th centuries, you have noticed that the spelling and pronunciation of many words have changed a great deal. Our word *book*, for example, was earlier spelled b-o-c and was pronounced *boc*.

Weimert—And this year I have learned that the German words were not taken over from the English, nor the English words from the German, but both were developed out of a much earlier common form. It is as if there had been a parent word *boc* sometime around the fifth century after Christ and as if it had produced two sons, the English *book* and the German *Buch*. Thus it may be said that many English words have *relatives* in other languages.

Myers—The number of relatives that English has is, at first glance, almost incredibly large: the original family must have been *quite* a family. English is definitely related, for example, to most of the languages of Europe,—to about forty of them. Not only that, but it is also related to Latin and Greek and to the languages of India and Persia. But with most of these languages the kinship is not nearly so close as is the kinship with German.

Weimert—I see: if English and German may be called sister languages, then English and, say, Latin, are to be called second or third cousins.

Myers—Right! and although the cousinship is more remote it is not any the less definite and certain. Thus some second cousins of our English word *book* are the Latin word *fagus*, the Greek word *phegos* and the ancient Indian word *bhaj*,—words in which every sound is changed but which, quite certainly, descended from the same parent word as did the English *book* and the German *Buch*. The discovery of these relationships, a century or more ago, has

produced many far-reaching results. The special study of these relationships has produced the science of comparative philology and this science shared with Darwinian evolution the responsibility for the vast expansion, during the 19th Century, of the horizons of human thought. As the comparative study of languages advanced it very soon became clear that the speakers of these languages of Europe and India must have descended from some pre-historic common family and must have been heirs of a common cultural heritage. There are many tests of relationship. Do you remember them, Mr. Weimert?

Weimert—Yes. It is this: if Greek and Latin and English and German and Scandinavian and the ancient language of India have in common the words of kinship, like *father* and *mother*, and *son* and *daughter*, and the numerals *one*, *two*, *three*, *four* and so on, and the pronouns like *you*, *he*, *she*, *they*,—if they all have these words in common, then the words must either have been borrowed by the one language from the other, or the words must have been descended from the same parent word.

Myers—Correct! And other considerations prove such a long series of borrowings to have been impossible. Hence these common, every day words in all these various languages must have descended from common ancestors.

A FRESHMAN COURSE IN LINGUISTICS AT TRINITY COLLEGE, HARTFORD

A paper delivered before the Linguistic Society of America at the Linguistic Institute at Ann Arbor, July 30, 1938, by Professor Edward D. Myers.

The titles of the articles appearing in *Language* and of the courses offered here in the Linguistic Institute suggest strongly that the dominant interest of the members of the Society and of those in attendance at the Institute is in the technical and detailed aspects of linguistic science, rather than, on the whole, in the cultural aspects. Yet, surely, all the members of the Society are, in their teaching, vitally concerned with these larger cultural aspects and must oftentimes have faced the unfortunate truth that, as Professor Spargo* puts it, "The average cultivated person of today can be expected to know less than nothing of language. . . . But perhaps the most important reason . . . (for this) is the terror of language study so prevalent in America, a terror which would be comical if it were not so far reaching in its effects, culturally and spiritually." What Professor Spargo says of the "average cultivated person" is even more generally true of the average undergraduate. That terror and the consequent neglect of language study are deplorable.

To remove the terror and thereby to encourage language study is the general purpose of the course at Trinity. But this general purpose includes a number of specific purposes, that is, a number of needs which the course will, in part at least, satisfy.

Perhaps the first of those needs is that of replacing the values offered in the teaching of Latin and Greek. As is well known and often deplored, in the past generation the study of the classical languages has either diminished considerably or vanished entirely. At Trinity College, for example, in the year 1905, 65 percent of the degrees granted were arts degrees, which meant that 65 percent of the graduates had each had at least three years of Greek or Latin. In 1920 the percentage was 50; in 1925, 30; and from 1930 to 1938 the average percentage has been 27,—as over against an average of 65 for the years 1900 to 1907. This was a decrease from two-thirds to one-fourth, and that the decrease was to *only* one-fourth marks Trinity, in this regard, as one of the outstanding colleges in the country. The decrease at Harvard, Princeton and Yale, for example, was so sharp that for this and other reasons the classical language

* Preface to his translation of Pedersen's "Linguistic Science in the Nineteenth Century."

requirement has been removed entirely from among those for the bachelor of arts degree.

The administration at Trinity has been and is unwilling to follow the lead of nearly every other college in simply dropping the classical requirement for the arts degree. This unwillingness proceeds from its belief that there are definite advantages to be derived from the liberal arts course and that the mark of having acquired those advantages should not, in honesty, be bestowed upon graduates who lacked them.

I am anxious not to talk nonsense and not to become sentimental about the value of the classics. Probably the disciplinary value of classical studies in college should not be defended, because such discipline should be taught in the schools and can be taught through other means. Probably the cultural value of a first-hand acquaintance with Homer and Horace should not be urged in defense of required courses, because most students promptly forget their classics once the requirement has been satisfied. Yet, on the other hand, we have often been captivated by the clarity of thought and aptness of reference in the man of classical training as we have been appalled by the lack of those virtues in the man without the training. Thus there is the need in some way to replace the educational and cultural values which have been lost through the dropping of Latin and Greek. A properly planned course in linguistics will replace some of those values.

There are a number of other purposes to be served by such a course. For example, teachers of German complain that it is impossible to persuade the student to learn and understand what is meant by cognate words or cognate languages; teachers of English composition complain that it is impossible to make clear the meaning of the subjunctive in English, the distinction between *shall* and *will*, etc.; teachers of biology, that students can get no real grasp of their technical terminology,—that the names are generally regarded as so many nonsense syllables to be memorized.

Well, if I may say so without encroaching on metaphysics, it may be that, in the nature of things, it is *not* possible clearly to present cognates, the subjunctive, the simple and coloured futures and classical derivatives in the conventional manner. This is because the conventional presentation is of these different matters as isolated facts quite unrelated to the rest of the subject matter of the course and without any other associations in the student's body of knowledge. If, however, the student is first given a knowledge of language structure, of the relations existing between languages, and of historical and descriptive English grammar, then he really learns and has considerable interest in cognates and derivatives and subjunctives.

Thus the purpose of the course at Trinity is to give an understanding of language in general and of English in particular. Such an understanding may then serve as a background against which other subjects, otherwise incomprehensible, become clear and interesting.

It was in the belief that these aims might be fulfilled by such a course that, two years ago, President Remsen B. Ogilby inaugurated the course at Trinity College. More recently, the faculty has issued a ruling that permits a student to offer Linguistics for the arts degree. The exact place of the new course in the curriculum is indicated by the fact that the A.B. degree may be obtained under either of two plans. Plan A is called the Classics Plan and requires the usual work in classical and modern languages. Plan B is called the Linguistics Plan and requires that the student majoring in Economics, History, or Philosophy complete the Linguistic course and at least two of the five following courses: Greek Civilization, World's Literature, Ancient Civilization and the Origins of Society, the History of Philosophy, and Greek Philosophy. Under this plan the student must also offer three years of German or four years of French.

Two years ago the course included one section of ten students. Their response was so satisfactory that last year there were four sections with an average of twelve students each. A different approach to the subject was made in each section and from the different experiments and from the study of them the following conclusions were derived. First, that a general account of language and languages must be the background against which only more detailed studies can be made meaningful and interesting. Secondly, that it is possible and relatively easy so to present elementary Greek that the student can, in twelve to fifteen recitation hours, learn enough of the structure and vocabulary of the language readily to understand the principles of word-formation and to acquire an insight into the scientific vocabulary of English and other modern languages. And, incidentally, in each of the two sections to which Greek was taught the class as a whole was able satisfactorily to translate the beginning of the Fourth Gospel at sight,—with no previous practise in sight translation. Thirdly, that the vestiges of the two or three years of school Latin offered for college entrance can be developed into an understanding of word-formation in Latin, a further insight into modern vocabularies, and an understanding of the relationship between English and Latin and Greeek cognates.

From these conclusions and from the information acquired during the year of fairly intensive study and experimentation the subject-matter of the course has been blocked out and some of the details filled in. But, both in general and in detail, that subject-matter will be subjected to the tests of the class-room, of student responses, and of criticism.

The subject-matter of the course, then, includes, in the first place, a discussion of language, what it is, and how it works. The point of view taken is, in general that of Otto Jespersen. This is followed by an account of the Indo-European family of languages with special attention to the place of English and Greek and Latin in that family. Such an account necessarily involves some discussion of the marks of linguistic relationship and of the peculiar characteristics of the various languages. It is to be based on Meillet and Vendryes.

The second block of material follows from the first and covers the history of English with special attention to its structure and grammar and to the various periods of word borrowing and word-coinage.

The third and fourth blocks of material are studies of the structure, principles of word-formation and selected vocabularies of Greek and Latin. The vocabularies will consist of Greek Latin and words each of which has five or more primary derivatives in English, thus permitting the presentation of much more extensive vocabularies which will be at the same time foundations for the study of English derivatives.

With this material as a basis, then, the succeeding study is of the principles of etymology, the development of the Romance Languages, particularly French, out of Latin, and a more detailed study of word-borrowing in English.

And, finally, the study of language is made both *as* poetry—in Kittredge's phrase—and *in* poetry, as in the work of George Rylands. This leads naturally to an account of semantics and of slang and idioms, and this latter, in turn, to the changes in our own language observable at the present time.

It may be remarked in conclusion that what might be called these chapters in a Freshman Linguistics course are not sharply divided, that each lecture and class discussion suggests a different mode of presentation, and that the fitting-in of details is determined largely by the grasp and interest of the students.