

This ought to show that Psychology deals with a whole department of things accessible to observation and in that department, as in the department which forms the subject matter of Zoology or Botany, there is an immense field for an explorer. Certain mental things are well known as certain species of plants or animals; but there are numerous others which remain to be discovered by careful observers. Most books on Psychology scarcely draw the attention of the student to this fact; and their systematic and 'sketchy' treatment of the subject produces the erroneous impression that the task of a Psychologist is not so much *discovery* as *explanation*. But Psychology would no more be perfect with the known mental facts than medicine with the known diseases, or astronomy with the known planets. There are numerous feelings and mental phenomena which for their minuteness have escaped observation and have therefore remained un-named. But minute though they are, they are to be discovered by the Psychologist, classified, described, named and if possible explained. What discoveries are being made in this direction, and what immense field there is for an explorer in the mental region, I shall try to describe in a future paper.

P. L. B.

#### ENGLISH AT THE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION.

Although English is a foreign tongue to the Indian student, it has been deliberately adopted by the University as the medium of instruction, as well as the medium of expression of thought on the part of candidates for examination. What therefore is practically wanted is that our students should obtain such a ready familiarity with the language as to be able to understand books written and lectures delivered in English

and to express their thoughts on all subjects in decent English. It follows then that English should be so taught from the earliest stage that it may become 'a second native language' to Indian students. This is a hard task but not an impossible one, let us hope.

Any one conversant with the art of teaching a language knows that there are four ways of acquiring it. (1) A wide range of study of its literature. (2) A familiarity with its grammar and idiom. (3) The practice of composition (and conversation) in the language. (4) The practice of translation—in case it is a foreign tongue and not the mother-tongue of the learner—from it to the mother tongue and *vice versa*. We shall show later on that some of these principles were not adequately recognized in the past Regulations of the University.

*Importance of translation as an instrument of linguistic training.*

Perhaps the ideal method of acquiring a foreign language is by completely forgetting one's mother-tongue and constantly reading, writing, speaking and thinking in the foreign tongue. An English child if completely cut off from the company of his own people and sent away to France from his childhood upwards, readily picks up French from amidst his new surroundings and learns the tongue like a native of the soil. Some Indian fathers have made a similar experiment successfully with their children in the matter of learning English. This perfectly natural way of learning English is in the very nature of things inaccessible to the vast majority of our students. We cannot change their environments at our pleasure. To Indian boys, therefore, who cannot cut off all connection with their vernacular, the only efficient way of learning English is by constant comparison of the peculiarities of English grammar and idiom with the peculiarities of the grammar and idiom of their verna-

cular, from the earliest stage. Nothing brings this difference to so much prominence and drives it home into the mind so forcibly, as the practice of translation from English to vernacular and from vernacular to English. At the same time it enables the young learner to master the vocabulary of the foreign tongue. This two-fold process, therefore, is of the highest importance. *The practical test of a person's thorough acquaintance with a foreign language is his readiness in faithfully rendering a passage in his vernacular into it and vice versa.* One is surprised pretty often to find that even College students do not know the equivalent words in one language or another for the commonest objects; the same may be said of corresponding idioms. This is because the two languages are studied independently of each other; and the teachers in the lower classes do not lay sufficient stress on the comparative method. This neglect on their part is ultimately traceable to the scant recognition given by the University to the principle of translation.

It is a regrettable circumstance that sufficient stress has not been laid on this method by the University in the past. For long years there was no provision for translation at all; the principle of translation from English into vernacular was adopted as late as 1874, and the allied principle of translation from vernacular into English, much later, namely, in 1891. It was however not very judicious to have made the former a part of the Examination in the Second Language, (even when the second language taken up by the candidate was oriental classics). We are on the other hand strongly of opinion that translation, from English into vernacular like the reverse method, is really an examination in the candidate's knowledge of English — his ability to understand an English passage and to express the same ideas faithfully in his own

vernacular. We fail to understand the *rationale* of testing a candidate's knowledge of his mother-tongue by asking him to translate a passage in a foreign tongue into his vernacular. *We accordingly propose that both these translations should come together and be counted as part of the examination in English.* If the entire subject (English) carries 200 marks, 50 marks should be set apart for translation :—30 for translation from vernacular into English, 20 for translation from English into vernacular. We think this to be an equitable distribution of marks considering the relative importance of the two methods.

The existing practice of setting the paper and examining it is again radically wrong. An English passage is selected and it is translated into all the recognised vernaculars and the candidates are called upon to retranslate it into English. The original translation is not always happy and it seriously handicaps the candidates in rendering it back into English. The examiner—sometimes an Englishman ignorant of the vernacular—is not unoften called upon to award marks after a comparison of the candidate's work with the original English passage and not with the actual passage set in the vernacular. This is probably done for the sake of uniformity but it defeats the very end of the examination, as what is really to be tested is the candidate's knowledge of the corresponding words and idioms for the actual words and idioms of his own vernacular. *For such a process, an authentic production of a standard author in the vernacular is wanted and not an artificial, manufactured passage.* As regards the uniformity of standard of which we hear so much, we submit that if it is possible to secure uniformity without setting the self-same passages in the various second languages one does not see why it is not feasible here. Common sense and the sense of proportion will in every case enable the

paper-setters and Moderators (we have an elaborate machinery for the manufacture of questions) to settle the proper standard in each case.

Again, the paper on Translation from English into vernacular is in very many cases examined by *Pandits* possessing little or no knowledge of English. This is certainly undesirable. We therefore propose that *both those papers should be brought together as part of the Examination in English and that both these papers (forming a half paper in the afternoon paper in English) should be examined by competent Indian examiners equally well up in English and the vernacular.* The services of veteran Headmasters rather than those of English College-Professors are likely to be of the highest value in this case.

The task of teaching this subject should also be entrusted to the teacher of English and not to the *Pundit* considering that the latter's knowledge of English is, except in exceptional cases, inadequate for the purpose.

L. K. B.

---

## EXTRACTS.

### (i) *The Teacher as a character-builder.*

A circumstance that handicaps the earnest teacher in his work of character-building, is to be found in the perverted educational ideal of this country. It may perhaps be a trite remark—but none-the-less true—that, in this examination-ridden land, the be-all and end-all of education is considered to be success in a series of examinations and consequently, the chief function of the teacher consists in preparing his boys for them. It is therefore only natural that the work and merit of the teacher should be tested and appreciated more in the light of the examination-results than in the light of the moral and intellectual training he has imparted to his students. In these days of educational stir and reform, matters are,