

hometan schools; that is, an almost complete monopoly of the curriculum, with the exception, perhaps, of mathematics. The dusty authors of Greece and Rome, could they revisit the earth to-day and learn how their writings have been the chief subject of study since their time by the most civilized nations of the world, would doubtless think that the general welfare of our planet depended greatly upon their literary effusions.

The colonists of our country brought with them, as we might expect, substantially the same ideas of higher education as prevailed in the mother land. Our first colleges, therefore, did not differ much from Oxford and Cambridge. Now much has been done in late years toward giving other branches of study a fair hearing, but chiefly by establishing courses of study in which the classics are wholly absent. As usually understood, the design of college instruction, when not devoted to specialties, is to lay the foundations of a liberal and general culture. This would imply a symmetrical curriculum, composed of a variety of branches, and each receiving a proportionate share of attention. Is this carried out in practice, or is a college merely a normal school for the training of classical professors? Let us see.

Upon examining most of our college curriculums, we find that nearly every term has its measure of both Latin and Greek, accompanied frequently by a mathematical pill. Here and there are sandwiched in a few terms of literary and scientific studies, but scarcely enough to vary the monotonous recurrence of the classics. Only a scanty knowledge of the former can be obtained in the limited time afforded, while if Commencement find one not acquainted with every nook and turn of Cicero and Virgil, Plato and Homer, it is certainly not owing to a want of time.

The staff of life is justly considered to be bread and butter, but man craves other things as well, and unless gratified to some extent will not thrive on so monotonous a

diet. In like manner classical education is calculated to make one proficient in Latin and Greek, and that only. We claim that the customary time spent in the study of the classics is excessive. The classical writings of Greece and Rome, are in no respect more meritorious than hundreds of others, both ancient and modern. We have come to regard them as wonderful because their admirers for for eighteen centuries past have combined to make all their excellencies appear. We master Latin and Greek, but we neglect English. The former are necessary for a proper knowledge of the latter, but a less quantity than is now prescribed will amply suffice for all ordinary purposes. Anglo Saxon, the groundwork of our own tongue, is of quite as much importance as either, and is now so admitted, yet it has been greatly neglected.

The complaint is universally raised by outsiders that their sons and daughters in college receive but little that will be of use to them in the practical affairs of after life. To a considerable extent this is true. We are well aware of the utilitarian spirit of the age, but we know, too, that the usual four years classical drill proves of little advantage to many persons. Too often they become mere cultured nonentities. Now, if a portion of this time were devoted to other branches of study, it would make the course more useful and practical, and do much to make the student a more practical person. A desire to attain this end drives many students nowadays into purely scientific courses of study, in which they are wholly deprived of the benefits of the classics. As there is no middle ground by which the advantages of both scientific and classical education may at the same time be measurably secured, students are induced to pursue one or the other extreme, for the sake of obtaining a diploma.

Many rich fields of investigation are either ignored, or at best but little more than touched upon, in an ordinary classical curriculum. To this it may be replied