

that the student wishing to pursue these can do so by himself afterward. We think it a general truth, however, that when earning a maintenance, a person has neither the time nor as good an opportunity as the college ought to give him. American students, unlike those of Europe, are very often compelled to work their own way through college. It is, therefore, only natural that they should desire a full and substantial reward for their hard labor.

Then, abridge the disproportionate time that is allotted to the study of the classics. Let it be shortened at least a year, and let only the choice portions of the best and most instructive classical authors be read. Let the remaining time be devoted to topics of interest and practicality. A more general culture would thus be afforded, and the well founded objections to classical education would lose much of their weight. We would not be understood as wishing that the classics might be done away with. On the other hand, we fully admit their great utility, yet we contend that they now receive a disproportionate share of attention. Scientific and other studies are now claiming more attention than hitherto, and if we would have true liberal culture, we must accord to them the place which their merits demand.

M.

American Names of Places.

What a striking lack of originality our people exhibit in naming our cities, villages and counties! Look over maps and gazetteers, and count, if you can, the Berlins, Miennas, Chesters and Romes that are scattered profusely over the country. The poverty of names which our people would seem to possess, induces them to appropriate indiscriminately and often ridiculously the names of the most prominent places in the Old World. A railroad station, composed of a few dwelling houses, blacksmith shops, whiskey saloons, and diminutive "stores" is dignified

by the name, perhaps, of Paris or Palmyra; while the same name may be found applied to some town or village in nearly every State in the Union.

And how do these names appear in comparison? Would the name of George Washington, or Thomas Jefferson, give dignity to a street rowdy, or a drunken debauchee? As well should a magnificent gateway be erected at the entrance to a turnip patch. And yet this is a parallel case. New cities and towns are constantly springing up on our borders, and receiving the oft repeated application of transatlantic names, until there is scarcely one of the latter but has its scores of namesakes in our midst. And still the practice goes on. What is the need of this? Why not retain the aboriginal names as far as practicable, and then exercise our originality a little in devising the remainder?

The State of Michigan, some years ago, enacted a law to retain the native names of places as the mementoes of a race now so nearly extirpated. By this arrangement, there would be no Naples and Alexandria within ten miles of each other, and no insignificant village in the backwoods bearing the imposing name of Pekin or Calro.

The names with which the Indians designated the places they frequented were appropriate and expressive. It is far more fitting that we should retain them, since we have pushed their originators from our path, than that we should increase the misused and roughly handled names we have imported, until they become threadbare and their number defies computation. When the former resource fails, let appropriate names be invented. Many such have been produced from this source, but the practice is much less common than it ought to be. The first occupants of every country derived their names for each locality from some peculiarity connected with it.

Many old places have retained their names for so long a time that their import