

tive to bias, and more stimulating to progress than an inquiry into motives, and a frank disavowal of one so unworthy. If such a reason turns the balance against a revolution in method of study let us discard it and take an unprejudiced inventory of an argument.

The strongest argument for the present system—say of our work here in the University—is that a division of time between from five to eight or nine subjects a day furnishes necessary mental relaxation by change of work. The change may be allowed to be necessary, but can it be provided only by a change of subject? It may well be questioned whether this constant, periodic change of subject be not one of diffusion rather than of relaxation. The tension of mental steam is by no means lessened because the train of thought is switched to another track. The line of thought is broken, the results of experiment are often vitiated by interruption or delay; reference reading is disconnected because of short period. Energy is rather lost than conserved.

It is more probable that the average student needs relief from pressure more than he needs frequent change of work. This pressure is not the result of too much work but of too many lines of work. The conscientious student is oppressed with the feeling that the time this study needs and must have cannot fail to rob the next of the time it needs and must have. So he fights with his conscience; and inclination weakens, then conquers, will. The relief he needs is from a continual call for choice and discrimination, and that relief can only be in a chance to give deliberate, well planned, effort to a single line of work; and every line of work which is worth pursuing at all, is worth consecutive, thoughtfully directed and surely executed effort upon itself, and is only half done when it receives the mere residue of time from some other work, which, because it has the student's interest has taken his time and exhausted his energy.

Every student, worthy of a name which in its origin includes the very idea of "zeal," has a certain amount of honest effort to devote to his school work. Every day receives its share of that effort. It by no means follows that each subject receives a share proportionate to the time allowed it in the curriculum, or even in the student's own program. Few students have enough strength of purpose to allot time and energy to interesting and non-interesting subjects alike. Can this have any other result than that the same student is credited in different departments with unequal amounts of zeal, and unequal power of application?

Give the same student the advantages of the system of major and minor studies, better still that which is the ideal of the system, let him devote his time to one study at a time in a judicious manner and note the inevitable profit. The strong ground here lies in the major premise of our last argument. "Each day will receive its share of the student's energies." Now, with his effort confined to one subject, where else will it be expended than upon that study regardless of its interest for him? The interest may be no greater now than before—although the chances are that it will increase with diminished division of attention—; yet without it how can the results of this work be otherwise than an improvement upon the time when his activities were dissipated and his attention distracted by a half dozen demands from different directions.

Innumerable examples might be adduced where, in particular instances of daily work, the results of a change of method would be such as have been indicated. Lecture might be followed immediately by experiment (by the student) upon the same topic or by reading along the same line, or reading by experiment, or *vice versa*, or reading and experiment might accompany each other with advantage impossible in isolated, single hour periods. In these ways the method commends itself especially to scientific