

in the process of development as the dead languages—can be made to stimulate individuality, which is a function the dead languages cannot perform—it would be economy to give science the first place on the curriculum. Life is short; and, if the student spends the precious hours of his youth in learning to write Latin and Greek when he cannot write a good English letter, in learning about the myths and heroes of old while there are multitudes of valuable facts to be gleaned from the history of the present, in learning the false philosophy of a superstitious age while there is a true philosophy that has a direct bearing on present interests, in learning the functions and attributes of the Grecian gods while he neglects science, which is the thoughts of our own God as revealed through nature, is it reasonable to claim that the classical education is an equivalent for the scientific education, or that the dead languages should be allowed to crowd out the natural sciences from the curriculum?

Again, the fact that the New Testament was originally written in Greek has been used as an excuse for putting Greek on the curriculum. "Do you suppose that I would depend on hearsay," says the professor of Greek, "for the facts concerning our religion."

Undoubtedly Christianity is of primordial necessity; and every individual that has as his ideal "complete living" must study its doctrines. But, nevertheless, the facts upon which the Christian faith is reared must be left in the hands of specialists. For, in the end, the student is obliged to accept the statements of those who know more about the subject than he does himself. Evidently, his time would be spent to better advantage if he should study the New Testament itself instead of the language in which it was originally written.

William T. Harris, Esq., of Washington, claims that the structure of languages, the manners and customs of social life, the ethical principles governing peoples, as revealed in works of literature, are facts worthy of study, and that the study of nature is not more practical than the study of man. Now it seems to me that much depends on how these studies are carried on. It would not be an economical system of education to require students to learn all facts of science in the same manner in which the scientific discoverer learns them. In every science there are certain facts that can be systematized by the student himself; and, by leaving a reasonable amount of work in this line for the student to do, his powers are developed while he is acquiring useful information. Why not apply this principle to the study of the dead languages, and, instead of requiring the student to use the method of the classical researcher in hunting up the derivation of words and in memorizing idiomatic constructions, let him learn the *facts* of the language? There are scientific specialists and specialists in classics. It is not economy for the student in getting a general education to follow exclusively the