

might not come later in particular instances. For example, a man might get interested in Hellas (say by travel, or by examining Greek sculpture), and might reasonably take up Hellenic art and Hellenic archæology; in connection with which it would also be desirable that he should read Æschylus, Sophocles, Herodotus and Thucydides, not to mention likewise Pausanias and Pliny (I am aware that Pliny wrote in Latin). Or he might have business relations with Germany; in which case it would be desirable that he should learn German. Or he might take an interest in literature as a whole, and in the history of its development; in which case, of course, he could not afford to neglect French literature. Moreover, since languages are most easily acquired during plastic childhood, I do not deny that if exceptional opportunities exist for picking up modern languages (as during travel, etc.) advantage should be taken of them. I am not dogmatically opposed to the learning of languages; I have learned one or two (besides Greek and Latin) of my own accord. I only say their importance has been vastly overrated, and the relative importance of certain other subjects unaccountably underrated.

Or, the other hand, education ought certainly to include for everybody, men and women alike, some general acquaintance with the following subjects: Mathematics, so far as the particular intelligence will go; physics, so as to know the properties of matter; generalized chemistry; zoology; botany; astronomy; geography; geology; human history, and especially the history of the great central civilization, which includes Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, Persia, Asia Minor, Hellas, Italy, Western Europe, America; human arts, and especially the arts of painting, sculpture and architecture in North Africa, West-

ern Asia and Europe. If this seems a large list for the foundations of an education, it must be remembered that six or seven years would be set free for the acquisition of useful knowledge by the abolition of grammatical rote-work; and that a general idea alone of each subject is all I ask for.

For instance, in physics, it would suffice that students should be taught the fundamental laws of matter, solid, liquid, and gaseous; the principles of gravitation; the main facts about light and heat; and some notions of electrical science. In biology, it would suffice that they should be taught the general classification of animals, a little comparative anatomy and physiology, and some idea of specific distinctions. At present, quite well-informed people will speak of a porpoise or a lobster as a fish; such grotesque blunders ought to be made impossible; they ought to be considered far more damnable evidence of ignorance and ill-breeding than "you was" or "me and him went there." A few weeks' practice will enable any intelligent young man or woman of eighteen to identify any plant in the American flora by the aid of a technical description; and the mental value of that training is immeasurably greater than the mental value of ten years' work at Greek syntax. And so forth with the other subjects. I contend that a man or woman ought to leave college with a fairly competent general idea of most arts and sciences, to be supplemented by exact knowledge of one chosen subject—say, beetles or chemistry, or the English literature of the seventeenth century, or Hittite inscriptions, or the fresh-water mollusks of the United States, or early Flemish painting, or the geology of the Ohio basin. The special subject ought always to be one chosen, out of pure predilection, by the student himself; the general subjects ought to be