

Correspondence.

To the Editor of Knox College Monthly :

DEAR SIR,—An article on the question of Scholarships, in the last issue of the Monthly, has filled readers with surprise, not so much by the arguments which it contains, as by its bold assumptions and sweeping assertions. Will you then allow me space to review its contents, lest it be inferred that the writer is speaking the mind of the students in general. The special care he takes to tell us "This is an Editorial," might well seem to convey this impression. True, his utterances may be official, as he claims, but it is also true that he does not, by any means, express the views of those he represents.

While it certainly requires some fortitude thus to oppose the views of an editorial *We*, yet *we* do so, much more freely than he could have done had the article appeared over the signature of the writer who may be, even at this moment, keenly smarting from the demoralizing influence of failing to win a scholarship.

But laying aside the authority due to the authorship, we proceed to examine its arguments. The first point he endeavors to make is, that the winning of a prize implies "a trusty memory and a rapid hand," but nothing more. We almost wonder if this statement was made in good faith. Surely no person in looking back over the years he has spent in college and recalling the names of the prizemen during that time, will say it implies nothing more than has been indicated. On the contrary, most of them were men of "more than average brain power" and acknowledged leaders among the students in their time. If there is any doubt about this, a glance at the list of tutors, all of whom were prize-winners in their respective years, will show the correctness of this statement.

The second argument is rather more emotional than reasonable, and while it may appeal to our sympathy, yet it fails to influence the judgment. "What of the earnest student who has been narrowly scrutinizing the systems? Oh, he has the fortune of figuring in an obscurer place!" If we understand the writer's position correctly it is this, that it is impossible to master thoroughly the amount of work gone over in the class-room, and as a consequence, he who wins a prize, must resort to memory in order to accomplish the task.

Now if the work laid down in the calendar is greater than the writer can overtake, let him say so plainly, and call upon the professors and members of Senate to give us no more than we can "narrowly scrutinize." Let him strike at the root of the evil, (if evil there be), but why make an attack upon scholarships, which have nothing to do with the amount of work prescribed?

But if on the other hand the field of our investigation is not too extensive, then the prize-winner will necessarily be the man possessing the greatest earnestness and diligence.

In passing to the next argument, we are pleased to find common ground upon which to stand. There is no doubt that in almost every examination, the questions are too numerous to allow as full a criticism as we might wish, too long also for the physical endurance of those engaged in them. Who has not often observed the weary and languid look of the students as they left the hall, and who has not often heard the complaint, "the paper was too long, I am completely worn out"?