

attempt to teach anything but Latin and Greek." Dr. Arnold at Rugby was among the first to advocate the study of something besides the classics. On this mental food hundreds of Englishmen have become intellectual giants. Their minds had time to expand. They were not expected to know a little of everything, but a great deal of something. This is as unlike our system of universal cramming as it possibly can be, and indicates that when the time of returning sense overtakes the educational world that the quantity obliged to be learned will be reduced to a minimum. Mental culture does not depend upon the amount memorized, but upon the mental discipline gained and its relation to the work of life.

WILL the reader please cast his eye upon the following questions: 1. How can it be proved that nicotine is a poison? 2. Why are cigarettes especially harmful? 3. Is alcohol a food? 4. What is the effect of disuse upon a muscle? 5. Under what names is opium sold? 6. Under what names is alcohol drunk? 7. What is the difference between a food and a poison? 8. Is anything gained by changing from one narcotic to another? 9. What is the effect of beer as a drink? 10. How does cheerfulness help the muscle? These are the questions given as a test in physiology in the public schools of a prominent Eastern city. They are not addressed to young men about to leave school. No, they are asked of little boys and girls of from eight to ten years of age. This is the examination-paper at the end of the first year's elementary instruction in physiology. Of ten questions, eight relate to drinking and smoking: the physiology is a mere side issue. These children, who ought to have about as much knowledge of such matters as they should of the methods in vogue

at the stock exchange, are actually forced to learn by rote the details of human vice; and that, too, under the name of "physiology," the only science which they learn. Unconsciousness, *naïveté*, is the symbol of childhood. The fact that physiology, even if well taught, tends to destroy this trait, is the chief objection to its early study. Instruction such as the above implies crushes the most valuable trait in the child, directs its curiosity to what is morbid, and forces into precocious development all its dangerous elements. Not enough that the newspaper and the dime novel proclaim in glaring colours the story of crime and sin: some notion of the perversity of human nature must be mixed with the food of babes. That the result of this teaching is to excite in the children a morbid curiosity to experiment for themselves in such matters; or (with the boys) to regard the whole thing as a lesson in "goody-goodyness," to which they forthwith decide to show themselves superior; or to regard their father, who takes his glass of wine at dinner, as an incipient criminal,—this could easily have been foreseen, and goes without saying. If there is one method better than all others to produce a race of drunkards this has good claims to that distinction. If there is a degree of wrong in such superlatively perverse methods, then it is still worse that the fair name of science should be outraged in this cause. Not only that this kind of teaching necessarily depends upon catechism methods (that the answer to the second question, for example, is to read that the especial perniciousness of cigarettes is due to the fact that they are usually made of decayed cigar-stumps), but that the entire idea of science thus implanted is as wrong as it well can be. Better far revert to the old days when there was no science on the curriculum than have science thus taught. The