

and they were given the option of dropping it.

The present question is not between the classical and the scientific education, but between obligatory and optional studies. The staple arguments for optional studies are two: (1) Let the young men follow their natural aptitudes; and (2) let them study the subjects that will specifically fit them for their life work. Both these arguments proceed upon a fundamentally wrong conception of the purpose and value of a college course. It is not useful primarily for the amount of information secured. This, at the best, is very small. Its value lies in the mental discipline acquired; in the mastery gained over one's powers; in the outlook upon life; in the ideals and ambitions stimulated; in the character formed and solidified. Not one of these ends seems to be best attained by letting the young man follow the lead of his taste. If he is naturally indolent, he will, of course, choose the line of least resistance. If diligent and conscientious, he is still a young man, immature in taste as well as in other things, and far from certain to choose wisely. He will, no doubt, consult his parents and teachers; but few parents are practical educators; and each professor naturally and rightly magnifies his own department. The choice is thus apt to be determined by other considerations than this prime one. What discipline does this young man especially need?

Moreover, the probability is that needs the very thing that his uncultivated taste rejects. What a young-man with weak lungs needs is to stand erect and breathe deeply. But these are just the things that he finds painful and fatiguing, and that he will do only under constraint. So the boy who finds mathematics irksome because he lacks a natural talent in that direction, certainly should not be cut

into a life work where high mathematical attainments is essential; but no more should he be allowed to ignore mathematics in his education. Standing erect and breathing deeply soon come to be a delight; and so does the mastery of the study at first most uncongenial. Again the theory that one is best prepared for his life work by studying only the things that directly bear upon it—that he will use, as the phrases goes—is a total fallacy. He is best prepared by a broad and generous culture. That he should emphasize his special line is probably advantages. But few boys know upon entering college—many do not know upon leaving it—what their life work will be. And it may be seriously questioned whether their education is not the better for this ignorance. It certainly is the broader. They read more widely. They lay more spacious and secure foundations. If, along with this, they have an eye steadily fixed on a goal, the ideal conditions would seem to be realized.—*Rev. Dr. Teunis S. Hamlin in the New York Independent.*

---

THE UNITY OF TRUTH.—Those divisions which, for the sake of convenience, we make between one department of learning and another we are too apt to regard as essential and final. They are not stone walls, but curtains temporarily dividing one part of the temple of learning from another. They may serve a useful purpose, but we must not allow them to master us, nor blind us to the great fact of the unity of truth.—*The Globe.*

A TEACHER'S INFLUENCE.—I think that the influence of a good man or a good woman teaching ten or twelve children in a class is an influence in this world and the world to come, which no man can measure, and the responsibility of which no man can calculate.—*John Bright.*