

the great masters of his language ; that to send forth boys who know not a word of Shakespeare and Milton is scandalous, and so forth. I am quite accustomed to this argument from the *dilettanti* members of education boards. They think it a scandal for an education pretending to be complete to omit any topic which is in itself important. I have heard it urged with equal force concerning chemistry, botany, physics, what not ! These people seem to be perfectly ignorant of the fact that no instruction of boys can be nearly complete, and that education consists in learning how to learn, not in learning all that has to be known.

Moreover, in the particular case of our own great literature, there is surely something to be said for reserving some one sanctum from the prying of competition, some department of intellectual recreation for our leisure. Is it not likely that those who have been plagued with learning the minutiae of an author for a purpose not only irrelevant to, but at variance with, their enjoyment, will henceforth associate that author with their pains and not with their pleasures ? So far as my own experience goes, the boys trained of recent years in English read less of the great poets, and think less about them, than those who have only read them for pleasure. It seems to be the first instinct of every boy to get rid of all his Examination work as soon as the struggle is over. If this extends to his English poets, are we wise to associate them with the bitter draughts he is forced to take for his competitive training ? At all events, it is not so serious for a boy to hate Latin prose and Euclid, provided he has mastered them, as it is for him to hate Spenser or Milton, because he was forced to know them in a scholastic way.

To expose human imperfections and prophesy human misfortunes may

well be called an easy, and withal a profitless, task. Why, then, turn from the duty of increasing human knowledge to brand human folly and presumption ? Merely because to men of the study is apportioned the duty both of making theories and of criticising them. The public is in the end led by the judgment of the learned just as it has often been fatally misled by adopting too quickly their speculations. The theory of the millennium of happiness to be produced by the spread of education can fortunately be discussed, partly at least, on practical grounds, for the incipient stages must indicate what the future is likely to bring us. Hence it was that I proposed, at the opening of this paper, to review the actual results of the modern movement, before we reverted to the criticism of the theory, first as a working plan, secondly as a philosophical hypothesis.

The results, as stated above, seem to point with certainty to this conclusion : that the progress of the race, though real, has not at all kept pace with the outlay of the treasure and toil in public instruction and competition. Our youth is not more vigorous or more perfect, though it may be taught many more things. The quantity of teaching, both in hours and subjects, is damaging the quality ; instruction is impeding education. In fact, the main feature of the modern system is hurry ; and hurry is fatal to all good training. No human excellence in any subject, except it be in the case of some stray heaven-born genius, is attained without prolonged and deliberate attention. When the prizes of life had to be attained before the age of fourteen, or nineteen, or at most twenty-two, and in a large number of courses of learning, it is obvious what the mischief must be. Fatigue of mind and of body engenders either physical failure, or that apathy of