

history of the world shows, that a nation never struggles so valiantly for its liberties as when its liberties are best understood; that a people never make so vigorous a stand for their immunities, as when they are deemed most valuable. An educated, refined people best understand their rights, and we have yet to learn, they will not fight all the more determinedly to preserve them. By parity of reasoning, such maintain that literary culture is not compatible with the vigorous prosecution of the professions. That literary Statesmen. (for statesmanship is a profession), literary Lawyers, literary Doctors and literary Divines are either mountebanks, or fall far below their brethren in the same profession, who devote their attention exclusively to their avocations? Such an argument is based upon false premises, or is inferred from hastily formed or sweeping generalizations, that will not bear the test of critical examination. We think we can prove theoretically, as well as practically, that the cultivation of literature is not only not incompatible with the successful prosecution of a profession, but is, instead of an impediment, an aid to professional excellence. Because, occasionally, one makes a failure in his profession, if he be of a literary turn of mind, this does not prove the converse of our position. A grocer may go stark mad on literature and neglect his customers; a salesman, his yard-stick; and a merchant, his ledger; yet their failures do not prove the rule. Their want of success may be attributable to the same causes that retarded the advancement of Mr. Micawber, one of Dickens' most irrepressible characters, who was never so busy as when engaged in what did not pertain to his business, and never so happy as when working for what would not bring him any remuneration. Mr. Micawber's literary taste, or its culture, did not operate against his success in life. So we find all trades, all callings and all professions, represented by its Micawbers, who, for the very same causes, that kept their illustrious prototype in the background, will always be laggards in the great struggle of life. The mind possesses almost an infinite number of capabilities, and if any particular one, or set of them, be exercised or cultivated to the exclusion of the others, those not cultivated will gradually lose their native force and energy; so, in the end, instead of a robust, well developed intellect, we will see an abnormal, disproportioned one, incapable of accomplishing so much or of putting forth the same powers, as if all had been equally cultivated. We see this exemplified in numberless instances. One may so far cultivate his imagination as forever to revel in unreal, fanciful scenes, and thus quite incapacitate himself for the dull, unpoetic duties of every day life; or he may so exercise his memory, as to unfit himself for the free use of his reasoning powers; or he may so far play the role of the Orator, as to lose all vigor of thought, or become too deep a thinker to be an eloquent speaker. The old Latin adage—*in medio tutissimus ibis*—best illustrates the principle I seek to deduce, that is to say, the necessity of an uniform exercise, as far as possible, of all the faculties of the mind. For this alone can insure a well developed, healthy, vigorous intellect. One faculty so operates upon another as to afford mutual assistance; so when all are equally developed, a greater force or power of concentration is attained, and consequently greater mental momentum, if such a figure be allowable, is effected. So following out the analogy, if an individual devote his attention exclusively to one branch of study, or to one particular profession or calling, to the neglect of all other studies, he becomes a man of one idea and fails to grasp the grand principles that underlie all studies, all arts and all sciences. While he who takes in a wider range of studies, and views the vast domain of thought from a loftier stand point,