

that have a family kinship; all the faculties and all the acquisitions of the human intellect are relations to each other. If there be some one speciality in art, literature, science, or even in the business of life in which we can succeed best, that speciality is improved and enriched by all the contributions obtainable from other departments of study. I remember deriving both amusement and profit from attending many years ago a course of lectures in this city given by the American Emerson. In one of these, the Lecturer took for his text "Mind your own business," "do your thing" was I think his exact expression. In the course of his Lecture he observed that any man who strayed from his own domain into that of his neighbour, to steal fruits and flowers was not unlikely in his ignorance to bring away worthless berries and weeds, and find burs sticking to him—duped by a dandelion.

Nevertheless it is worth consideration whether a man does not do his thing the better for the recreative exercise mental or bodily which he takes in doing the things of others. After all, are we sent here merely to do one thing. Is not this world a school for the education not of a faculty but of a man. We are it is true fragments viewed in relation to the social whole. But each of us is in himself a whole, made up of parts. And if the whole be greater than any part, a whole man must be greater than that part of him which is found in his speciality. We should therefore strive while improving our one talent to increase our whole capital.

One beneficial result, not the least, would be—a greater liberality of feeling in our intercourse. Society would not be so much of a Dutch concert in which many members are found not only playing each his own tune on his own instrument, but extolling his own humstrum above the rest.

There are too many Chinese educators amongst us who, making a map of human knowledge mark out their own domain as the "Celestial Empire" and all others as "Deserts" or "Inhabited by barbarians."

A little of this spirit is all very well, it is refreshing to find a man thoroughly in love with his own subject, and endeavouring to make the most of it. But the feeling is apt to degenerate into narrow-mindedness.

The partizans of an education purely classical have greatly themselves to thank for the attacks that have long been made upon Latin and Greek. Their claim for the superiority of these might be allowed if it were not, as is too often the case even with eminent scholars, accompanied with an offensive determination not to recognize the value of other studies. The active opposition formerly made by classical head masters of schools to the introduction of modern languages and of mathematics and physical science among the boys has if we are to judge from the Report of the School Commission of a few years back, in too many cases only subsided into a passive resistance nearly as bad. They do not seem to think it incumbent upon them to do any thing. Where they take measures of any kind they nevertheless put other studies on a footing of such marked inferiority that it is evident how very lightly they esteem them in comparison with their own. At Rugby School where the curriculum of studies appears to be the most liberal, the proportion of marks is;—for mathematics as compared with classics, 1 to 6½—for Modern Languages as compared with classics, 1 to 8—and for Natural Philosophy, the same viz. 1 to 8.

This is far too much in favor of Latin and Greek. Indeed the Commissioners pronounce the judgment when they recommend that instead of awarding exhibition for "mixed attainments" five shall be adjudged for classics alone, two for Mathematics, two for modern Languages, and two for Physical Science. At Eton where the curriculum is the most illiberal, little or no honour was found to be given to any thing but classics, and as a natural concomitant the masters employed in teaching any other than these subjects, were regarded as altogether in an inferior position. The authorities of this great school, as is now well known, seem to have long regarded verse-making to be the greatest line in

their circle and all others so remote from the centre that the difference between a greater and a less was below consideration.

It is not easy to decide what knowledge is of most worth—I speak of course in reference to our life here—and scarcely possible is it to determine satisfactorily upon the relative values of different branches of human knowledge. The ratio would no doubt vary with the world's progress, but if we could arrive at an approximation for our own age it would go far to settle the just proportions of a school curriculum.

At any rate if there is one question more than another upon which we should hesitate to pronounce a dogmatic judgment, it is this one—of the relative importance of various studies.

If we have been able to look for a moment beyond the narrow limit of our own special reading—and our self-education is advancing to perfection only as we can do this—we can hardly fail to perceive that each department of human inquiry has an interest and a value of its own, while none can boast itself independent of the rest. Feeling this truth we shall hesitate to assert that the things we do not know are less important than what we do. Our attitude towards other workers in the field of knowledge or of thought will be one of humility and respect. Education has but imperfectly done its work upon us unless it has cured us of the vulgarity of presumptuous self-assertion. That any mere system should impart to common place men a liberal appreciation of all studies is scarcely to be expected. But there must be something very ill-balanced in a method which while loudly professing to train the mind, leads a scholar like Dr. Goodford of Eton to reject modern languages from the regular curriculum. He answers the questions of the Commissioners as follows.

(Lord Clarendon, speaking of French). Would it not be considered necessary by the authorities of Eton to render obligatory a thing which they think ought to form part of the education of an English gentleman? Answer. I should not. 3527. You would not consider it necessary to devote any part of the school time to its acquisition—No! not a day.

3528. You do not intend to do so.—No. Dr. Goodford does not appear to have been called upon for his reasons for this unhesitating exclusion and yet there is scarcely any intellectual calling in which access to works written in French and German is not absolutely indispensable. Nor need the study of it, if properly conducted, be altogether unproductive of the philological training for which the dead languages, rightly enough, claim a supremacy. French learnt from a French *bonne*, or from a phrase-book, however useful, is trivial enough and affords no discipline of the faculties or cultivation of the taste. But French studied under a really good teacher, with attention to the niceties of the language, and with a French classic as a text-book may afford a good deal of training to both.

But again, what are we to think when we find so eminent a man as Dr. Temple of Rugby speaking disparagingly of mathematics and the physical sciences. He is arguing the necessity of making choice of some one study to be the chief, and of requiring all others to be subordinate to it. He pronounces in favor of the classics and goes on to say, "When we have to choose between literature, mathematics, and physical science the plea advanced on behalf of the two latter is their *utility*. They supply a man with tools for future work. Man's chief business, it is said, is to subdue nature to his purposes, and these two studies shew him how to do this. Those who use this plea seem to forget that the world in which we live consists quite as much of the men and women on its surface as of the earth and its constituent materials. If any man were to analyse his own life, he would find that he had far more to do with his fellow-men than with any thing else. And if, therefore, we are to choose a study which shall pre-eminently fit a man for life, it will be that which shall best enable him to enter into the thoughts, the feelings, the motives of his fellows.

"The real defect of mathematics and physical science as instruments of education is, that they have not any tendency to humanize.