

mous as to this point. Without discussing the question theoretically here, we would only insist upon this: that, so far as any change of this kind is made, it be made only on the ground of greater serviceableness for purely educational purposes, as being better fitted to "educate the man"—the only test of studies with which the college has anything whatever to do. Probably Mill's answer, or counter-question, will eventually be found the wisest one as between the classical and the modern languages and literatures: "Why not both?"

The other principal proposal of change is the substitution of natural science in place of the "humanities." To the addition of a certain amount of natural science, enough, certainly to impart its admirable methods of research, and, what is more, its admirable spirit of uncompromising adhesion to the exact truth, no one is likely to object. But when it is proposed to make any radical substitution of the material studies for the human studies making courses (as has been done) without Latin, Greek, Literature, Logic, Philosophy, Ancient History, etc., supplying their places with the natural sciences, it is well to consider carefully, first, the result of the experiment so far as it has been tried; and, secondly, certain well-established principles concerning the human mind in its relation to studies. As to ascertained results it is to be said that for some time now there have been, in several of our institutions of learning, courses having these contrasted characters running

side by side. We will not here offer any testimony of our own as to the comparative results of the two in the production of broadly educated men. We would only suggest to those who are in any doubt upon the matter, or who have any radical change of college courses in view, to look into the results of the experiment for themselves and to take the testimony of those who have had opportunity to observe them. The effect of such an examination will be likely to produce hearty agreement with an editorial writer in a late number of *Science*, who remarks that "the introduction, of scientific studies in our educational systems has not brought about the millennium which was expected." Much good, no doubt, they have done, when introduced in proper proportion. Their methods have certainly influenced favourably the methods of the older studies. But, after all, we come back to the truth that, of the two groups of studies, both indispensable, the humanities furnished the greater growth-power for the mind, because they are the product and expression of mind.*

(To be continued.)

* Sometimes we hear the curious remark made, perhaps by one of the weaker brethren among those very useful persons, the dealers in second-hand science (popular science), that the book of nature is the expression of the mind of God, while other books only express the mind of man. But it does not require great acumen to perceive that the mind of man and all its productions are also the work and the expressions of the same Author—His Bible, one might say, to carry on the figure, while material nature is only His spelling-book.

THE SCOTCH BLUE BOOK.

ONE does not expect, in exploring between the covers of a Blue Book—ground consecrated to the particular and the concrete—to be suddenly called upon to pause and appraise the value of a whole cluster

of first principles and neatly cut abstract propositions. Such, however, has been our experience, on lately going through the Report of the Council on Education in Scotland for 1884-85. Before the dust settles down