

## EDUCATION WITHOUT STUDY.

Is this a new invention? No. The theory has been in practice for years. What is the result? *Graduated dunces*. Is it a scheme of parents or children? Both. Do explain—what is it? The parent thinks, as he pays high tuition, he ought not to concern himself about his children's education, and the child is very glad not to be examined and have his acquisitions tested, so gets along smoothly—studies as much as he pleases and plays the remainder of his time, which is the larger portion. But where is the education? The teacher will impart that any how—he is so learned a man. Without the efforts of the pupil? Certainly, what is he good for, if our children have to endure all the drudgery of study? That is the idea, the invention, to imbibe knowledge from the instructor as plants imbibe moisture from humid ground. If this is the plan, why not make a scholar out of a piece of sponge which has very strong imbibing powers? Fit up the machinery to hold the books, and see what a scholar would be produced.

But the planter knows that unless the grass and weeds are kept under and the soil cultivated, the crop will be very small and the grain immature; so if you depend upon the *imbibing process*, you will be but a *rubin scholar* at best. Study stands in relation to scholarship as does food to life: as he that eats little or nothing, just enough to sustain *stolt* or *sudil* existence, will reach only to pigny size; so with study, for it alone can produce scholarship. The hungry boy asked for a breakfast, and stood by the fire while the cooking process was going on, and was satisfied by the savory odor of the dishes and refused to pay for the meal: the magistrate to whom the case was referred for adjudication, decided that the boy should *jingle his money* in the cook's ears as long as the other enjoyed the savor of the dishes. But the poor cook was no richer, for things, like money, have no power to impart benefits by the *tinker*; it must be possessed or does no good. If you can enrich a man by the jingle of money, so you may store the mind with knowledge by *imitation* without study.

But are there not *self-made men*? True, but they studied more diligently than 99-100 of your College boys. The illustration you would borrow from this fact is against you, it inculcates study, study, hard study all day and most of the night. The theory of education without study is deceptive and fallacious, it is founded in ignorance and indolence. Do you remember the little girl that was informed by another how she always recited her lessons so well, that she *prayed for aid*: the girl was pleased with the theory, but made a splendid failure and reproached the other for deceiving her. Did you study your lesson? "No, I only *prayed* that I might recite well." If you depend upon your new invention, you will fare as badly as the little girl.

This plan is a very accommodating one for lazy boys and inattentive girls, who seem to think the teacher is paid to think for them and furnish them a good education, and the pay secures the object. But it is a sad mistake—the whole is so rotten

that it does not *deserve* the pains of exposure.

When a Railroad is constructed to run up the Hill of Science, I may give credit to the plausibility of the theory—not before, for a thorough education will be acquired by neither—the one depends upon the teacher, the other upon the cars, but as only *footmen* ever ascend the Hill, so *students*, studying boys and girls, not *imbibers*, will have an education with the name. The *thirsty* man must *drink*, not depend upon *imbibing* moisture through the pores, he will die of thirst, and you, you passive imbibler of knowledge, will die of ignorance.—"PARENT," in *Georgia Journal of Education*.

## VERY YOUNG CHILDREN AT SCHOOL.

The statistics show that a large number of children are sent to school at too early an age. We sometimes hear parents object to the rule adopted by Committees, excluding all under four, and, in some towns, five years of age. It is a question whether the limit should not be higher than lower. In some cases it is frankly acknowledged that "they are sent to school to get them out of the way," and, as this educational fever is intermittent and hebdomadal, uniformly most prevalent on Mondays, the motive may be no better where there is less frankness in its avowal. The confinement of children at so early an age must be prejudicial to the proper development of their physical powers. Action is as necessary to the health of a little child; as the atmosphere is to life. To keep a child still and unoccupied; is doing violence to its physical nature. In its very sports and plays, a child may be learning what are, for its age, the most important and practical lessons.

It is true, a precocious development may be secured, by a premature stimulus of the mind, carried on in advance, and to the neglect of physical and moral training. Dr. Johnson's suggestive question, "What becomes of all the clever children?" fitly indicates the value of such precocity. A few years ago, infant schools suddenly became very numerous, and little lipsers astonished wondering spectators by their ready answers, from "Infant Philosophy," "Physiology made easy," etc. Some thought a new era in education was about to dawn upon the world, and predicted that these precocious prattlers were the harbingers of "the good time coming." Time, however, has not verified their predictions. But the eager attempts still made in certain directions, to convert our schools into nurseries, show that some vestiges of this exploded theory still remain. The number of children under five, attending Public Schools in Massachusetts, the last year, was 12,370. It is gratifying to observe that there was a decrease for the year of 1,238.—*Massachusetts Teacher*.

## THE RIGHT TRAINING OF WOMEN.

The *Church of England Review* has an article on Female Education, from which we take the following:

Much remains to be done in winnowing out of peoples' mind ridiculous ideas of a certain purely fastidious style of living, without which it is impossible to keep house. There are plenty of young men who have yet to unlearn the foppery of expenses disproportioned to their means, and the sordidness of luxuries which feed not self respect, but gluttony and pride. The possibility must be secured to daughters and young sisters growing up to be rational, appreciative companions, girls who, if they ever marry, will choose and value their husband for what he is, and be interested in his calling and his opportunities for observation, women who will estimate the grave and sweet realities of wife and motherhood beyond any accident of precedence or superfluity. By dismissing false and foolish notions of respectability, by refusing the cheap fascinations of a paltry education of display, by discountenancing restraints misdirected or too rigorous, by cultivating an intelligent and unassuming mode of intercourse, by a careful foresight in assisting young people to prepare themselves for the exertion and cost of one day being the centre of a peaceful, hospitable home; in these and other ways much may be done to remove obstructions to that unaffected respect and attachment which lead on to happy marriage.

In the meantime it may be well to think, with not only the sympathy, but the veneration they deserve, of among those who will never marry; to assist in multiplying the too few occupations suitable to women, or open to them; above all, not to preach by implication or otherwise, that a woman's life need ever be dwarfed to a negation, coked miserably away by causes absolutely out of her control. There are women strong enough to keep their womanly dignity and sweetness, and to organize around them the moral elements, at all events, of an independent existence. They whose steps are feeble need the more to be helped, rather than hindered in the struggle with their fainter and more yielding self. If they fail here, is it all certain that in wedded life their lot would have been suspicious? Alas! how many a faltering will has been bent and "given" beneath sanguine, unfulfilled resolutions, to reclaim and humanize the husband, who has pulled the wife down to his mean wretched level. Marriage is not lottery; but it is mere willful blindness to forget that in all its higher aspects, it may be woefully inverted or appallingly debased. Not all the grand provisions of tender ties and gracious instincts which surround one of the greatest of Divine ordinances, will make people pure or happy who insist on being peevish or frivolous, or worldly, sensual and devilish.

Wedded life is a great and holy mystery, and a source of power for good, often far beyond estimation; but unless there be at least one soul filled with unselfed love, and strong in an unflinching faith, the formal union of two persons is no guarantee whatever for a will ennobled, or affections enlarged and cleansed. And the faith which so works by love can make a sunshine in a shady place, without an infant's or a husband's eye to look into. The harmonics of a developed and trans-