

didn't he stick to composing miracle plays, with a comic devil and some surprising feats in stage-carpentry which were all the share of the "heritage" in question that the poor were then thought fit to enjoy.

A Florentine of the 15th century, you tell us, knew more of the movements of the learned world than the average nineteenth century citizen of London or New York. I grant you he took a keen interest in the narrow circle of the learned in his own city, but, in the absence of anything corresponding to our daily press, how could his knowledge of the "learned world" at large be compared to ours. You go on to add that this typical Florentine of the 15th century "was livelier, more agreeable and refined, *as indeed he is at this day*, than even the wealthy commercial classes of other countries." The Florentine of the 15th century is, *at this day*, I should fancy, rather too dusty and decayed to compete with a modern Canadian in refinement or any other agreeable quality.

We must needs take it for Gospel that there were 30,000 students at Oxford in the 13th century. It is true that careful historical writers denounce this as a myth, but Huber states it and you endorse it, so let it pass. What a falling off we have to lament, to be sure! But stay, did or did not the Universities then, and even later, take in mere boys, fulfilling, in fact, the place of our modern grammar schools—and was not the teaching there, as well as under the sainted Abelard at Paris, very much of the how-many-angels-can-stand-on-the-point-of-a-pin sort of style? Perhaps my querulous critic admires the scholastic philosophy, if so, pray let him give it a niche beside the Stuarts. I am content to laugh at it with Rabelais and to turn away from it in the company of Verulam.

"Scholastic culture" in this pet 13th century "was widely diffused through the nation at large,"—with such excellent results that the highest nobility seldom signed their names, preferring to make a cross or use a seal, and that the unwonted power displayed in stumbling through a verse of the Psalter

ranked a man at once among the *literati*, and enabled him to claim his benefit of clergy.

But my chief sin and shame is the divorce of religious and intellectual training. My critic announces the "truism" that "a good sound training in religious belief is an essential quality" (element) "in all systems of education." If he would accept a word of advice from an antagonist, I would bid him beware, lest when he thinks that the enunciation of a truism will floor his opponent, a begging of the question does not lie hidden beneath. State a case thus. Plenty of good food is an essential element in the successful bringing up of a child, *therefore* no school should be allowed to teach a child unless it also looks after its diet. It has seemed to me that as tastes differ both in food and religion, and since what is one man's meat is another man's poison, we should do well to leave parents to their own discretion on these points and not to attempt to coerce people in things which everyone but those of my critic's way of thinking have agreed should be left free.

Having done with education, we come on again to legislation. I am told that I profess to hate class legislation and yet indulge in it. My critic has succeeded in fastening a charge of hypocrisy upon me by means of confounding two perfectly distinct things. The class legislation which aimed at dictating to each rank in life what it should wear and how many covers it should have on its table, I despise as childish and absurd. The class legislation which provides for the peculiar needs of each class, as Acts regulating railways, doctors and lawyers, has nothing in common with this, and there is nothing inconsistent in approving the one and condemning the other. Proper precautions against quacks and pettifoggers have nothing invidious about them. The class legislation which, in my critic's model 13th century, bade fair to lay the foundations of a system of caste and, as in the case of the benefit of clergy already referred to, tended to place whole privileged bodies *above* the law which was made in the instance for all alike, was both invidious, unpractical and unjust.