

often repeated. Is not the true education that which teaches men and women such a practical understanding of the good of others that they will, without the restraint of law, limit their actions in behalf of self by a high regard for the benefit of others? This means the brotherhood of man, "the federation of the world," which means the "fatherhood of God."

"Not to know at large of things remote
From us, obscure and subtle, but to know
That which before us lies in daily life,
Is the prime wisdom."

I do not mean to decry scholarly attainments; but I mean that these attainments are not everything. All who can ought to receive intellectual training, but they ought also to secure that practical knowledge which makes the training available. Emerson tells us that England is filled with "a great, silent crowd of thoroughbred Grecians," who prime the orators and writers, but who, "unless of impulsive nature are indisposed from writing or speaking by the fulness of their minds and the severity of their tastes." Is this the culture that we want? "How," says Carlyle, "can an inanimate, mechanical Gerundgrinder foster the growth of anything; much more of mind, which grows, not like a vegetable (by having its roots littered with etymological compost), but like a spirit, by mysterious contact of spirit; through kindling itself at the fire of living thought." And again he says, "Alas, so is it everywhere, so will it ever be; till communities and individuals discover, not without surprise, that fashioning the souls of a generation by knowledge can rank on a level with blowing their bodies to pieces by gunpowder."

The world wants both "men of thought and men of action." It wants the talent that knows how to do it. It wants, not "the knowledge that puffeth up," but "the charity that buildeth up;" not the culture that teaches its possessor to look down upon the rock whence it was hewn, but that which fosters "a sense of oneness with all humanity," however remote that humanity may be in learning and refinement; not the over-educated, "silent Grecians," but those who know "how to take occasion by the hand, and make the bounds of freedom wider yet." It has had its kings and its queens, its Latimers and its Luthers, its Shakespeares and its Newtons, its Arkwrights and its Stephensons, but its work is not yet completed. Let us not then be content with the things that be. The best fun in the world is activity. "It is with us as with things in nature, which, by *motion*, are preserved in their purity and perfection; if the water runneth it holdeth clear, sweet, and fresh, but what is more noisome than a stagnant pool!" Pythagoras says that in this theatre of man's life it is reserved only for God and angels to look on. But, according to Swift, even angels are not to be passive. The royal arms of Liliput, he says, are an angel lifting a lame beggar from the earth. In conclusion then let me say with Carlyle: "It is to you, ye workers, who do already work, and are as grown men, noble and honourable in a sort, that the whole world calls for new

work and nobleness. Subdue mutiny, discord, wide-spread despair, by manfulness, justice, mercy, and wisdom. Chaos is dark, deep as hell; let light be, and there is instead a green flowery world. Oh, it is great, and there is no other greatness. To make some work of God's Creation a little fruitfuller, better, more worthy of God; to make some human hearts a little easier, manfuler, happier,—more blessed, less accursed! It is work for a God. Sooty hell of mutiny and savagery and despair can by man's energy be made a kind of heaven; cleared of its soot, of its mutiny, of its need to mutiny; the everlasting arch of heaven's azure overspanning it too, and its cunning mechanisms and tall chimney-steeple, as a birth of heaven; God and all men looking on it well pleased."—*Lampyde.*

HOME RULE IN IRELAND AND EDUCATION.

AN article which appeared in the December number of this JOURNAL under the above heading calls for a reply, not so much for the intrinsic merits of the essay in question, as because the views expressed therein are shared by many fair-minded men in this country. The writer of "Home Rule in Ireland and Education" has failed to throw any light on a subject which requires explanation alone in order that a fairly sound judgment may be formed on it. The question he puts "Why is it that an influential section of the people of Ireland is so passionately opposed to what Mr. Gladstone was disposed to grant to that country?" This question he answers by a wandering and illogical disquisition, in which it is attempted to prove that the intelligent classes of Ireland are opposed to the concession to Ireland of her national Legislature, because such concession would result in the handing over the control of her educational interests to the churches, and chiefly to the Church of Rome. The most superficial reader cannot fail to observe that the writer of the article under consideration has made three distinct categorical statements: (a) an influential section of the people of Ireland is opposed to Home Rule; (b) this section is opposed to Home Rule partly because the concession of Home Rule would result in ecclesiastical control of educational powers, but chiefly because (c) this control would be for the most part centred in the hands of R. C. ecclesiastics. The remainder of his essay consists of his attempt to prove these three statements.

At the present stage of the Home Rule controversy it is hardly necessary for us to deny the assertion that an influential section of the Irish nation is opposed to it. Leinster, the wealthiest, relatively and absolutely of the four Irish Provinces would be unanimous for Home Rule, but for Dublin University, and it is worthy of note that at the recent general elections Trinity College, Dublin, was nowhere excelled for scandalous rowdyism. Ulster, the second of the Irish Provinces in the order of relative wealth, sends a majority of Home Rulers to Parliament. Munster, the second in order of absolute wealth, but third in relative, is unanimous on the subject,