

ture and with the various branches of practical and theoretical knowledge is as sefficient as a classical education.

It may be asked, What is the precise meaning of the word culture? It is indefinite, and hence may be understood in different forms. But be the meaning what it may, must it not depend to a great extent on individual capacity and power of mind which the effort is required to develop and direct? May not the peculiarities of one mind suggest that it will derive advantages from the pursuit of classical studies, while in another case they point to the benefit of making modern researches the keystone of the arch we wish to construct? Physically, how rare it is to see two people in every way resembling each other. Mentally the diversities are perhaps as great. Do we not find natural aptitudes and incapacities in the same individual, which cannot be materially changed by any effort of education? We meet men in the possession of powers which find their place in one sphere marked by weakness in another. Some natures are logical, philosophical and contemplative, to whom the gift of fluent speech is denied. Scotchmen are laughed at by men of vivid imagination for their tendency to indulge in metaphysical speculations. There are gifted men and women who have a keen perception of all that is pleasant to the eye or ear in form or in sound, others have a high sense of the beautiful in colour or in words, who have no relish or capacity for the solid attractions of science. Our experience tells us that there are natures in whom some or all of these delicate perceptions are weak or wanting, and faculties of another kind predominate. How many of us are deficient in appreciation of music. Johnson's insensibility to it is well known. Luther delighted in it. But in accordance with the beneficent law of compensation, minds constituted

like that of Johnson may be distinguished by great intellectual power. We have only to suppose that proficiency in music was made the test of passing a matriculation examination to conceive the difficulties that would result. Men such as Johnson would undoubtedly be rejected. The Greeks taught music as a science; indeed, the main subjects taught in Greece up to the days of Aristotle were music and gymnastics. Of course, all are aware that music with the Greeks implied much more than with us, but the illustration is the same. Whatever it implied, its theory and practice were regarded of the first importance in training the intellect and in advancing morality. Music was held to have a humanizing effect on the man in performing all the social and public duties of life. Such was the Greek theory. Suppose music again obtained the same distinction, and was placed in the prominent position in the curriculum which classics hold. What shipwreck would there be to many a brilliant youth of high endowments and deep feeling, but weak in the perception of harmony. Indeed, had music in modern days been raised to the supremacy which classics have long held, the portal of the university would have been practically closed against many men who have become illustrious in the annals of their country.

It has been said that a defect in one faculty is compensated by a redundancy of power in another. One man may be colour-blind, but have the keenest perception of form—one unimpressed by music, but have a gift for mathematical analysis. A third, to whom the study of a language is weary and unprofitable, may be an untiring devotee of science. Men are not mentally uniform. It is wisely ordained that we differ in our tastes, in our capacities, in our power to undergo different kinds of mental