

Speaking of music as an element of education, he says: "As to music, some may entertain a doubt since most people now use it for the sake of pleasure; but those who originally made it a part of education did so because nature requires not only that we should be properly employed, but that we should be able to enjoy leisure honourably: for this of all things is the principal." "By all means we ought to learn what we should do when at rest."

It will be readily seen that the system of education of Aristotle is less formal than that of Plato, and covers the ground of a limited public education. It is also easier to determine what these systems were not, than just what they were. In the first place they were not utilitarian, using the word in its modern sense, for they insist on philosophical and ethical pursuits. But these, again, were not their sole concern, for they included the study of art, music, and the practice of athletics. Neither did they aim directly at a formal morality. These systems were never put into general practice; they were ideal, a sort of *ex post facto* plans, based upon living examples of their time. Perhaps Xenophon was the best example of an all round culture such as these systems taught—a culture conterminous with a man's life; beginning at birth and ending only with death. It is true that under this system Xenophon shone brightest as a general, Socrates as a moral teacher, Lysias as a lawyer, Isocrates as a rhetorician and writer, thus falling into the niche for which they were naturally, not artificially, destined. Their position in life, as that of every one, was the inevitable outcome of their natural talents plus their cultivation, either of which, we may assume, would have been well-nigh a dead letter without the other.

Now amongst the many systems of

education, and their name is legion, from Aristotle to the present day, it may as well be confessed, that but few have had any other ostensible object than the very one of Aristotle; *i.e.*, the development of the whole man; only that from the modern tendency to specialize departments of learning, and to provide different schools and regimen for these separate departments, we are in great danger, to-day, of mistaking the means for the end. The means—that is, the special methods for the prosecution of individual subjects for the end, that is, culture in general. And so, we hear people speak of taking a classical education, a technical, a scientific, a musical education, instead of being trained in these special subjects; no one or two of which can properly be said to constitute an education. It cannot, we think, be too clearly set forth, that the general development of the physical, the mental and the moral in man, has been the aim of the great teachers of mankind, who have allowed special talents at first to take care of themselves. To-day, however, an opposite tendency is seen. The way in which schools for special subjects have been pushed, and the magnificent provision which has been made for them, and, more still, the one sided influence of men who have only this special training, is evidently tending to turn aside the minds of men from the old-time idea of education; from, if you please, the Aristotelian idea. Moreover, this specializing of training is but a product of other influence due to the progress, not of the civilization, to which it is so often erroneously attributed, but of the material prosperity of the age and especially of the blind devotion to that prosperity and to all that it implies; individual wealth, luxury, influence, station. A careful examination of the educational courses of the day will not fail to