

who has lapsed into sin. The man who has known the most poverty, if he becomes rich, despises those of his brethren who are still needy and unprovided, with even more disdain than does he who never knew the want of superfluities, and whose purple is without a rent or a stain; the City scrivener knighted feels prouder of his tinkling cymbal than the duke does of his silver trumpet, and the extreme of vulgar arrogance matches the extreme of highborn pride. So the world goes on; and for the most part mankind gives itself up to these extremes, and finds it wise to show a fine contempt for the golden mean and the middle way by which the unexaggerated guide their thoughts and direct their steps. But, just as frozen mercury burns the skin like hot iron, so do extremes on either side, and on any question, for the most part lead to evil and end in pain; and the *tulissimus ibis* is now as ever to be found *in medio*.—(From the Queen.)

*Early Rising.*—Why is it that folk who like to do a thing are not content to do it, and leave others, unadvised, to act for themselves? Why should they insist on putting everybody into their pint measure, and condemning all who happen not to fill it exactly? This peculiarity is conspicuous in social habits, in the routine of every-day life. The man who confines himself to two meals in twenty-four imaginings he has cause of grievance against the man preferring three or four meals. The woman who enjoys society and travel feels uncharitable towards the entirely domestic stay-at-home body.

In nothing is this trait more observable than in getting up in the morning, about which people differ so very widely. They who choose to lie late are amiable enough towards those who believe, from a queer sense of hospitality, that they ought to welcome the dawn; that the dawn would be distressed unless they should cooperate with it, and keep it in countenance for its premature coming. But the early risers are not so kindly or so tolerant. If not positively inimical to the late lier, they greatly disapprove of him wholesome countenance against his habit.

Can any one tell why the mere fact of being up at or before daylight yields to a man an assurance of a moral superiority? What specific and shining virtue is there in leaping out of bed and dressing one's self in the dark? What crown of honour is conferred upon the fellow who, unable to sleep in the morning, bounces up betimes to advertise such incapacity? These be subtle questions, and their answers inhere in the mysterious root of things. But there can be no question that the habitually early riser conceives that the Ten Commandments are conserved in him, in addition to an ample system of ethics. When he appears at breakfast, he is very likely to ask those at table when they rose, feigning ignorance on a point on which he takes particular pains to be informed. Having been told that they rose at six, or seven, or eight o'clock, he invariably announces, with grand gusto, "Why, I was up two hours before any of you!" Then he proceeds to patronise in a very lofty manner, the inferior mortals who are not ashamed to confess that they have no prejudice in favour of getting up in the middle of the night. Nor is he content to enjoy this exalted triumph once, twice, thrice, or twenty times. Every morning he plumes himself anew, puts the same question, and each time adds to his moral worth and personal consequence.

What offence is there in sleep, that to protract it in the morning should be visited upon us so severely? Casuists have informed us that man is always sinning, except in sleep, which should therefore be ardently encouraged, whether before or after dawn. Do the Seven Sleepers typify the Seven Deadly Sins, or does the early riser design to bamboozle our theology? We suspect the latter, for he is an incomprehensible, wholly inconsistent person, who obviously thinks that his matutinal self-levation should atone for any and all other defects whatsoever. It is not sleep, but sleep in the morning to which he is hostile. He is fond of saying that we cannot be in bed too long before midnight, or too briefly after daybreak. And then there is some sort of iniquity appertaining to the bed. He himself will frequently get up at four or five o'clock, and, after dressing, descend to the library or sitting room, throw himself on the lounge, and be dozing in five minutes. He does not feel any shame for this either, although at breakfast he will be ready to hector his sons or brothers-in-law, who were at the same time innocently asleep overhead for being irredeemable sluggards. It is noticeable that the early riser often compensates himself for his greeting to the dawn by frequent naps between that hour and his regular bed-time. He gets up, but only to lie down again; he is not up for all day, nor is there

need of it, in his judgment, after he has performed the one important duty.

The whole matter lies in this: it is good for persons to rise early who want to do so, or who have something to occupy them, but they who have no necessity, and enjoy sleeping, ought to be privileged to lie abed without discredit or condemnation. This is rank heresy we are aware, but we are averse to fanaticism even on this time-honoured subject. There are virtues altogether independent of the hour of getting up, and some men who have slept late have gone to their graves with blameless records, and left large estates for their kindred to quarrel over. To get up merely for the sake of getting up is not of necessity a saving grace, and vices might be named—it is true they are deep and dark—which it will not expiate. Late sleepers have so long been bullied and persecuted that they would seem to have earned indulgence. The inexorable early riser should compassionate them at last, and permit them to go to perdition, if they will, on downy beds of ease. Even if they be resolved to rush upon destruction from hair mattresses, let them rush, while he may seek absolution for non-interference by getting up for six months at two o'clock in the morning.

It is well not to be beguiled by saws and counsels on the subject. Most of them had their origin in a distant era, and under conditions totally different from those now existent. Our remote ancestors went to bed early because there was nothing else to do. Their descendants of to-day go to bed late and get up late for very much the same reason. Country folk seek their pillow from sheer fatigue, from weariness, from want of mental stimulant. City people avoid their pillow, for at dark their recreation begins, and the joys of the night are poetic and manifold. The latter half of the nineteenth century is an age of gas-light, of midnight suppers, of nocturnal pleasures, of turning night into day. He who goes to bed early cannot see the realities or the ghosts of the time, and to rise early would subject him to a splendid isolation, besides fitting him ere long for a sleep in the cemetery.—(From the N. Y. Times.)

*History in Schools.*—There is hardly any department of education which has attracted more attention of late years than history. A generation ago it was almost wholly neglected. Boys were expected to learn the main outlines of Greek and Roman history; but the development of modern nations was ignored, even that of England being only superficially studied.

Two theories of the proper mode of teaching history are now frequently discussed. One is that a particular period should be selected for study, not the whole history of a people or of the race. The other theory favours exactly the opposite course. The ground of the former is that if too wide a field is gone over it is impossible to interest young students. Their attention, it is insisted, is distracted by the mass of facts they must master, and as a rule they forget almost as quickly as they learn. On the other hand, a special reign, or a special series of events, may be examined with tolerable minuteness, and it is possible to form some degree of intimacy with the figures that stand prominently forward on the foreground. There is undoubtedly some force in this contention: but it overlooks one fact—that no historical period can be perfectly understood if taken apart from all other periods. Every one ought now to be familiar with the idea of the continuity of history. The best recent historians object even to the venerable distinction between ancient and modern history, on the ground that although it may be of service in marking profound differences, it gives the impression that there was at one time an absolute break in human progress. It is impossible, they urge, to point to a date when what is called ancient history stopped and modern history began. Each shades into the other, and the earlier have left their traces in every important element of the later developments. For a like reason an energetic historical school has long protested against the custom of treating the Norman Conquest as the true starting point of the history of England.

The chief blunder hitherto made in teaching the history of a nation or race has been the attempt to impress on the minds of pupils far too many dry facts. Most men and women remember with horror the lists of dates they were expected to learn at school: and they may be excused if they do not see any very great benefit that sprang from this overburdening of