

might have been escaped, had the preparatory training of the operators been broader and higher. A thorough grounding in the principles of economic science, a better insight into the nature of social and political and moral duties and obligations, and the enlargement of sympathy and of public spirit, by a wider range of reading and study, would often go far to counteract that exclusive subjection to one dominant idea and aim, which hurries so many on the headlong race to financial and moral ruin.

But if we take a higher view of what constitutes preparation for any specific life-work, if we embrace in our idea of fitness the ability to appreciate and to discharge all the obligations to individuals, to society, and to the state, which arise out of the relations which the contemplated position involves, we find ourselves obliged to include both general culture and general knowledge to an extent limited only by the dimensions those obligations assume to our individual eyes. I am, of course, far from attributing this largeness of view to the majority of those teachers who, consciously or unconsciously, act upon the theory under discussion, in the discharge of their professional duties. That they ought to interpret their theory thus widely, in order to make it worthy of the dignity of their profession, and to fulfil the obligations to society and the state arising out of their own relations to each, seems clear to the most commonplace thinking. But certainly, it must be admitted, that only by virtue of so broad an interpretation can this special view of the functions of the educator be brought fully within the scope of the common principle I am trying to apply.

It would occupy too much space, and is probably unnecessary to go on and try to show how each of the other educational theories referred to can be brought within the range of the

same unifying process. The course of thought will readily suggest itself as I proceed to show that all these theories, however apparently diverse in themselves, are forced in practice to adapt themselves to one and the same method. There is practically but one method in education. The real work must in every case be performed by the pupil himself. All that the teacher can do is to prescribe the course and aid the student in his efforts to follow it. To this, all will assent. Is the intelligent teacher's aim to inform the mind of his pupil with useful knowledge? He can but place the means of acquiring that knowledge within easy reach and say to him, "I cannot give you this knowledge. It can be made yours only by your own toil. Exert yourself to grasp it. Put forth your best efforts, exercise all your mental powers, patiently, energetically, perseveringly, and you will gain the prize; not otherwise." Is his aim to fit his pupil for some professional, or other work? Still is he forced to say "I can give you no preparation or fitness. I can but show you how to acquire it. The rest must be your own. Nature has given you the conditions of success in your untrained powers. Voluntary and prolonged exertion of these powers in the direction I point out, is the only possible means whereby you can reach the end you have in view." The same train of remark obviously applies with, if possible, increased force to either of the other theories under consideration. The two conditions of mental, as of physical, strength and growth, are food and exercise. And the food can be taken and assimilated, the exercise performed with vigour and effect, by no one but the individual to be benefited himself. It matters not whether the aim be the narrowest and most selfish, or the broadest and loftiest, imaginable. The humblest, as well as the highest faculties can be brought