

manifest. For one thing, there is the loud outcry, heard in many quarters, for the introduction of "manual training" into our common-school systems, not as an adjunct to intellectual training, which it may very properly become, but as a substitute for what is contemptuously styled the *Wortkram* (word-cram) of the old systems. One persistent advocate of this particular nostrum goes so far as to say that in the ideal school of his imagining "the highest text-books are tools, and how to use them most intelligently is the highest test of scholarship." In the field of higher education, the same spirit is illustrated by the immense expansion of the technological and scientific departments of our universities, at the expense, too often, of the humanities, and by the determined warfare that has been waged, during the past score of years, upon the classical and other branches of the older education.

In the development of the current popular opinion upon this all important subject, we may distinguish two phases. To begin with, science, in the first flush of its great mid-century achievements, put forth the arrogant plea that it alone was deserving of serious consideration as an educational discipline. Mr. Spencer's famous tractate upon "Education" seemed to give cogency to this plea, and for a time did duty as a sort of gospel of the new dispensation. But the narrowness and inadequacy of that gospel became, after awhile, apparent even to the less reflective of minds, and a new doctrine emerged to fit the altered educational attitude. That doctrine, which has lately been urged with considerable eloquence, is, substantially, that all subjects are equally valuable as intellectual disciplines, and that physics and biology, if pursued in the proper spirit, are as potent to build up the full-statured

life as are history and literature and philosophy. But there are now indications that a third phase of the discussion is at hand, and that the question of relative educational values is about to receive a more searching examination than it has ever had before. And, in this connection, it is indeed significant that the President for 1895 of the National Educational Association, in preparing his inaugural address, should have felt that the time was ripe to use such words as the following :

"If it be true that Spirit and Reason rule the Universe, then the highest and most enduring knowledge is of the things of the spirit. That subtle sense of the beautiful and the sublime which accompanies spiritual insight, and is part of it, it is the highest achievement of which humanity is capable. . . . The study of nature is entitled to recognition on grounds similar to those put forward for the study of literature, of art, and of history. But among themselves these divisions of knowledge fall into an order of excellence as educational material that is determined by their respective relations to the development of the reflective reason. The application of this test must inevitably lead us, while honoring science and insisting upon its study, to place above it the study of history, of literature, of art, and of institutional life."

Contrasted with such an ideal as this of well-ordered education, how poor are all ideals that but proclaim the watchword of a narrow practicality. One of the finest expressions ever given to the nobler view is embodied in this passage from Newman's "Idea of a University :

"That perfection of the intellect, which is the result of education, and its *beau ideal*, to be imparted to individuals in their respective measures, is the clear, calm, accurate