

contrast of the treatment of the facts of evolution by a Darwin and a Haeckel, or a Tyndall, and of the use of their accumulated thousands by a Peabody, and many another millionaire who might be mentioned, will serve to illustrate this truth. There seems to be no doubt that the preceding ages of intellectual training in metaphysical and abstract lore furnished to the human mind just the necessary education for grappling with the facts of modern discovery. The natural order of development would seem to be first, analysis, then synthesis. A man must first have studied and thoroughly mastered the relations of bones in the animal frame before he can reconstruct, from a fraction of the skeleton of an extinct species, not only the skeleton itself, but the entire animal. So the inductive philosophy has no place in the history of a world or in the education of an individual before the deductive philosophy has been, as it were, exhausted. At any rate, we must confess that this has been the history of the development of philosophy, and we have not, as good evolutionists, the right to say or even believe that the intellectual life of the world or of the individual, could have been developed in any other way. The "bon mot" of the epicure, that "doubtless the Lord *could* have made a better berry than the strawberry, but doubtless never did," would not apply to the actual fruitage of the human mind. It ought not to be forgotten, therefore, that the intellect of man, in the progress of its collective development by which it has arrived at what is called modern civilization, has arrived there, not by training in specialties, but by general culture; not by a ratiocination from the individual to the general, but from the general to the individual; not by a *posteriori*, but by a *priori* processes; not by the principles of the "Novum Organon"

of Bacon, but by those of the "Organon" of Aristotle. This was the process of tutelage of the human intellect and it is absurd for us to say that there might have been a better, or even any other possible way of intellectual development. This has been the Way, the Truth, and the Life of mind evolution, and to us it would seem to be as safe to discard Him who has constituted for the ages this triple bond of union in our religious and moral life, on the ground that He had served this purpose, and substitute for Him the Religion of Humanity, as for the same reason, to put in the place of a liberal education any form of special training whatever. Is it not plain, from the very nature of things, that such a substitution in the place of religion means a cold and calculating policy instead of a spontaneous philanthropy, and, in the case of education a narrow, sordid, penny wise-and-pound-foolish policy which must eventually stunt intellectual growth?

The necessities of daily life compel us, more or less, to special pursuits, and she who has aptly been called the "mother of invention," will doubtless furnish us all with a vocation, dependent on our desires, our ambitions, and our capabilities. These desires and capabilities, again, must depend, in larger degree, upon the character of our previous education. Just here are we again brought face to face with the great question, the actual educational dilemma: Shall we recognize district schools of learning which have nothing in common? or, must the whole system of education, properly so called, be looked upon as one undivided and undivisible whole, and should all that tends to sectionalize, to antagonize different schools, especially schools of different degrees, be pronounced a vice and corruption?

The late Mr. Matthew Arnold was