

its foundations and examine them afresh.

But the examination must be thorough and honest. We must not be satisfied, on the one hand, with traditional methods which will not stand investigation, nor, on the other, with abstract definitions which are too vague to admit of practical application. We must be able to give a reason for the faith that is in us; we must know what we are aiming at, and be able to explain and justify the way in which we are trying to reach our object. It is of little help, for example, to be told that "education" is from a Latin word which means "to draw out," and that the business of education is not to communicate knowledge, but to draw out and expand the pupil's mind. Psychology steps in and replies that the human mind is not a thing, but a congeries of powers and faculties. And then it asks, Which of these are to be developed? and if the answer is all of them it asks still further, In what order are they to be developed, and what is their relative importance? And when these points have been settled the practical application begins. How are we to proceed to develop these various faculties? What are we to do and what to teach? Has the communication of knowledge as such no effect at all in such development, or is it merely a mechanical process, to be judged apart on its own merits? And what would be the nature of a mind highly developed but absolutely devoid of stores of acquired knowledge? As soon as these questions have been faced and the answers driven to their logical conclusion, we shall be in a position to estimate the value of the abstract definition, that education means a drawing out.

No doubt those who use this definition have in their minds the development of the thinking faculty pure

and simple, and we are familiar with the expression, that the business of education is to teach a boy to think for himself. But what of other faculties, memory, taste, imagination, love of literature, rapidity of mental movement, and another, which is perhaps not so fully cultivated as it ought to be, the faculty of enjoyment, whether in work or amusement? Probably many of you have read the autobiography of John Stuart Mill, which contains an account of the most gigantic experiment ever made on the human mind. His father was a man of great mental power, and he determined to train his boy to be a reasoner only, everything in the nature of emotion being eliminated. The son was reading Greek at four years old, mathematics a year later; at ten he had gone through an extensive course of Political Economy, and had criticized and pointed out the fallacies of every book which he had read; at twelve he was writing articles for Reviews on subjects connected with Logic and Philosophy. He was never a child, never had any amusements, and in his autobiography, written at middle age, never alludes to his mother. By twenty he had thrown himself passionately into the work of Social Reform, and believed that in this task his aspirations would find satisfaction for the remainder of his life. But the time soon came when the results of this abnormal and one-sided development were to show themselves. A crisis came in his mental history. The world of his hopes and efforts suddenly became a dreary waste. The things which he had cared for he cared for no longer, and there seemed nothing else to care for. Life seemed utterly emptied of purpose and meaning. He asked himself what satisfaction it would give him if the reforms for which he had been striving became suddenly accomplished facts, and there was no