

example to follow; and our readers, we think, will agree with the conclusion.

He next sketched the educational system of India, and noticed particularly one fact, that the system of Lancaster, which made the more advanced pupils, under the name of monitors, instruct the younger pupils, was derived from India. The Rev. Mr. Bell observed it, and made a report to the East India Company on the subject, from which Lancaster derived his idea. The same system had been tried and condemned, however, in Germany, long before it had been tested and failed in England and the United States.

The Persian system was next commented on, which differed little from the Indian, except in having more vigour, in consequence of the lack of the castes which hampered it in India.

From the Persian the lecturer next turned to the Egyptian system, which was more complete. He commented on their proficiency in mathematics, which seemed to have been their favourite study. It did not, as Plato justly remarked, seem to benefit either the administration of the State nor the private concerns of the people, nor tend to ennoble the character of the proficient—neither of which, we should suppose, would be claimed for the study by its greatest admirers.

After an examination of the Theocratic system of the ancient Hebrews, which followed after that of the Egyptians, he advanced the opinion that to Egypt not only was the Hebrew, but also the Greek culture largely indebted. The position of Dr. Buchheim is undoubtedly correct. The admirers of Greek literature and laws will not admit that there was any high civilization until that of Greece appeared; but the evidence now before the world shows that Egyptian civilization was in full vigour before that of Greece, and in some things surpassed it; and careful examination enables us to trace much of Grecian science, letters, and arts to an Egyptian source. Yet the educational system of the Greeks, on which the lecturer dwelt, was more perfect than its predecessor. The Greeks were desirous of developing both mind and body—to combine mental and physical culture—so as to produce a cultivated mind in a perfect frame. Hence their gymnastics—the games as well as the schools—Herakles had equal honour with the Muses.

A commentary on the system of Crete and Sparta, which differed for the worse from that of the rest of Greece, preceded an examination of the Roman system, which was patriotic and practical. It had, too, this distinguishing feature, that it had high notions of family life, and hence the position of woman was better than among the Greeks. The conclusion of this part of the lecture is worthy of attention, and hence we quote it:

“The greatest theorists of those times in educational matters, were Cicero and Quintilian. Their theories were in accordance with the Roman character, highly practical, just as they were the results of practical wants. Many of their wise precepts ought to be engraven on the heart of every man. What a wholesome truth lies in the Ciceronian saying: ‘To undertake nothing that is averse to our nature and capacities, and always to follow our individual natural ability; to do nothing against the will of Minerva; that is to say, nothing against our natural aptitude!’ If this precept were strictly observed, we should not see so many bunglers and dabblers in the world. Certain subjects are necessary for everybody; but when they have once been mastered, let every individual choose what suits best his nature. Let nobody undertake anything against the will of Minerva. When we consider how many hundreds of boys are most injudiciously compelled to plod, during the best and brightest years of their lives, over the languages of Rome and Greece, to no other purpose but to follow the common track, which prescribes the study of the ancient Classics as a *sine qua non* for those who aspire to a gentlemanly education—when we see that most of those who study Latin and Greek are not able to read with ease the works written in those languages, and that only an exceedingly small number of them are endowed with the proper taste really to enjoy them—and when we know at the same time that the study of the modern languages would be far more conducive to their intellectual development, because they are more congenial to them, and would tend much more to help them on in their future career—are we not in duty bound to call out to them, ‘Do not undertake anything against the will of Minerva?’ Fortunately this view is gaining ground, though slowly, still steadily; and so I have no fear of being accused of speaking on the ‘Nothing-like-leather principle.’

“Many eminent English scholars are now advocating the general introduction of modern languages as a necessary branch of education; and if the cry be raised that the limited school-time will not allow us to embrace both the ancient and the modern languages, we would only refer to the statement of Mr. George Long, who is undoubtedly one of the greatest authorities in classical matters, and who has declared that ‘both Latin and Greek can be learned well in much less time than they are often learned very imperfectly. The student may begin later and he may end earlier,’ &c.; and

finally he says, ‘that the study of the ancient languages is generally commenced too soon.’ On the greater part of boys, the study of the ancient classics is certainly quite lost, whilst German and French would be of real advantage to them. . . .

“It has often been remarked that ladies express themselves in more refined language than gentlemen. Well, they do not spend two-thirds of their school-time on Latin and Greek, but they apply themselves to the study of modern languages, and the refinement of their language might partly be attributed to this circumstance. Still we know there is a great waste of time and talent in female education also. We are well aware that the greatest part of their time for study is devoted by young ladies to music, and we are equally well aware that only a small number of them really have any talent for that art. Now, the unfortunate pupils who are endowed with no ability for music, may possess unusual talent for languages or literary pursuits. But Minerva must yield to Saint Cecilia: the young strummer is compelled to go on with her sterile musical studies, to her own prejudice, to the annoyance of her master, and to the terror of all the visitors at her parents’ house.

“A more complete system of education than that of Cicero we find in Quintilian, who, although he took Plato as the basis of his theories, had only the practical wants of life in view, like a true Roman. His works may still be studied with great advantage by all who have the educational question at heart. He prefers the ‘bright light of the schoolroom to the dark solitude of a domestic education;’ and above all he condemns the not unusual custom of taking an indifferent master for beginners. Such a proceeding he considers highly prejudicial to education; for when at a later period the better master is employed, his work is double. First he must eradicate the unsound teaching, and then he must teach what ought to have been taught before. Every thing becomes more intelligible the more intelligent the teacher is. He further thinks it necessary that the educationist should be acquainted with the theory of teaching. Marcus Aurelius Quintilianus was born, as you well know, in the year 42 Anno Domini; and I am grieved to say, after a lapse of 1800 years, we still find the prejudice prevalent all over the world, that inferior teachers are good enough for the beginning and that the practice of employing qualified schoolmasters only is still a *pium desideratum!*”

Professor Buchheim now took up the second part of his subject, and in introducing it asserted that the aim of education in the ancient world was but limited, since the right of man, as man, had not then been acknowledged. The aspect of affairs changed with the new era—the individuality of nations began to soften, and the world was divided into Christians and non-Christians. From that time out the lecture would have nothing to do with nations, but with the systems of individuals. The Professor gave a sketch of the origin and progress of the Christian schools under the influence of the Fathers of the Church, and the state of education in the Byzantine empire; digressed slightly to the Arabians; examined the Monastery and Parochial schools of the middle ages, and the polite education of the Knights. He described the extraordinary education movements which took place in those times—in the Netherlands, where Gerhard Groote, Thomas à Kempis, Rudolph Agricola, and Erasmus from Rotterdam, disseminated classical learning and sound educational principles; in England, where John Colet founded the Schola Paulina, and where Louis Vives contributed much to the enlightenment of teachers;—in Italy, where at the time civilization centred;—in France, where the first University was founded in Paris;—and in Germany, where Guttenberg made the most beneficent human invention, and the son of a poor mincer freed the Church and emancipated the School.

In describing the great influence which Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe exercised in those times on the minds of the educationists, the lecturer found an opportunity to speak of J. J. Rousseau and his remarkable book on education. “Rousseau’s Emile,” said the lecturer, “was a protest against the shallowness and demoralization of French life as it was during those times. Men were then nothing but artificial creatures, and Rousseau wanted to lead them back to nature. His object was, however, not to ennoble them afterwards by art, but to leave them in their natural state, and thus he committed the error of falling into the other extreme.”

To a detailed criticism on Rousseau followed an outline of the “Philantropin,” which was founded by Basedow, in 1774. He became thus the founder of the “Philantropinists,” whose aim was “to raise education to a science, to make instruction not a mere trade, but the object of scientific research.”

The example set by the Philantropinists had a very beneficial effect on the educational world, and made itself felt even in Austria. In France it was the great revolution that paved the way to a better educational system; but no considerable improvement took place there before the July Government had sent a special commission to Germany to examine there the educational institutions of her various states, and especially of Prussia. The special commissioner