

take the extremes), are largely modelled on the plan of fitting their students for money-making, in one form or another. The effect of this attitude is, in the case of the lower schools, to exaggerate the already strong money-making spirit and to make it the one object, not only of education but of life, and to induce a contempt for higher learning which has not for its foundation the same motive. In the case of the universities, where, if anywhere, the tradition of pure education, of culture for its own sake, still exists, this sordid spirit of the age tends to isolate them from the other extreme of the educational army, the common schools; leading the former to seek large endowments for the secure prosecution of their aims, to plant their headquarters aside from the mighty army of students over which they should, but do not, preside, to make invidious distinction between the character of their work and that of the officers in the ranks below them; to endeavour, by raising a high pecuniary, rather than a high intellectual, barrier, to win a *select* clientele. Now, no one will deny that making money is a creditable business, if made honestly and for a right purpose, and, so, the endowments of high institutions of learning, in order that talented specialists may prosecute their investigations, is highly praiseworthy. The question is, Has either of these pursuits anything to do with a general system of education? We think not. If money considerations are foisted into the early education of children, thus robbing them of the only taste of pure culture which the most of them can ever hope to have, they might as well be sent to the workshop and store at once. And if special training is declared to be of such moment that immature young men are asked to elect life pursuits before their powers are well in hand,

then would they better abandon the university and take up, at the first, with the training school, as many are already doing? No, as James Russell Lowell has recently reminded us, a university has been defined as a place where nothing useful is taught; a sentiment by the way derived from Aristotle's more truthful and less extravagant statement, "*Politica*," VIII., III.: "*τὸ δὲ ζητεῖν πανταχοῦ τῷ χρήσιμον ἥκιστα ἀρροττεῖ τοῖς μεγαλοψύχοις καὶ τοῖς ἐλεύθεροις.*" "To be forever striving for the useful little befits noble and free men." And it is nobility and freedom of soul that any education worthy the name inculcates. But, passing from theory to fact; we are confronted, at the present day, in the United States, with schools of so-called learning, advocating methods based upon diametrically opposite principles, the one of which has for its object the furnishing of the mind with a learning practical and useful (to employ the favourite characterization of this kind of education), the other aiming at the general and even development of a man's capabilities without regard to its immediate practicality. We do not have to go far to derive the parentage of these two systems. The former, as has been said, is the direct product of the spirit of this practical age—an age which, in politics, demands rights before respect for law, in business, profit before honour, in society, wealth before worth. Such an age must perforce demand, in education, facts before theories. But the simple accumulation of facts is like the accumulation of money; in itself, of small practical utility; nay, of decided detriment in unskillful or untrained hands. Moreover, exclusive devotion to the accumulation of facts produces an effect similar to the exclusive devotion to the accumulation of money, namely, an incapacity to handle the material when once-acquired. The