

COMMON SCHOOLS ABROAD.*

I THINK I have mentioned somewhere or other how much I was struck with a remark made to me more than twenty years ago at Rome by Cardinal Antonelli. I was visiting popular schools on the continent. "So you have come to see our schools," he said, "our popular schools; and many people would tell you that our popular education is nothing at all, or next to nothing, and that you will not be able to find anything worth reporting to your government about it. But you may tell your government this," continued the Cardinal: "that illiterate as the Italian population is said to be, and I suppose is, yet, if you mix with the people at any festival and listen to their criticism of what they see,—è brutto, è bello (that's ugly, that's fine!),—you will find their criticism to be almost invariably right. And a people," he concluded, "of whom that can be said must surely be allowed to have a certain sort of education."

I thought of the stolid insensibility to ugliness, the inability to discern between good and evil where the beautiful is concerned, which so easily besets our Anglo-Saxon race, and I acquiesced in what the Cardinal said. And at the same moment there rose to my memory the admirable sentence of a Moravian school-master in the seventeenth century, John Comenius, fixing the universal scope and aim for education. "The aim is," says Comenius, "to train generally all who are born men to all which is human." Surely, to be offended by ugliness, to be delighted and refreshed by beauty, is eminently human; just as, on the other hand, it is a proof that our humanity is raw and undeveloped if we confound the two together or are indifferent to them. For we are then "in bondage," as Goethe says, "to the common and inferior"; out of that bondage we have to rise, and to know that, however general it may be around us, it is not less a bondage and an evil.

Almost immediately after my arrival the other day in this country, I happened to come across a speech by one of your politicians, whom I hope I may venture to call a friend of mine, Senator Hawley of Connecticut. He was praising the system of government of the United States, and he praised it as being "a government of, by, and for the average man." I will not dispute whether or no in politics this is a benefit; but remember that in

our education and culture it is precisely the slough of "the common and average and inferior thing," *das Gemeine*, as Goethe calls it, which we have to cast off and rise out from. The common and average thing is our danger; it is comparatively easy of attainment, but no true friend of education will be satisfied so long as this is attained and nothing more.

In popular education, at present, "the common and average thing" is the ability to read, write, and calculate, and the possession of a certain amount of what is called useful knowledge. This is what, in progressive nations, we nowadays expect the whole population to attain, and what they do attain. If we ask for the educative result of this, we shall find it to be, in the main, that the whole population learns to read the newspapers, is formed by the newspapers. This is what modern popular education really leads up to, and many of us are apt to congratulate ourselves when this result has been achieved, and to think that here we have indeed a triumph of progress and civilization.

But then, Cardinal Antonelli points to an illiterate people able to discern much more justly than the English, and probably than the Americans either, between beauty and ugliness, and suggests how far distant, therefore, the popular education of our progressive nations still is from Comenius's ideal of a training of all to all which is human. And when our attention has once been called to the matter we may go further, and consider how entirely the popular education actually now given, in England at any rate, often fails to awaken and train not only the sense of beauty, but the soul and feelings generally. Therefore, what interests me in popular training abroad, which I have formerly had opportunities of studying, and have again been studying very recently, is especially to ascertain how far it succeeds in doing more than impart a certain amount of useful knowledge, how far it reaches the soul and feelings, and trains its pupils to that which is really human.

I am not sure to what extent your common schools in America resemble ours in their deficiencies; but I hope you will listen to me while I mention some points in which the common schools of Germany and France seem to me to succeed better than common schools in England in training their pupils to what is really human. You will then be

* Address delivered before the University of Pennsylvania.

able to judge for yourselves whether your common schools in America are more in the case of our English schools, or in that of the schools of France and Germany.

I will take first what is certainly a main agent in touching man's soul and feelings—religion. In England, religion is excluded from the official programme of the popular schools. If it is taught, it is taught outside of the official school-hours, and subject to private and local regulation. Religious liberty, it is said, requires this. If religion is taught at the public expense, what religion is it to be? If it is the religion of the majority, the minority are aggrieved. Religion, therefore, must not be a prescribed school matter at all.

Well, in Germany they no more hesitate to make the religion approved by the majority a school matter for fear the minority should object, in the name of religious liberty, to its being taught, than they hesitate to make the literature approved by the majority a school matter, for fear the minority should object, in the name of intellectual liberty, to its being taught. In German countries—for German Switzerland is much the same as Germany in this respect—religion stands as one of the foremost subjects of instruction in the popular school. Instead of being, as in England, a subject not laid out or noticed in official programmes, a subject which inspectors and official people are told to avoid, it is a subject laid out with the greatest care, and in which inspectors examine with special diligence and interest.

In general, one may say that three religious denominations, and no more, are recognized in German schools,—the Evangelical or Protestant, the Catholic, and the Jewish. Between Catholics and Protestants the public authority deals, both in theory and in practice, with absolute fairness. There is no persecution and no proselytism. So fair is the action of the administration, so complete is the confidence of the people in its fairness, that in the lower classes of Evangelical or Catholic schools you not unfrequently find the Evangelical or the Catholic minority taking the religious instruction, by the parents' consent, along with the majority. In the upper classes, the law requires the minority in these mixed schools to be separated, and to receive religious instruction from teachers of their own communion.

With us the difficulty of including religion in the school programme is caused by the sects of Protestantism. Everybody knows how our Protestantism breaks into sects. There is an instructive list of them in "Whitaker's Almanack." One might say that amongst our Anglo-Saxon race a new sect often arose from the mere pleasure of making one. And

these sects in England would cry out against a religious instruction based on the formularies of the established church, or in America, where you have no established church, of any one great body of Protestants; but throughout Protestant Germany the religious instruction in Protestant schools is based on the Lutheran catechism, the Evangelical hymn-book, and the Bible, and all denominations are expected to follow it. With us, the individual judges what degree of diversity among religionists renders separate religious instruction necessary; in Germany, the law.

I do not think that in Germany, where the spirit of sect has been less carefully cultivated than amongst ourselves, Protestants in general feel the obligatory religious instruction of the public school to be any hardship. I could not hear of any complaints on the subject. But I was very curious to learn how the working classes in the German cities, who are said to be greatly estranged from the Christian religion, took the obligatory religious instruction of their children. In the capital of Saxony, the country which is reported to be the stronghold of socialism, I asked an inspector what proportion of the working classes he thought were socialist and opposed to the established religion. "At least two-thirds," he answered. "Well, then," said I, "how do they like all this Lutheran religion for their children?" "They do not like it at all," he replied, "but they have to submit to it." He added that the religious instruction did the children good; that the mothers in general could perceive this, and some even of the secularist fathers.

I spoke on the same subject, when I was at Berlin, with a man whose name will be received with respect in any university,—Professor Mommsen, the celebrated historian. I told him how surprised I had been to find, after all I had heard of the decay of religion in Protestant Germany, how important a place it still held in the programme of the public schools. He agreed that it did so, and he, too, thought that this was a good thing. He said that the actual religious instruction given was too dogmatic, and that it was a fault of the persons in power that they made it more and more strictly so. But in general, he thought the school instruction in religion a good thing. He quoted to me words of Goethe which I remembered: "He who has art and science, has religion." But he quoted them with an addition which I had forgotten: "He who has not art and science, let him have religion." The popular school is for those, he said, who have not art or science; to leave religion out of its programme would therefore be a great mistake.

Imagine, in a country where government is, as Senator Hawley declares, of, by, and for the

average man, imagine recommending that a religious instruction should be imposed upon the common school because the classes frequenting it, not having art or science, require religion! Every term in the proposition is to the average man either unmeaning or else offensive. But I doubt whether the religious feeling of England would not be as much shocked as the democratic feeling of America by the notion of teaching religion in the popular schools as a thing which uncultivated people require, though cultivated people do not. And therefore, while the spirit of sect makes it in one way impracticable to introduce religion into the programme of our popular schools in England, the spirit of religion makes it impracticable in another.

Nevertheless, I wish to report things as I have actually found them, and as they are. The religious instruction in the popular schools of German countries seems to me one of the best and most effective parts of the school work. I have had a long experience of school-teachers and school-children, but seldom have I seen teachers and children to more advantage than once when in a Saxon school I heard them dealing with a theological problem raised in the Lutheran catechism,—the question in what sense men can be said to be tempted of God. In spite of the necessary ambiguity of terms which attends all such questions, in spite of their perhaps necessary insolubleness, they are eternally interesting when handled with thought and earnestness; and so they were handled in this instance.

But if one might have doubts as to the profitable effect, in the common school, of these theological questions, one could have none as to the good effect of what is, after all, the chief and the best part of the religious instruction in German schools: the learning by heart of Bible sayings and parables, and of the Evangelical hymns. I lay stress on the hymns in particular, because such hymns are a form of literature of which I keenly feel the defects, and of which I have more than once spoken disparagingly. The German hymns, however, are better than ours; and no one who watched the serious and touched expression which often came over a child's face at a moving verse, could doubt that here the soul and feelings were reached in a way of which we get no experience with the secular programme and with the useful knowledge of our own common schools.

It is said that the alienation of the working classes in Germany from the Christian religion proves that all the religious instruction of the popular schools is of very little use. I believe that the alienation is exaggerated. But even admitting it to be as great as any one chooses

to suppose, I feel sure that on the religious German nature sentiments and impulses raised by the religious instruction of school often and often continue to work, even though from positive Christianity a man may have become quite estranged.

Well, then, in the religious instruction of the German schools I find an educative force of much value, which in our English common schools is wanting and perhaps impossible. You will know whether it is wanting in your schools also.

But curiously enough I unexpectedly found in France likewise, in a public school, a type of religious instruction which seemed to me of high interest and value, and which also would be in the public schools of England quite impossible.

Not that religion holds the place in the programmes of the French public schools which it holds in those of Germany. Twenty years ago, when I had last seen the French schools, it did, but it does so no longer. The chaplains are gone from the public schools, and religion is gone from their programmes; it may no longer be taught in the public school-rooms out of school hours even. True, moral and civic instruction has a place in the school programmes, and regulations and high functionaries say that the schools are to teach the existence of a God, "in accordance with that spiritualist philosophy which is the glory of Descartes and of France." But in Paris, the center of that great development of popular education which undoubtedly is now going forward in France, in Paris the municipality, which provides and maintains the popular schools, will not have the name of God introduced in their teaching, and has even sanctioned a school manual altogether hostile to religion and contemptuous of it. It has not been possible, indeed, to bring the book into use; but the action of the Paris municipality, in regard to religion, is undoubtedly violent and blameworthy. That municipality has a sincere zeal for instructing the people, and from jobbery and corruption it is, I am told, perfectly free. But it has pushed forward school establishment so fast, and on such a scale as to expense, that the complaints of its extravagance are loud; and so intemperately as to religion, that it outruns the wishes of even that not very religious population, the population of Paris. The religious teaching orders, banished from the public schools, have been enabled, wonderful to relate, to give to their own schools—which are now maintained by private contributions only, and that in a country where voluntary effort is supposed not to flourish—an immense development, so that these orders now actually

educate, in private schools, one-third of the school-children of Paris.

As to the moral and civic instruction of the French schools, it seemed to me to be poor stuff, and I saw no signs of its touching the soul or mind of anybody receiving it. Moral teaching for young people, except when it is indirectly conveyed in stories, as in Miss Edgeworth's immortal "Parents' Assistant," is in general dull; and when it is conveyed in stories, the story may interest, but the moral is apt to be lost sight of. As to civic teaching, the most remarkable specimen of it which I met with I will mention, for it is worth mentioning. "Who gives you," said the questioner to the children, "all the benefits you are enjoying: these fine school-buildings with all their appliances, your instructors, this beautiful city where you live, everything in which the comfort and security of your life consists?" I was attentive, for I said to myself: Surely the child must be going to answer what children have from time immemorial been taught to answer to the like question, "God gives me all this"; and yet the name of God must not be used in a school of the Paris municipality. But the civic instruction proved equal to the occasion, and a legitimate answer came from the child: "It is our country gives us all this." *Eh bien, c'est le pays!* The force of civic instruction, I think, could hardly go further.

All this seems futile enough; but I am bound to record, too, that in a French training college I found, in connection with the teaching of pedagogy, what was really a religious instruction of the most serious and effective kind. I am disposed to say that I should call it, in view of our modern situation and needs, the best religious instruction which I have ever yet heard. The college is at Fontenay-aux-Roses, a few miles out of Paris. It was instituted a year or two ago by the French government in order to train directresses and teachers for the normal colleges for lay school-mistresses, which are now to be established throughout France. At the head of it was placed a man between sixty and seventy years old, who was originally a Protestant pastor and afterwards an inspector-general of primary schools, M. Pécaut. The choice was indeed an admirable one. M. Pécaut has the very gifts requisite for the delicate and difficult post to which he has been called. Whoever wishes to find a success achieved in the teaching of that much-talked-of but in general most unsatisfactory thing, undogmatic religion, should go to Fontenay and hear M. Pécaut in his morning hour with his students. He is fortunate in their quality; the Frenchwoman, under good teaching, makes one of the best students and school-mistresses in the world:

so quick is she, so clear, with such perfect presence of mind, such a keen and true sense for excellence. Most of the girls at Fontenay are Catholics, and attend Catholic service on Sundays. But I heard them taking with their director, paragraph by paragraph, Bishop Dupanloup's book on school, "*L'École*," a book in which all sorts of questions of religion in connection with education are raised; and really these girls were led to treat them in the same large and free, but at the same time tolerant, sympathetic, and pious, spirit, in which M. Pécaut treated them himself. A German expert in schools, who has lately been reporting to his government on female education in France, is as much struck with admiration at Fontenay and its inmates as I am.

Now here again we have a success which in England would hardly be possible. A government setting up a training college like Fontenay, with a man like M. Pécaut at the head of it, and with a religious instruction like that given by M. Pécaut, would run the risk of being accused of wishing to start a new religion of its own; and no English government in our day would ever, I suppose, run such a risk as that!

I pass on now to other matters of teaching. Here too I had, of course, our English popular schools constantly in my mind while I was observing the foreign schools, and the comparison thus established was highly instructive. In general I thought the methods of teaching better in the foreign schools than with us, and the results of the teaching better. And they are better because the teachers are better trained.

To take the scientific branches of instruction first. Anybody can construct a pretentious and showy school programme. Such a programme is the habitual instrument of unsound schools and superficial teachers. The limitations of a programme are often a proof of wisdom. In arithmetic and mathematics a hasty observer might at first, perhaps, be disposed to wonder that the common schools abroad, and particularly in Germany, do not go further and faster than they do. But in my opinion they prove the goodness of their methods just by not going too far and too fast, by directing their efforts above all to making sure that the average learner shall master every step of the process which he is following. I take myself to have been barely an average learner in arithmetic and mathematics, and I have the most distinct recollection that in these matters I was taken too far and too fast. Either the rule was propounded to us as a kind of trick, and then we had to bring sums right by following it, whereby we got no real insight into arithmetical principles at all; or else the principle of the rule was explained,

but not sufficiently developed and dwelt upon for the average learner, who was too rapidly hurried forward before he had fully grasped it.

Again, the use of the blackboard and of oral teaching for arithmetic will often in German schools strike an English observer as excessive. It seems as if a German child in his school-time was never to be left to work sums quietly on his slate by himself; but the sum is put on the blackboard and one child after another is called up to bear part in working it, with continual questioning as to his reasons for what he does. This certainly takes time; but the teacher's aim and endeavor is, not to make his pupil bring sums right (as the phrase is) in as many rules as possible, but to train him to understand the principles of arithmetic.

In teaching natural science and physics, the Germans show a like care not to outrun their scholar, to insure his comprehending all that is said and shown to him. I heard a lesson on electricity given to a class of girls in a Berlin school. I should call it an ambitious lesson in one sense; namely, that it went much beyond anything that I have known attempted in a popular school for girls in England. But what I felt, as I listened to it, was how thoroughly the lesson was within the girls' comprehension, and how I myself, if I had been taught in this fashion, could have been interested in electricity, though I have no bent for studies of this kind. The answering of the class proved how the girls were interested by their teacher's treatment of his subject, and how intelligently they followed it.

But the literary branches of the instruction were what interested me most. These are eminently the humanities, these are what train us to all which is human; and I find occurring frequently in my notes on the foreign schools this entry: *the children human*. I can best explain what I meant by saying frankly what is the impression generally made upon me by the literary performances — reading, reciting, foreign languages, literary history and criticism — in popular or common schools. Often I have to praise the performance as good; but I feel almost always bound in conscience to add secretly to myself: good, considering the class from which the children come, considering that they come from the uncultivated class.

In fact, for the production of good reading and reciting, really good reading and reciting, reading and reciting with proper intonation, pronunciation, and expression, it seems requisite generally to have been brought up in a certain atmosphere of refinement, in the company of people whose speech has these characters. Of course, raw people may call their own speech proper if they choose, but the

good judges will not go with them, and this is a case which turns on what "the judicious," as Aristotle says, would decide.

For foreign languages, again, some advantage of travel, of mixing with foreigners, is in general necessary, if proficiency is to be attained; and this advantage can seldom fall to the lot of those from whom the common schools are mostly recruited.

For conversance, once more, of any genuine sort with literary history or criticism, to have lived with cultivated people and to have heard their talk and their judgments seems in general necessary. There may be individuals of genius who have such astonishing natural aptitudes for declamation, or languages, or literature, that they seem to be self-made; but in general, good reading and reciting, and proficiency in foreign languages, and conversance with literary history and criticism, are produced as I have said, or, if they are produced in a class of learners otherwise, then we conclude that there must have been very superior teaching.

I repeat, therefore, that when I call the reading, or the declaiming, or the French, or the literature in a common school *good*, I usually mean good when all due allowances have been made, good considering that the children come from an uncultivated class. And I can hardly remember a case where I have not had to make such a secret reservation in praising these matters in English common schools, except now and then when I have found myself in presence of an eminent and charming natural gift for declamation.

But in popular schools on the continent of Europe, I have found whole classes whose reading and reciting might be called good without any such allowance or reservation whatever, called good just as absolutely as we can call reading and reciting of children of the cultivated classes good; reading and reciting with proper intonation, pronunciation, and expression, and which it was a pleasure to listen to. I recall particularly the reading and reciting of Lamartine's poetry by a class of girls in a primary school in Paris, and the reading of Schiller's "Wilhelm Tell" by a class of boys in a primary school at Lucerne.

Foreign languages are not in general obligatory matters in popular schools abroad, and it is not judicious, I think, in schools of that kind to make them obligatory. But in the popular schools in Hamburg English is obligatory, owing probably to the commercial intercourse of Hamburg with England; and in the popular schools of German Switzerland French is obligatory, because Switzerland is a bilingual nation. In Hamburg one could praise the performance of an English class, in

Zurich that of a French class, without any mental reservation, just as one might praise the performance of a French class in a good and expensive school for young ladies in England. The performance was not limited to a few pages of vocabulary and exercises, as in an elementary school in England; the class turned English or French fluently into German, and German fluently into English or French; they knew the grammar of their foreign language, and the way to pronounce it.

Finally, in literary history and criticism, I found in the common schools abroad entire classes familiar with the biography of the great authors their countrymen; capable of comparing and discussing their productions, and of indicating the sources whence these productions draw their power to move and delight us. I found classes trained to that which is human—to follow still the formula of Comenius—to this remarkable extent, a thing unexampled, so far as my experience goes, in popular schools at home.

I cannot enable you to hear the reading, or reciting, or the French and English, of these foreign classes, and thus to make a comparison of it with what you have in America. But I can give you two instances to show you, first, what degree of grammatical proficiency in a foreign language I have found in a common school abroad, and next what degree of proficiency in literary history and criticism.

Visiting one day the French class in a school at Zurich, I asked the master what his pupils were doing. He handed to me the book he was using, and went on with his lesson. His subject was the place of the pronominal objects in a French sentence. Many people who think they know French well are not sound on this point, though it is one where no French person will ever make a mistake. In a popular school in England, to deal with such a point at all would be ridiculous. The point is that in an indicative sentence the pronoun of the first or second person, used datively, always precedes the pronoun of the third person used accusatively: *on me le donne*. But if both pronouns are in the third person, the accusative comes first: *on le lui donne*. There are further rules as to the order of the pronouns in imperative sentences, both affirmative and negative. The point is rather a nice one for a foreigner who has not the instinct of custom to guide him; but again and again the Zurich pupils, to my surprise, displayed their firm hold upon the rules in question, and applied them unerringly. This is a matter of detail, but to any one who knows what common schools are, and what modern languages in them are, it will have great significance.

My second instance has a wider range. At Trachenberg, near Dresden, I entered the common school with the inspector, and found the upper class at their reading lesson. The inspector took the book; the children were reading a well-known ballad by Goethe, "Der Sanger," and he began to question them about Goethe's life. They answered as no children in a similar school in England would answer about the life of Milton or of Walter Scott. Then the ballad was read, and the children were asked to compare it with a ballad by Schiller which they had been reading lately, "Der Graf von Habsburg." They were asked what gave to each of these ballads its charm; what the Middle Age was, and whence is the attraction it has for us; what chivalry was, what the career of a minstrel, and so on. They answered in a way in which only children of the cultivated class, children who had had all manner of advantageous influences to mold them, would answer in England; and which led me to write in my note-book the remark which I have already mentioned: the children *human*.

You will judge whether you have in your common schools a like soundness of performance in these matters; whether you really have it, I mean, and are not merely said by patriots and newspapers to have it. I do not think it has much to do with the form of government. One learns, as one grows older, to assign causes with more and more caution. I do not see any necessary connection between government of, by, and for the average man, and an educational superiority such as I have been describing.

No, that superiority is due to a more direct and simple cause. That cause has powerfully affected and benefited popular education in Germany for a long time past, and is now showing its power for good in France also. It has expression well given to it by an article in the constitution of Canton Zurich, which declares that "there shall be an *organische Verbindung*, an organic connection, between all the schools of the Canton, from the lowest to the highest." It is this connection, this vital connection of popular with higher instruction, which produces its superiority.

America has been severely blamed by foreigners,—by foreigners I do not mean Englishmen; I never speak of Englishmen as foreigners to America, nor of Americans as foreigners to England,—but by foreigners America has been severely blamed for contenting herself generally with instituting a good public system of common schools, and leaving intermediate and higher instruction to chance. When one sees colleges such as Harvard, and Yale, and Columbia, one may

be inclined to say that in America higher instruction seems able to take good care of itself. But the question will still remain: What connection does it hold with popular education, what influence does it exercise upon *that*? In England we inherit from the past splendid seats of higher instruction, where some great branches of knowledge are undeniably taught with high success; but our higher instruction has no relations whatever with our popular instruction. In Germany, France, and Switzerland the case is otherwise.

There the Ministry of Public Instruction represents the community, in its collective and corporate character, dealing with education as one whole. Higher schools and universities are for the most part state institutions. With them the minister is most directly concerned. Often he is himself a personage distinguished in the higher instruction; thus Guizot and Cousin have been education ministers in France, Wilhelm von Humboldt in Prussia. At any rate, he is always surrounded by representatives of the higher instruction, and in close communication with them.

The popular school is naturally and properly a municipal thing. The minister's dealings with it will be less direct than with the higher schools. But he has the supervision of it, he has the responsibility for its being kept efficient and complying with the school-law of the country. Above all, he has under his direct care the training colleges, where the teachers of the popular schools are formed.

Now observe what effect this naturally has upon popular education. The minister is, I say, often a man who himself has borne a leading part in the highest and best instruction of the country,—in that which is most opposed to charlatanism, vulgarity, and unsoundness in learning, least apt to be satisfied with the common and average and inferior thing. At all events, he is surrounded by representatives of that higher instruction, he is constantly feeling their influence, he has them at his disposition to be consulted and used at any moment. In all those questions so important to the popular school, questions as to studies, methods, school-books, examinations, he takes their advice. They are his delegates and commissaries in his dealings with the popular schools. In the training colleges a certain proportion only of the teachers may be taken from the popular school; the rest must be representatives of the higher instruction. The minister can also depute special professors to give important parts of the training-college teaching; in France especially this is done. At Fontenay, which I have already mentioned, and at Auteuil, the training college of Paris for

school-masters, I found the young men and women thus coming under some of the very best and most stimulative instruction to be had now in all France.

You can understand how this action of superior instruction upon the teachers of the common schools must affect them; how it must tend to raise their work above that "common and average thing" which the school work of institutions fed from the least cultivated classes, and taught by instructors drawn from those classes, would of itself tend to become. You will understand how it produces results upon the training of the scholars of the common school which again and again moved me, as I have told you, to write in my notes: "The children *human*."

In England things are very different. There no branch of education is publicly administered except popular education. The education minister is charged with one branch of national education only, and that the lowest and simplest, as it is thought. When, moreover, the English Government found itself at last compelled to assume the responsibility for popular education, it approached it from the point of view of the politician rather than that of the knower and lover of education. Popular instruction had to be recognized as a public charge; it must necessarily be costly, and the great thing, therefore, was to satisfy the House of Commons and the public mind that the public had value for its money. Hence our system of *payment by results*, as it is called,—a vicious system educationally. But then our education minister does not see education as a whole; he is not surrounded by representatives of the higher instruction, men who look to the effect on education of plans adopted in schools, not to the effect on the House of Commons. A friend of education, who can merely urge interests of education against a plan for schools which is likely to please the House of Commons and the public mind, must feel that he is listened to with polite inattention. "It is all very fine," the minister is saying in his heart, "but my business is not to satisfy educationists; it is to satisfy the newspapers and the House of Commons."

If we could have for education minister in England a man like Sir James Mackintosh or Mr. Hallam, and surround him with the representatives of all the higher instruction of the country, then we should have a minister living in an atmosphere of what one may call *educational opinion*, and induced to give effect to it when the common schools and their studies are concerned. Such a minister we have never had in England, but in Germany and France they have; and the common

schools of those countries have felt the benefit of it in their methods and studies, in the training of their teachers and the humanization of their school-children.

Therefore I say that what is most to be desired for the common school is an *organic connection*, to borrow the phrase of the Zurich Constitution, with higher instruction,—a vivifying relation and contact with it. But for this purpose public instruction must be organized as one whole. We have not yet so organized it in England, and I do not think that in America you have yet done so either, although in your State governments you have the very machinery best suited for the purpose, a machinery which is lacking at present to us in Great Britain no less than in Ireland, where its absence attracts just now universal attention. Intermediate and higher instruc-

tion would themselves, in my opinion, be great gainers by such an organization. But the great gainer of all would be popular education. I can conceive no worthier ambition than that of training all who are born in a country like this of yours to all which is human. But it will not be done unless we can impart to popular instruction the contempt for charlatan-ism and vulgarity, the sound standard of excellence, by which all serious higher instruction is characterized. Bring, therefore, popular instruction in America into organic connection with higher instruction. Universities and higher schools would do a gracious, a patriotic, and a wise thing by advocating this; and let me say that such advocacy could come from no university with more grace and more force than from the university of Franklin.

Matthew Arnold.



A MADRIGAL.

SWEETHEART, the year is young,
 And 'neath the heavens blue
 The fresh wild-flowers have hung
 Their cups to catch the dew.
 And love like a bird carols one soft word,
 Sweetheart, to the sapphire skies;
 And floating aloft comes an echo soft
 "Sweetheart"—your eyes!

Sweetheart, the year is sweet
 With fragrance of the rose
 That bends before your feet
 As to the gale that blows.
 And love like a bird quavers one low word,
 Sweetheart, to the garden place;
 And across the glow comes an echo low
 "Sweetheart"—your face!

Sweetheart, the year is gone;
 Lean closer to my heart!
 Time only weighs upon
 The loves that dwell apart.
 And love like a bird with his whole soul stirred,
 Sweetheart, shall carol his glee;
 And to you I'll cling while the echoes ring
 "Sweetheart"—for me!

Sweetheart, the year grows old;
 Upon the meadows brown
 And forests, waving gold,
 The stars look, trembling, down.
 And love like a bird whispers one pure word,
 Sweetheart, to the cooling air;
 And the breezes sure waft an echo pure
 "Sweetheart"—your hair!

Sweetheart, the year wanes fast;
 The summer birds have flown
 From winter's spiteful blast
 Unto a sun-bound zone.
 And love like a bird warbles one clear word,
 Sweetheart, to the balmy south;
 And back to my ear comes an echo clear
 "Sweetheart"—your mouth!

Frank Dempster Sherman.