

completeness in telling the story, in expressing the idea: this is a characteristic of the lyrical writings of Longfellow. It is this sense of propriety, joined to imaginative insight, that gives us, in one of Longfellow's most vivid and characteristic poems, such perfect and exquisite lines as these:

"Lo! in that house of misery,  
A lady with a lamp I see  
Pass through the glimmering gloom,  
And flit from room to room.

"And slow, as in a dream of bliss,  
The speechless sufferer turns to kiss  
Her shadow, as it falls  
Upon the darkening walls." \*

It is this sense of propriety, allied to the qualities which we have mentioned, which has given to the world so many lines, stanzas, and lyrics that have become actually household words. Other poets of our generation have stirred us more profoundly: but but one other has the English-speaking world accepted, and absorbed into current thought and speech, so many poetic phrases. No other poet of our time has struck out so many pieces which have gone at once, and as a whole, into general intellectual circulation.

Longfellow, we have said, did not "originate ideas" to any great extent. Indeed, we have known a reward to be offered, in heated literary argument, to any one who could discover a single strong, imaginative thought in Longfellow which was not obviously quoted from some other writer. This was a rash wager, but it is evident that, even if he did not often invent ideas, he was a most prolific and felicitous inventor and adapter of images. We could easily cover pages of the magazine with quotations to prove the assertion, but the memory of every reader will supply him at once with a sufficient number of examples. As has recently been said, everything was to him an image of something else; he seemed to think "double, swan and shadow."

The poetry of Longfellow—to read it with care might almost be called a "liberal education," from so many sources of history, of literature, of life, and of nature is its inspiration drawn. We fear there is no one man who can fairly be called a typical American, but Longfellow was a type, certainly, of many Americans—a type of a large part of "the national mind." While loving best, and having the utmost faith in and hope for his own new world, he had the national love and hunger for the picturesque life, the art, and the traditions of the old world. It was long ago pointed out that he scarcely ever wrote a page that did not have in it the words "old," "olden," "ancient," or equivalent expressions. But this, we should say, might be rather a sign of his American nationality than a proof of his being a foreigner at heart. It is true that America was made for Europeans, but it may be said with equal truth that Europe was made for Americans.

The stream of Longfellow's poetry, beautiful from the first, grew broader and deeper to its end. In all his prime he wrote nothing more spirited and vigorous than "The Revenge of Rain-in-the-Face," "A Ballad of the French Fleet," and "The Leap of Roushan Beg"; among his latest poems nothing more pathetic than "The Chamber over the Gate." It was in his

old age that his harp gave forth those deep tones which move us in "Morituri Salutamus," and the sonnets entitled "Three Friends of Mine." From the latter series we quote the fourth, the one on Charles Sumner—a sonnet which will come home now with a new and more poignant meaning, not only to those of our elders who were his personal companions, but to many others who never saw the poet's face, yet to whom he has always been a living, revered, and beloved presence:

"River, that stealest with such silent pace  
Around the City of the Dead, where lies  
A friend who bore thy name, and whom these eyes  
Shall see no more in his accustomed place,  
Linger and fold him in thy soft embrace  
And say good-night, for now the western skies  
Are red with sunset, and gray mists arise  
Like damps that gather on a dead man's face.  
Good-night! good-night! as we so oft have said  
Beneath this roof at midnight, in the days  
That are no more, and shall no more return.  
Thou hast but taken thy lamp and gone to bed:  
I stay a little longer, as one stays  
To cover up the embers that still burn."

#### Practical Education in the Common Schools.

THE perennial demand for "practical" education in the public schools is just now exceptionally strenuous. At a recent conference of teachers and school committees, this question was discussed: "How shall we educate our pupils so as to fit them for the practical duties of life, such as farming and the various industrial pursuits?" That is a fair statement of the problem as it is urged in many quarters.

In trying to solve it, everything depends on the meaning of that short word "fit." If by "fitting" pupils for farming and other industrial pursuits is meant giving them technical instruction in agriculture and the various handicrafts, then it is doubtful whether the public schools can attempt it. It is true that, in some parts of Austria, small "school-gardens" have been established in connection with many of the public schools, in which most of the common grains and other plants of the country are cultivated, the names of which are taught to the children, thus giving them object lessons in botany, by which they become somewhat familiar with the flora of their own neighborhood and learn something, also, of the structure and habits of plants. As much as this might be done in connection with many of our suburban and country schools. But this would go but a little way toward fitting boys to be farmers. In the public schools of Boston, girls are taught sewing; and this branch of "practical" education might well be taught in other places. But it is not easy to see how our schools can undertake to give any instruction in the methods of agriculture, or of those other industrial trades by which men and women earn their livelihood.

It might be possible to establish in every considerable town a public workshop, into which boys could go out of school-hours and learn the use of various mechanical tools, under the instruction of a competent mechanic. Most school-boys in the cities and larger towns have much spare time on their hands, which might well be put to some such use. Perhaps a portion of the funds provided by taxation for public schools could be profitably expended in furnishing such schools as these. To do this would require legislation in most of the States; but it is open

\* "Santa Filomena."



to any benevolent gentleman to offer the boys of his own town such an opportunity. If it should be appreciated and improved, the public authorities might be led to adopt the same plan. Beyond some such simple provisions as these, we do not see how industrial education can be furnished to the pupils of our public schools. The handicrafts are so many, and their methods are so constantly changing, as civilization becomes more complex and the practical arts are multiplied and modified, that it would be quite out of the question to teach them all, even if skilled instructors could be obtained, which is equally out of the question.

Besides, it is hardly the function of public schools to impart any kind of special or technical education. We cannot "fit" boys to be ministers, or doctors, or lawyers, or farmers, or carpenters, or shoe-makers; we cannot train girls to be artists in pigments, or in music, or in millinery, or in cookery; all we can undertake to do in our public schools is to train the intellect and develop the character of the pupils so that they shall be intelligent, industrious, contented, and virtuous citizens. It ought to be possible to give the pupils of these schools a mental and moral discipline that shall "fit" them for any calling in life, and not more for one honest calling than for another.

The thing to be first sought, and the thing most often neglected in our public teaching, is the development of a sound character in the pupils. The State cannot teach religion, but it can require its teachers to enforce the virtues of industry, self-reliance, truthfulness, purity, honesty, justice, kindness, and courtesy; it can make the inculcation of these virtues a chief part of the teacher's work. The education that neglects or undervalues morality is worse than worthless; it "fits" the pupil to be a malefactor.

The next thing to be sought is to awaken the minds of the pupils, to stimulate their thirst for knowledge, to train them in habits of inquiry. The successful teacher is the one who makes his pupils think patiently and independently, who stirs them up to original investigation. Any pupil who has had this done for him has been "fitted," so far as his mind is concerned, for success in any calling.

As to the subjects taught in our common schools, it is plain that the old-fashioned rudiments of an English education are essential, though the amount of time given to some of them might well be reduced. Every pupil should learn to read the English language readily and intelligibly, and to speak and write it with a good degree of propriety. Some knowledge of geography is also important, though the time generally devoted to this study is fully twice as much as it is entitled to. Exactly the same thing may be said of arithmetic. In many of our graded-school systems, boys and girls are kept studying arithmetic for ten full years. Half of that time is ample for acquiring all necessary knowledge of that science. Some acquaintance with the history of our own country, and with the forms of our government, indicating the political relations and duties of citizens, is also indispensable. All these subjects must be taught in the public schools. In most of the public schools they are taught, and in the district and grammar schools, where the great majority of the children of the State finish their schooling, not much else is taught. A little music and

sometimes a little drawing may be added; but this is about all that is attempted in the great majority of our common schools. The high-schools are much more ambitious, not to say pretentious, but only a very small minority of the children taught by the State ever reach the high-schools.

Now, doubtless, a teacher who knows how to teach may manage, even in this narrow curriculum, to awaken the mental faculties and broaden the horizon of his pupils; but it is evident that a little wider range of subjects would make this work much easier. For it is not only necessary to awaken the love of study, but also to direct it toward subjects that will afford the student a life-long pursuit. We want to give our boys and girls a training that shall enable them not merely to make a living, but to find contentment and enjoyment in life.

Let us suppose that a boy is to be a farmer. It is notorious that boys in these days do not take kindly to the farmer's life. What is the reason? Is it that the farmer's gains are slow or that his labor is severe? These reasons partly explain the fact, but neither of them is the strongest reason. The loneliness of the farmer's life is a weightier consideration. The girls and boys now growing up, whether in the towns or in the country, do not like the isolation and solitude of the farms. They would rather live in less comfort, and work harder for less net wages, at more disagreeable labor, in the factory villages and in the cities, because they like to be in the crowd. They depend on outside excitements. "There is nothing going on in the country." That is the uniform reason given for preferring life in the city.

The first thing to do in "fitting" a boy for the life of a farmer is, therefore, to get this notion out of his head. The reason why life is so lonely in the country is that his mental resources are so small, and his own knowledge of the objects round about him is so limited. If we could give the boys who are destined for such life as this a kind of training which would enable them to see that there is something going on in the country all the while,—something of marvelous and thrilling interest,—that would help greatly in fitting them to their environment, and in enabling them to find contentment and reward in their work. Would not this result be secured, at least in part, by giving a portion of the years now spent in the everlasting grind of arithmetic and geography to the study of natural history, the materials of which are under the farmer's feet, and on every side of his path, and in the air all about him? Would not some knowledge of the minerals, the plants, and the animals of his own neighborhood, and some enthusiasm in prosecuting his studies among them, wonderfully broaden the farmer's life, and dispel much of its loneliness?

It would be easy to show how the study, in some elementary way, of these and perhaps other sciences of nature would do the same service for those who are to spend their lives in other industrial pursuits, enlarging their horizon, multiplying their resources, and showing them how to extract from the world about them a higher enjoyment than is to be found in the diversions and dissipations on which the multitudes are trying to feed their cravings.

The kind of education that fits the men and women who are to live by agriculture or the various handi-



crafts to find meaning and recompense in life, would be practical education in the highest sense of the word. And it is worth inquiring whether, by reforming the courses of study in our common schools so as to make room for such subjects as have been mentioned above, this end would not in some good degree be gained.

#### Minister and Citizen.

THERE have been lively discussions lately, in the press and elsewhere, as to the part American clergymen may, can, or do play in public affairs. It has been intimated that a clergyman is partly deprived, in America, of those extra official opportunities of usefulness and influence which, in England, especially abound.

There is a certain correctness in such a view as this. In England, a clergyman—that is, a clergyman of the Established Church (and in England all others are designated simply as ministers)—may be, and in the country often is, a magistrate. In cities he is eligible for election as a school commissioner, as member of the local board of charities, and other similar bodies. No such usage obtains among us, or if it does it is exceptional. Nor is the reason for it obscure. In England there is an Established Church, and bishops sit in Parliament and help, as “peers spiritual,” to make the laws. From such a condition of things the step is natural and easy to a usage which puts both clergymen and ministers in places, as we should say, of “political influence.” But imagine Cardinal McClosky running against Mr. Conkling for the position of United States Senator, or Bishop Simpson contending with his fellow-citizen Mr. Randall for the speakership of the House of Representatives! Such a thing we say is not to be thought of. We have no state Church, though it used to look sometimes in New York, on St. Patrick’s Day, as if we had an Established Church. It is undesirable that clergymen should hold, or be candidates for, positions which make them the nominees of political parties. If a clergyman is to “run” for an office, one who belongs to that class in the community which esteems ministers will be inclined to say, “Let it not be my minister, but some other minister.” We do not want one whose office brings him into such tender and sacred relations with the most serious facts of our lives to subject himself to the rough usage received by a candidate in a lively political campaign.

And yet we do not want him to forget that he is a man, and a citizen, as well as a minister. The best evidence of this is to be found in the fact that ministers who have remembered this, and who have illustrated it by conspicuous and long continued services to the state and to the community, have been those ministers whom we have most of all delighted to honor. There went to his rest, not long since, an eminent citizen of New York who was not less eminent as a citizen than he was as a minister. And yet, as a minister in the communion of which he was a life-long member he was, distinctly and undeniably, its foremost man,—not by any eminence of self-assertion or of ecclesiastical rank, for he ministered in a fellowship which knows no distinctions of ecclesiastical

rank, but simply and supremely by the divine right of his noble gifts and nobler service. The pastor of a large city congregation, which, like other city congregations, expected little from its minister in the way of pastoral service, he yet made his name a proverb for pastoral fidelity. The preacher in a pulpit which demanded from him who undertook to fill it the best that his brain and heart could bring to an exacting and critical people, he never disappointed by meagerness, though he sometimes taxed severely those who listened to him by his seemingly exhaustless fullness. A thinker of genuine insight, and with a mind so open that it welcomed truth from all quarters and honored it, though disguised sometimes in strangest “motley,” he kept himself abreast of the best scholarship of his time, and was as profoundly interested in his ministerial work the day he laid it down as when, more than forty years before, he took it up.

And yet this minister (we are speaking, we need hardly say, of the late Dr. Henry W. Bellows) was no less eminent as a citizen than he was as a divine. The civil war and the organization of the Sanitary Commission gave him, some may say, an opportunity to which he owed much of his subsequent usefulness and fame. But, “the gods give chances, and they who are their children seize them,” the proverb runs, and it was so here. Dr. Bellows had the courage in a great national crisis to see his opportunity to serve his country, and to seize it. In his pulpit, first of all, he spoke such words as helped to decide doubtful men and to nerve timid ones; and then, when he came down out of his pulpit, he took his rare gift of organization and administration and put it to work in the service of his imperiled country.

That preëminent ministry of helpfulness and leadership was but a type of all the rest. There is no good cause that has been contended for, whether on the platform or at the polls, in which Dr. Bellows was not felt and heard. With characteristic modesty, he was wont to wait till his fellow-citizens summoned him before obtruding himself upon the public notice; but when the call came, he never shrank from obeying it. And all this (for this, after all, is the point of our little homily), without the smallest loss of his influence or dignity as a clergyman. Dr. Bellows not only *looked* his profession (unlike, in this, some modern ministers, especially of the younger generation, whose appearance is a cross between a billiard-marker’s and a commercial traveler’s), he honored and adorned it. He will always be thought of in connection with it. A minister in an unorthodox communion, according to prevailing standards, he yet made himself to be recognized and respected everywhere for his ministerial office as well as for his personal character. And thus he will be remembered and regretted—as an exemplary and faithful divine, and no less as a public-spirited and influential citizen. This, we venture to submit, any minister may be in any American community, in his measure and according to his gifts. His people will not begrudge him the time he gives to public interests, though they may never wish to see him elected to office; and the community will not disesteem him as a minister because he chooses to remember that he also is a citizen and a man.