

FRASER'S MAGAZINE

247

NEW SERIES. VOL. XII.

JULY TO DECEMBER 1875



LONDON
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
PATERNOSTER ROW
MDCCLXXV

ON A UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM.

THE great peculiarity of modern European history has turned on the fact that many independent kingdoms were pervaded by a single religion, which was highly organized in an exterior centre. The ecclesiastics in every kingdom needed at all times a common language, and they found it in the Latin. From the tenth century the renewed cultivation of nobler Latin literature, in which the moral works of Cicero were prominent, began to dispel barbaric puerility of thought. Some five centuries later, the capture of Constantinople by the Turks brought the ancient Greek literature into Europe, by no means to the pleasure of ecclesiastics.

A common literature has been, and perhaps is, the most critical fact to Europe collectively. Of old it implied common religion: it now implies a common estimate of the great moral principles which the Christian religion inculcates. Hindus who have been trained in English literature, without any inculcation of professed religion, are amazed to hear such literature denounced as 'godless' and 'irreligious'; for in writings which the authors meant to be purely 'secular' they constantly find a pervading Christian sentiment. The existing European literature is a force of prime efficacy permeating the whole world of Asiatics, first, through the literary curiosity of a few princes; next, through the native press, especially in India. To undervalue this literature in a survey of the world would involve grave mistake. While the Latin language was that in which secretaries of state wrote, in which men of science corresponded, and philosophers conversed, at a time when philosophy and science hardly deserved their names; in that language was to be found the only accessible valuable litera-

ture. This fact was abundant reason for making Latin the foundation of all higher cultivation, as it was really the key to all liberal knowledge. It was indeed the area on which grammar was to be understood. 'A grammar school' meant a school for teaching Latin, as though the vernacular language had no grammar. Even after Greek literature was accessible, Latin necessarily retained its priority, as more urgent: but in the highest schools of learning the claims of Greek could not long be denied; while it might still be maintained that in Cicero, Seneca, Bœthius, moral thought attained higher perfection than among the Greeks; also that in jurisprudence the Romans bore off the palm. Yet the complex variety, beauty, and subtlety of the Greek language and literature could not fail at length to assign to it the higher academical place. No one therefore will wonder or blame that Latin and Greek, from the reigns of Henry VII. to Charles II., were predominant in our Universities. They contained between them by far the noblest literature known to the world; also Latin continued to be the diplomatic as well as the ecclesiastical medium of European communication. At the end of this era Shakspeare had written, and was appreciated, but not as now; Milton was in disgrace as a republican. Sir Isaac Newton was about to rise; and, before him, the importance of Galileo was imperfectly understood. We had no great native historians or philosophers in the English tongue, though Plutarch and some other ancients were translated; and on looking abroad, nothing was found in German, French, or even Italian and Spanish literature, which seemed worthily to compete with the ancient classics. At the same time they

gave the most direct and authentic information concerning Christian antiquities, a very vital consideration to every Protestant country. On the whole, perhaps, every one will see that the University curriculum was reasonably and wisely adopted at the era of our Reformation.

Much as the question has been debated in the last thirty years, whether it is *now* proper to make Greek and Latin the basis of general education, we do not seem to be any nearer than in former days to a solution of it in which all will acquiesce. If the scheme of a real Northern *university* as distinct from a *college* which is to feed Oxford or Cambridge should ever be brought into a practical form, beyond a doubt an immediate difference of opinion would arise on this subject, which might cause a formidable dissension among the friends of such an institution. It is hard for an individual to present both sides of the question with perfect impartiality. Unless he weakens the statements of one or other side, so as to bring the two into a balance of indifference, perhaps he will not gain credit for real fairness: nevertheless, the attempt must be made.

The classicists insist that any system of University instruction for England ought to maintain, as its universal basis of study, the standard writers of Greece and Rome. Stress is laid by them peculiarly on Greek, because the Latin language is generally acquired to a respectable extent at school, and comparatively few Latin authors are made much of at our old Universities in the present century. They urge that the Greek language is itself so perfect and peculiar a medium of human thought as to deserve study for its own sake; that it opens to us access to the earliest extant philosophical literature, all homesprung and fresh; that it reveals to us a state of society highly civilized, yet

differing greatly from our own—a study which not only unites us to the ancient world, but by reflection makes us better understand our present condition; that the narrow limits of time and space in which Greek history is contained, the small material scale on which the whole wonderful scene of Greek history was acted, peculiarly adapts the whole to juvenile study, especially since the same causes give less complexity to the narrative than in modern Europe, and, on the whole, greater prominence to individual personages as types of their respective nations; that the history of Rome, as the first widely extended empire which attained durability and compactness, is itself of the deepest interest, while it gains a still higher importance by its connection with the history of Christianity; that the grammatical cultivation of foreign tongues of such complexity as the Greek and Latin is of the greatest logical advantage to the mind, and cannot be adequately obtained by any conceivable study of one's native language; that many of the most striking defects of the Greek mind itself are either ascribable to the want of such foreign cultivation or at least would have been greatly counteracted by it; that no native literature can be made to fasten on the mind so firmly as that which is in foreign idiom, and, therefore, without debating whether *Æschylus* be superior to *Shakspeare*, or *Sophocles* to *Milton*, the Greek authors are far better suited to University culture;—in short, that we have on this side of the question the testimony of experience, and also that of the wise who have peculiarly studied education. Appeal has of late been made in particular to certain great names. *Mr. J. Stuart Mill*, as a man versed in all modern thought, is justly regarded as an illustrious authority, so emphatic was his commendation of the classical studies; such, too,

is M. Guizot's recommendation of Greek to the French.

On such grounds it is maintained that a study of the Greek and Latin classics ought to be a substantive and essential part of any University curriculum in this country.

The arguments on the opposite side are oftener heard explosively than continuously. They are generally frowned down with contempt, but only so much the more do they strike deep internal roots, generating perhaps fanatical hostility to all instruction that is not obviously and superficially useful. The unanimity of learned opinion to the importance of Greek as a general study is easily asserted, and has far too much weight assigned to it. We delight in that study or art in which we have attained skill—that which called out the enthusiasm of our youth—just as in the rustic scenes where we then wandered joyously. Classical scholars recommend classical study as naturally as physicians recommend physiology, as chemists are zealous for chemistry, and mathematicians for mathematics. A controversy is not settled by such arguments. Mr. J. Stuart Mill injured his own cause by pouring contempt on the teachers of classics for incompetence, hereby showing that he did not discern wherein the modern difficulty lies. Nine boys out of ten ask, What is the *use* of Latin?—which no one asked three centuries ago, when the language was seen in daily use. Hence, unless the method of teaching be fundamentally changed, so as to beguile learners by taxing them with the minimum of effort, the able teacher will often labour in vain. M. Guizot's recommendation of Greek to the French schools was certainly no result of professional zeal. His judgment deserves high respect. He thought the study would counteract certain weaknesses of the French mind. This perhaps is too peculiar an argument to dwell

upon. If appeal be made to English politics—and we may suppose that the policy into which both of our great parties has settled down is not wholly wrong—it is to be feared that the study of Greek has not been of much avail to us politically; for it will not be disputed that the Tories of to-day stand about where the Whigs of Lord Melbourne stood; yet that there has been far more Greek scholarship with the Conservatives than with the Liberals. The true question is not, *What topic* is studied? but *In what spirit* it is studied? Notoriously, the study of Theology may yield flatly opposite results.

Nor is the anti-classical argument concerned to deny the advantages derivable from the study of Greek and Greek literature. It only questions whether these benefits are not equally to be had from other quarters, with various collateral points of advantage, or *at a cheaper rate*. The classical arguments, it is difficult to deny, are habitually overstated, for, if they are valid, they ought to apply equally to India and to England, yet no reasonable man, in devising a plan of education for the sons of wealthy Hindoos, dreams of teaching them Greek or even Latin; obviously, then, the *real* arguments for *our* learning Latin or Greek must be found in some intimate relation of those languages to *us*, and not in their abstract value. If it be conceded that a Hindoo has too much beside to learn, and that it is not worth the effort for him to study Thucydides, Homer, Plato, and Demosthenes, it follows equally to inquire whether it be worth the effort to an Englishman of the nineteenth century; whereas the classical reasoners always deal with the question abstractedly, and make no attempt to strike a balance of practical advantage. Suspicion is further thrown upon their arguments by their being nearly all after-

thoughts, directed to justify a system which had already established itself on other grounds in connection with powerful pecuniary interests. Originally, the Latin and Greek languages were studied solely for the sake of the treasures of which they were the keys; when, moreover, a knowledge of Christian history was to be obtained from no other sources. Whatever may be now said, and said with justice, concerning the beauty of Greek and Latin poetry, or concerning the utility of studying these languages as a cultivation of the powers of the mind, it is certain that these are not the motives that originally made them the basis of our national culture; nor would these motives ever have sufficed, without the desire of the positive knowledge which at that time enforced the cultivation of those tongues. But at present the modern tongues afford stores of knowledge far more valuable than the languages of Aristotle and Tacitus contain, and have incorporated into themselves with immense improvement all that the ancients knew. What, then, is the state of modern studies historically? Shortly this. Our forefathers, longing after knowledge, went to the fountain of Romans and Greeks to slake their thirst; in so doing they found more than they sought for, they gained a cultivation of mental power which is now alleged to be of superlative and decisive importance. Well, what is now the right way of imitating our zealous predecessors? The Classicist says, 'Study Greek and Latin, because they afford good cultivation of the mind.' We reply, that is *not* to imitate the first modern cultivators of the classics. Truly to imitate them, we must study *for the sake of the knowledge or wisdom to be gained*; let that be done efficiently, and cultivation of mind will come of itself, *unsought*, to us, as it came to them.

Further, it must be noticed how unfairly the Classicists press the value of Greek and Roman *history* as a reason for cultivating the Greek and Latin *languages*. In one sense this is a reason on the other side, for the time occupied in studying the mere languages encroaches on time which might else be devoted to the history. It is unquestionable that translations of the standard historians and orators of Greece and Rome may be executed, in every practical sense perfect, in our current English, by aid of a few notes; and if a thousand hours were allowed for ancient history by two students, of whom one were to spend five hundred hours on the languages and five hundred on the native historians, while the other bestowed the whole time on translations of those historians, with English commentaries or histories, the latter would, beyond all comparison, become superior to the former in real acquaintance with the subject. We shall concede that nothing so lets us into the *inner life* of a people as the study of their light literature, their poetry, and their speeches; and no one can fully feel as a native until he knows the native tongue. But at present, with all the apparatus and enormous sacrifice of time, not one in fifty attains any deeper insight into Greek and Roman life *by means* of their languages than can be attained with comparatively small effort *without* the languages. A professional historian, no doubt, will need to study them; but it is absurd to infer that all need to do so, or that more than a few can find it worth their while, or have talents for it.

Who can deny the fact, that when men who have taken high honours for Greek at Oxford or Cambridge begin practical life, whether they become county magistrates or members of Parliament, or enter diplomatic service or other posts

under Government, or are eminent as lawyers, it is very rare for them to continue the study of Greek literature? Two or three eminent names in our day are known as relaxing their minds in vacation by such reading; but certainly not for a better acquaintance with politics or principles of law.

In short, however the fact may be denied, it becomes more and more clear that in the nineteenth century the study of Greek has become a branch of elegant or professional culture, and has no longer any claim on English gentlemen universally. For ministers of religion, and for students of antiquity, it is of obvious and great importance; but it is impossible to enforce it on the mass without inflicting on them the loss of what to them would have been far more valuable. Even allowing that something is due to the past history of a University, and that in older institutions where such studies have flourished we could not wish them very severely cut down, this surely is no reason for introducing them into new institutions.

A delicate topic here arises, which, however difficult to treat, ought not to be evaded. The ancients were flagrantly and undisguisedly licentious. Accustomed to war and to slavery, trampling down the conquered without respect or pity for sex, they regarded all foreign females as a natural spoil and prey to their native youths. However jealous for the honour of their kinswomen, they rebuked no vice which spared their own nation and class. The Greeks went headlong into unnatural practices, and the Romans followed with unequal steps. The literature plainly exhibits the immoral state of the community, sometimes with disgusting frankness; for, it would seem, no writer lost honour and 'caste' even by sympathy with vice. Far other is our condition.

Our general literature is more decorous than ever; while there are many reasons to fear that our theories and our practice are gravitating lower than ever. It thus becomes a very complex question, whether the ancient literature will corrupt our youth. The argument, 'To the pure all things are pure,' is true, but is liable to become a deceptive truism, viz. when we are *not* pure; and if a majority of boys are corrupted at school, a majority who enter the Universities are already tainted in mind, and liable to be made worse by contact with evil. No class of teachers has felt the danger more painfully than Catholic priests. Among them, even in their least reputable state, there of course always have been men of unblemished purity, to whom the sins of their own order have been a mental agony; and whatever they devised for maintaining the purity of youth was received with far greater deference than similar movements among Protestants. Thus the excision of evil allusions from the school-books became general in editions prepared by Catholics; against which, among Protestants, there is frequent and wide-spread carping. But in our recent editions of Juvenal (for instance) for schools, both selection and excision are used. Few perhaps are aware how far the principle of change is sometimes carried. For the use of the pupils at the Oratory school in Edgbaston, Dr. J. H. Newman has printed a highly ingenious substitute for the *Eunuch* of Terence, fundamentally altering the plot, with a minimum of change in the Latin. Certainly, in reading Aristophanes, it would be a great relief to readers if some one would as ingeniously replace the impure words and thoughts by pure ones. To teach youths to relish impure wit is certainly an odious training.

But when pious care has done its

best, it is useless to shut our eyes to the fact that to many the second part of the aphorism applies, 'To those who are impure nothing is pure.' How, indeed, can a boy's imagination remain pure if he live in company with the foul and foul-mouthed? Some boys gloat in impure thoughts suggested to them by the most trifling pretence. Virgil cannot speak of a maiden as 'Jam matura viro,' but they so comment on it as to debase the imagination of younger boys. Old sergeants, it is said, comfort timid recruits by telling them that a musket-ball kills as well as a cannon-ball; and some such comfort, miserable as it is, may be administered to anxious parents. The purest literature will serve to corrupt some natures. The fact is that Virgil's *Æneid* is a work for which we may claim a purity higher than that of *Paradise Lost* or of *Comus*; each of which affords in certain places evil food for evil minds. If, from boyhood up, the moral relations of the sexes are deeply engraved in the mind; if a boy understands what conditions are requisite to make women blessed and a blessing to man, the sweet remembrance of mother and sister will fortify him when he rises into manhood. Apparently, in this matter, we must think *more* of strengthening his moral sympathies than of shielding him from evil suggestions; not that the latter is not earnestly to be desired, for a defiled imagination is a dreadful calamity to a young man who is resolute to act chastely. For some of the *Satires* of Horace and Juvenal, for Catullus, Plautus, and Aristophanes, even for parts of Theocritus, no defence is here set up. The more their bad portions are avoided the better. Nevertheless, the great mass of the really classical literature is as pure reading as can anywhere be hoped for. If allusion to a special Greek vice suddenly cross us, it can only dis-

gust and amaze, but can never allure an English youth. In every other respect Thucydides, Xenophon, Cicero, Plutarch, are purer than most English newspapers. Thus, while the topic is not at all to be neglected by the practical instructor, it cannot have any weight in deciding the question of a University curriculum.

Even if one hesitate on which side the balance of argument lies in this controversy, so long as it is debated in the abstract; yet the moment it takes the practical form, 'Ought a *new* University closely to follow the old ones in regard to its curriculum of study?' the just reply is obvious: 'It ought to discard their precedents altogether, and be founded exactly as they were, on a consideration of the needs of the day.' But here a new thought occurs. Cambridge remarkably deviated from her mediæval traditions by glorifying Sir Isaac Newton and the modern mathematics. This study has there entirely eclipsed Greek and Latin, and has been made the real academical basis. The contrast to Oxford is so startling as wholly to destroy the argument which rests on the authority of either. Besides, though high honours are given for classics in the Cambridge Tripos, it is not for knowledge of the literature, but solely for knowledge of the language. A young man may attain the highest classical honours there one day, and the next day confess to you that he is ignorant of the *contents* of the authors whose *dialect* he has most diligently studied. Thus Cambridge throws away the argument from 'dear Thucydides and Aristotle,' which was so powerful with the zealous Arnold. And as Cambridge set us the example of enthroning the new mathematics which sprang out of the school, first of Newton, then of Euler, so surely ought any new University to deal, now that we under-

stand the eminence of Linnæus and Lavoisier, Franklin and Haller, though surely not so as to undervalue the new European literature.

We may add, those studies have a great advantage, the utility of which is apparent to *that* public on whose patronage a new University must depend. Adaptation to popular common sense is a true merit, and does not deserve censure as narrow or low-minded. All great institutions must grow up out of a felt utility. When they have attained a vigorous material life, offshoots of beauty and grandeur will grow out of them. In architecture we know that mere utility originated certain forms of structure which at first had no other recommendation; but with the progress of time genius discerned how these forms might be modified into specific beauty. There is universally a natural tendency of Art, however mean at first, to develop itself into Science, whenever the mind is free and vigorous. A purely practical study, as that of surgery, or surveying, or agriculture, presently associates itself with abstract and elevating theory. Let us then begin to build on a stout foundation, and not be ashamed of the rudeness of our material. If the underworks are strong and massive, they will in due time be crowned by a noble or elegant superstructure. Let a University rise which three millions of persons regard as *useful*; let it be unfettered in its future growth, and there is no fear but in half a generation the greatest despisers of mere utilitarianism will confess that it has become *beautiful, grand, and ennobling*. Therefore, even if we had no lofty science, moral and political, to boast of, we should be right in preferring knowledge and truth when presented to us only in homely and practical shape. But the fact is that modern science, in grandeur as well as utility, vastly surpasses all

ancient knowledge; that our grasp of thought and delicacy of high criticism is equally superior; and that certain modern languages are now, as media of knowledge, *indispensable* to those who would be perfect masters of any one subject. And this is precisely the matter which the robust intellect of our self-raised wealthy classes—the most munificent patrons of knowledge—distinctly discerns.

‘How can a man (ask they) become first-rate in chemistry or medicine if he does not understand German and French intimately? Will he turn to Greek books to learn physical geography, or botany, or mining? What of combined mechanism, or the strength of materials,—what of engineering and high mathematics,—what about land-surveying, or even about the organizing of national institutions; does he expect to learn anywhere but in *modern* languages?’ The practical men of our day are aware that no accomplishment of profound scholarship can supersede the knowledge of our European tongues; also that the time necessarily occupied by any real mastery of the ancients is too formidable a price to pay when imposed on the students of a University promiscuously. It therefore appears undeniable that, instead of Latin and Greek, French and German are now the two languages that ought to be made the basis of *general* cultivation; while Latin and Greek, like Hebrew, or Arabic, or Sanskrit, ought to be left to a *special* class of students. Not but that, for a long time yet, most persons who aspire to education will desire a moderate acquaintance with Latin at least.

Efforts are at this moment being made, with excellent intention, to establish over the country as many points as possible connected with Cambridge by local examinations. It is, indeed, proposed to erect at Bristol a considerable College in

connection with Oxford. The existing academicians of course can only impart the knowledge in which they themselves excel. It may be that they will stimulate minds previously torpid, and will not impose any permanent fetters. Let us hope so. But instead of forcing private schools into relation with the *older* system, by making it hard for a school to live unless it can advertise that its pupils have 'taken honours,'—a method which entails an undue devotion of masters' time to those pupils who least need it, and hurtfully diverts their energies from those who most need their care—those who rather wish the local schools to begin all teaching of languages, from French and German, under the instruction of natives. Languages learnt in the natural way, as we imbibe our mother tongue, take no force out of a child's brain, which is simply receptive in the matter; but when taught by grammar and dictionary they require much effort, and largely diminish the power of learning other things. If from the average age of seven children began to learn French by being talked to, they would in three years be so advanced that at ten (on an average) they might similarly learn German. In no other way is a true pronunciation generally acquired. Then at fourteen, *half*, or a *third* part of a school might commence Latin; and by approximating the mode of teaching as nearly as may be to that by which a modern language is learned—i.e. by teaching the *language*, not the *literature*, and introducing a maximum of the material with a minimum of the peculiarities and difficulties—very rapid progress would be made even by pupils not clever; for language is our commonest attainment. From such schools pupils would come prepared for a truly modern University; namely, talking French and German familiarly, not unversed in Latin, and

having simultaneously acquired in other matters far more than is now possible where scholastic grammar and dictionary exhaust a child's faculties.

Geography is the branch of knowledge which peculiarly elevates us above the ancients. It ought to be taught to all in our primary schools, not pedantically by iuculcating the names of obscure places, but so as to conduce to accurate ideas concerning one's own country and grand general outlines of the continents, mountains, and rivers of the world. Thus a basis would be laid for the higher study of Physical Geography, and every newspaper would become doubly instructive. When schools are duly improved, colleges and universities will receive from them better material, and will be able to enforce a strict *preliminary* examination, rejecting all who are unduly prepared in German, French, Geography, and Arithmetic. (It is not now to the purpose to press any details of a University Entrance-Examination.) Arithmetic in the school will be immensely facilitated (here, as already in other countries) whenever we adopt, not decimal *coinage* but mere decimal *currency*. For this, it is only needful to have twenty-five pence in a florin; that is, a thousand farthings in the pound. As the late Professor De Morgan insisted, the Privy Council has only to do again what it did about sixty years ago. It *then* put forth an edict that every Irish halfpenny should pass as of equal value to an English halfpenny; whereas before there were thirteen Irish pence to a shilling. *Now*, we want an edict that twelvepence halfpenny shall go to a shilling. Very few would grumble at it; and thenceforward all would be able to keep accounts in pounds, florins, and farthings—a decimal system. This reform would not hinder, but would facilitate, an after and greater change,

such as is now wrongfully adduced as a reason for postponing this earlier and easier step. There is another aid to primary instruction much needed: namely, in all the early school books to print *accents* on doubtful vowels; as by writing *ängel*, *chämber*, *sön*, *fäther*, *öld*, *machine*. The French, Greeks, Poles, regard accents as essential. They are not all that English as an imperial language needs; yet a very moderate addition would be a very great help to pronunciation. Without a considerable change of principle in our schools any new University curriculum will not have fair play.

But if we could count that French and German were well taught at schools within the ages above indicated, and Latin commenced *after* them at the age of about fourteen, the progress made in Latin by boys already acquainted with two foreign languages would be vastly quicker than now. Those who remained at school till seventeen or eighteen might acquire in many other subjects valuable knowledge now not thought of, preparatory to various sciences. All should learn the *Laws of Heat*, the *Laws of Health*, the *Laws of the Market*, the *Nature of Currency*, the *Grounds of Property*, and not least, the *Grounds of Morals*, with manifold practical illustrations. Indeed, Mr. William Ellis's course of teaching Political Economy to schools practically shows that the basis of morals and of property is virtually one and the same. The *Laws of the Seasons* would introduce the union of Astronomy with Geography, and familiarize the mind with the ideas of Spherical Geometry. Boys thus trained would have minds open on many sides. If a systematic reading of the noblest poetry, under the guidance of a judicious elocution master, were added, and voices were trained in class to sing from musical notes, no lack of taste for our poets need be feared, and provincial utter-

ances might be extirpated. There can hardly be too much variety in the rudiments taught at school to all before the age of sixteen. Afterwards more concentration on special subjects might be allowed, and in the University still more. This would not at all contract the mind, when the pupil remained in daily contact with those who were interested in other studies. Moreover, when we observe the zeal kindled for transcendental investigations, such as those opened by the recent *spectroscope*, in the midst of the industrial inquiries of chemistry, it does not seem reasonable to fear that any noble studies will be neglected, where men devote their lives side by side to numerous branches of knowledge.

It may seem to many more probable that Oxford and Cambridge will succeed in adapting themselves to the needs of the present age than that any new University will arise on a really grand scale; and in favour of this view appeal may be made, not only to the energy of University reformers, but to the deplorable confessions made concerning the miserably low success of these institutions in extorting the elements of Latin grammar from their unwilling students. No one can foresee what will be the course of events. But both Oxford and Cambridge are weak from the absence of the practical schools in which Science becomes Art. Oxford, indeed, has an Observatory; but it is lamented that the fact has had no perceptible effect on the studies of the place. Mathematics at Cambridge have too often run wild, from want of the severe check applied by the question, 'To what use is this development of the study?' Not that we can always foresee the uses of inventions; but that when problems deeply interesting to human life remain unsolved, they have a prior claim on our attention. A great University, if it had arisen in

London, would have been in close connection with the Observatory at Greenwich, with military mechanism at Woolwich, with Botany in the parks—also at Chiswick and Kew—with ship-building on the river, with medicine in all the hospitals, with every species of manufacture on the Surrey side; while in respect to modern languages and geography it would be the most central point in England. Manchester also would have great advantages over Oxford and Cambridge by proximity to great workshops and preparations of material. Not that a University ought to teach any *art* in its detail, or anything strictly professional, except by means of special faculties incorporated with it. But co-operation and companionship with such practical developments stimulates and sometimes guides the scientific teacher, and immensely conduces to the zeal of students. The popular and practical results on Art rising out of noble Science are transfused among young academicians, and pass from mind to mind in daily intercourse, giving life and meaning to many an abstract doctrine, which else might remain as a formula of words.

But some one will reply, and perhaps truly, *It is too late*. Parliamentary electors no longer choose, nor will they choose, University men, however nobly the Universities educate them for every accomplishment of a statesman, but will choose local rich men, whom they

know as liberal neighbours. This was easy to foresee in any wide extension of the franchise; we are virtually sold into the hands of rich men, from whom no one can expect any high intelligence as to imperial questions. What will come to Parliament if the peasants be enfranchised (and their right to some representation is undeniable) it would be bold to prophesy. The present writer has long maintained that the Parliamentary reform needed was far different and far deeper, viz. Provincial Legislatures with household suffrage, and a Parliament over them consisting of ambassadors sent by the separate legislatures. It would have been far better to do this *before* the cry for an Irish Parliament was renewed; of course, Irish agitators would now call it an evasion. We must suffer, now as always, for past errors; but unless English 'Reform' learn to move out of the old groove, we shall suffer much more, and perhaps very acutely. It is certainly now more than probable that no national University can receive its fit development and noblest state, except in conjunction with a very fundamental change in our legislative organs, which shall liberate Parliament from the Cabinet, immensely lessen its work, assign to it only central duties, popularize aristocracy, and bring the holders of local privilege into local elective posts of administration and legislation.

F. W. NEWMAN.

