the case in the past, feel obliged to limit themselves to two years; the more fortunate may stay three, a few may be restricted to one. How, then, can these two years be used to the best advantage? It is my opinion — subject to correction by those older and wiser — that in many branches of learning, the best American universities offer today as good opportunities as do the universities of Europe. Of course it goes without question that one cannot get so thorough a knowledge of the language and literature of France and Germany, of Spain and Italy, here as there. So, too, it is doubtless true that the history and political institutions of the leading European countries are studied more satisfactorily in those countries themselves than in the United States. The same principle may apply to one or two other branches; yet in the main we can make a very creditable comparative showing. To my mind, therefore, it is advisable not to go abroad immediately upon graduation, but to spend one or two years on this side of the Atlantic in the further study of one's specialty, and then, with the foundations well laid, to take the two years in Europe with two objects in view: first, to add as much as may be to one's positive knowledge of one's field of investigation; secondly, and more particularly, to profit to the full from the broadening and the inspiration, the quickening and the incentive, which come from working with a master-mind, under new conditions and with unacknowledged methods. A careful study of men and of means is no small part of such an education. In my own experience a seminar course with Mommsen, the last of the giants in history until a new race shall have sprung up, was capable of demonstrating that history can be made as exact and scientific (and, parenthetically, as dry) as mathematics, for example.

Granting that broadening and inspiration should be at least one of the objects in view, is the best result to be attained by studying in Germany alone? If one year only is available, then by all means spend that one year in Germany, and preferably at two Universities; but if it is the more usual two years, the second year may, in my opinion, — and this brings me to my second point, — in four cases out of five be more profitably spent in France, in other words at Paris. We naturally expect American students of architecture and painting to go to Paris; but we scarcely realize the advances France has made in higher education during the last thirty years, and hence the drift which set in towards Germany continues to run in that direction practically unchanged. The late Max Müller was charged by his German friends with being no scholar, because he wrote books that were interesting. Now without attempting to settle the status of Max Müller, we can all agree that not a few German scholars write frightfully stupid books. Are we not sometimes a bit inclined to confound dullness with scholarship, obscurity with philosophy? I am willing to go as far as any one in conceding that the Germans lead the world in patience and thoroughness of investigation, but in lucidity of statement they frequently lag behind. And just because the freshman is clear to transparency, we are for that reason often too prone to charge him with superficiality. I cannot speak for pure or applied science, but in the fields with which I am best acquainted, just as substantial work is being done in France as in Germany; to what extent, if at all, this is true of science, others must answer. In many respects the Germans and the French admirably supplement each other. The unprejudiced American, by coming in contact with the leading scholars of both countries, is in a peculiarly fortunate position to profit from the best features of each and to avoid the weak. By combining German thoroughness with French clearness and orderly