

manners and habits, sharpen each other more effectually, since one does not surpass the other in depth of invention."

Further comparisons might be made, and quotations might be multiplied, but the point is perhaps sufficiently clear. The history of education first of all presents to the kindergartner a new field of literature on her own subject. It brings home the fact that most of the supposedly distinctive ideas of Froebel are not new. They are phrased differently by different writers; they reveal different ideals of the education of children; but they existed centuries ago. For the enlargement of her own view, she should know of these writings, in addition to those of Froebel.

Again, the study is of value in giving the whole kindergarten movement its proper setting in history; its relation to other great educational institutions. Schools are of very ancient origin. We know that they existed in Greece at least twenty-five hundred years ago; and there is evidence that they were established in one form or another under the most ancient civilizations. Our primary schools, our grammar schools, and our universities are the result of centuries of growth. The kindergarten is barely seventy-five years old,—the merest infant in comparison. Knowledge of these facts gives one a better sense of proportion, and a better historical perspective. To be sure, the kindergarten must always demand the greater part of the kindergartner's attention; but if she studies the history of education aright, it can never fill the entire circle of her thought. And she will be less likely, perhaps, to fall into the too common error of making

extravagant assertions concerning the value of this one of the many educational institutions.

Third, she will learn that Froebel's theory of education is only one of many. One may mention Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Comenius, Rousseau and Pestalozzi; but the list is too long to complete. Knowledge of the theories of these men enables one to give a juster and more critical estimate of the doctrines of Froebel himself. One way to escape undue servitude to the thought of one theorizer is to seek other points of view. And I think that such action is peculiarly needful in the case of Froebel. His writings have so definitely the stamp of genius, the "note of fire" runs through them so surely, that, without this precaution, one is likely to be carried away into excessive, exuberant, and uncritical adulation of the man and his achievements. One need not fear that his theory and his philosophy will wholly lose their inspiration in this wider knowledge. Rather, one will find in them new and more abiding significance.

I shall note but one more of the many services which the history of education may render. It gives inspiration and certainty to our own teaching by placing before us the examples of great teachers. No precept or theory can have so much power in spurring one to action as the concrete illustration of the thing actually done. It is easy to say to the young teacher, "Be enthusiastic"; but she will understand far better what enthusiasm is through the lives of Comenius, Pestalozzi, Froebel, and Arnold, and best of all through the example of living teachers. The methods of work, the successes, and quite as