

form, chiefly in sculpture and painting, to which may be added architecture, music, and *belles lettres*. I do not claim that teaching literally fulfils these requirements, since its results are not directly perceptible to the senses;—but I do claim that in true teaching the activity is essentially of the same elevated order, and that the results are the grander because they are not material and perishable as are the highest works of art.

More than a century ago a great contest was waged in Europe with a view to the entire re-organization of the teachers's functions. Before that time a system founded on repression and severity had prevailed. The attempt was rather to subdue what was evil, to discourage and regulate disorderly tendencies, and to communicate what was authoritative, than truly to educate. It was the result of the rigidity of Jesuitism blended with the false humility of Pietism. As a specimen of the style of teaching at one time prevalent in Europe, I quote the following from Jean Paul (*Levana*, p. 395:—

“Among all schoolmasters I say it is a rare and difficult thing to find a John Jacob Hauberle. Which of us can boast, like H., of having administered during his schoolmastership of fifty-one years and seven months 911,527 strokes of the cane and 124,000 of the rod; also 20,989 blows with the ruler; not only 10,135 boxes on the ear, but also 7,905 tugs at the same member; and a sum total of 1,115,800 blows with the knuckles on the head? And did he not threaten the rod to 1,707 children who did not receive it, and make 777 kneel upon round peas, and 631 upon a sharp edged piece of wood, to which are to be added a corps of 5,001 riders on the wooden horse. For if any one had done this, why did he not keep an account of his blows like Häuberle, from whom alone we have to learn this interesting intelligence, as from a flogging diary or martyrologium, or imperial School Flogging Journal? But I fear most teachers only deserve the contemptuous surname of Cæsarius, who was called the mild because he suffered no one to receive more than six-and-thirty-lashes?”

In these hands teaching was an artifice rather than an art. But it had the great advantage of a distinct, clearly defined purpose. A result was sought. Original corruption was to be crushed, original darkness was to be enlightened. It was teaching at a mark, however, insufficient and misplaced that mark might be—and it was in opposition to this one-sided and disheartening method that one of the most distinguished and most orthodox of German theologians of the eighteenth century, John A. Bengel, declared that, “It is not necessary that we should trouble ourselves about many maxims of education; for the simplest method is the best. We must avoid all artifice, as education is not an art. . . . The well-digger only removes obstructions, and the water will run of itself.” (*Hagenbach*, 18th and 19th Centuries, Vol. 1, p. 287.)

Here the function of the teacher is reduced almost to zero. Soon after, the world went into raptures over Rousseau's *Emile*, and came to contemplate the individual man as needing rather to be untaught the artificialities of civilization and to be helped back towards primitive simplicity; when Rousseau's authority “had fixed as an almost unlimited axiom in French and German pedagogics that man is by nature good; all of which was not so absurd and surprising if we remember the repressive monastic extremes against which it was a reaction. That man is not by nature good, Rousseau, in his own confessions, abundantly testifies. But there is no doubt that his views of education were the occasion of great and salutary reform, resembling in this respect the essays of David Hume, published about the

same time, in the domain of speculative philosophy. It was Pestalozzi who seized the valuable and practical elements in Rousseau, and made them effective and controlling forces in the whole subsequent history of education. It was he who recalled education to its real work as implied in the word itself, who bade educators see in the constitution of the mind a key to the nature of their work, who recognized and honoured a self-active reality in the pupil, and who in place of despotism and cruelty on the one hand, and of artificial inventions, prizes, &c., on the other, proclaimed the consciousness of increased intellectual vigour and affectionate regard for the teacher the best stimulants to exertion. “From his time,” says Rosenkranz, “dates popular education, the effort for the intellectual and moral elevation of the hitherto neglected atomistic human being of the non-property-holding multitude. There shall in future be no dirty, hungry, ignorant, awkward and thankless, will-less mass, devoted alone to an animal, existence. The possibility of culture and independent self-support shall be open to every one, because he is a human being and a citizen of the commonwealth.”

Here, then, the true function of the teacher emerges. No longer a mere artisan restraining and compelling a deformed and essentially rebellious nature, he is neither, on the other hand, a mere mechanical liberator of that which is to shape and develop itself; he is the true educator, awakening, stimulating, enlightening a free personality; measuring and judging, of his own activity by the reaction of his pupil's mind, working with the highest aims upon the noblest material, discerning and developing with patient and skilful strokes and with sustained enthusiasm the angel or the Hercules in the block; but the block in this case is incomparably more precious and more susceptible than marbles of Paros and Carrara, more varied and exquisite than the rarest gem that ever came under the cameo cutter's blade, a material of divine and immortal quality made in the image of God.

Nor has this view of the dignity and true nature of the teacher's calling ever ceased to influence educators. “Pedagogics,” says Rosenkranz, “as a science busies itself with developing, *à priori*, the idea of education in the universality and necessity of that idea, but as an art it is the concrete individualizing of this abstract idea in any given case. It is exactly in doing this that the educator may show himself inventive and creative, and that pedagogic talent can distinguish itself. The word ‘art’ is here used in the same way as it is used when we say the art of war, the art of government, &c., and rightly, for we are talking about the possibility of the realization of the idea.” (*Pedagogic*, p. 7.)

It is evident, then if the teacher is to be an artist, that he must first of all have a distant and exalted aim. He must know what he intends to do; he must have a science of teaching. Shall it be the monkish repression of the Middle Ages, or the easy indulgence of the reaction under the influence of Rousseau, or the firm but elastic guidance of an intelligent entity such as was proclaimed by Pestalozzi, called a “schoolmaster of the human race”? Shall teaching be education? Shall it be adherence to a mechanical routine, a dry drill, making each day the counterpart of its predecessor? Shall it be a mere text-book memorizing, an indiscriminating cramming method? Or, in avoidance of this extreme of rigidity, how shall it escape the opposite of an easy familiarity, a superficial, unimpressive, merely entertaining conversation between teacher and pupil, as if upon a level of dignity and attainments with each other?