

learned. All men look to our educational institutions, our public schools, our high schools, our colleges and universities, as the fountains from which issue streams of learning, and the thirst of those who seek earnestly for truth, cannot be slacked in shallow water. For those reasons, then, teaching *does* require a learned general education on the part of those who follow it.

We now come to the 4th inquiry. Is the nature of teaching such as to make special preparation necessary in order to success?

If a business requires no special preparation to fit those who engage in it, for properly discharging its duties, it is any or everyone's business, and cannot be called a distinct profession. If even all good scholars, or persons who have been well-taught, could teach, teaching would not be called a "profession," because, in that case, it would be a mere incident of good scholarship. Lawyers, doctors, and ministers, *should* obtain a general academical or collegiate education, and afterwards study their profession; and this special preparation, I am prepared to maintain, teaching also requires.

We, know, indeed, that certain enemies of the establishment of schools for the training of teachers, and consequently enemies of the profession, have asserted that there can be no special instruction to teachers, apart from the branches taught; and that anyone who is well taught according to a good method, will be a good teacher, if he can be induced to become one. Hence, it would follow that all colleges and universities, which have thorough, well-directed systems of teaching, must train good teachers, though they do not profess to make lawyers, doctors, or ministers. But we know that this is not so, for thousands of good scholars fail as teachers. I deny, most emphatically, the truth of this doctrine. It is a gross fallacy, and a libel upon the teachers' profession. I admit that there are those who have a

natural aptness to teach, as those who have a natural capacity for other kinds of business—and that such persons, after having received a good education, can teach well, but such exceptions do not invalidate the rule that special preparation is generally necessary, and always beneficial, any more than they would render unnecessary medical colleges, or military academies, because some men who had been trained in such institutions, have exhibited great skill in performing surgical operations, or in marshalling an army on the day of battle.

I admit, likewise, and have previously shown, that a teacher should possess a learned general education—the more thorough the mode in which he is taught, the better for him, and for those whom he instructs; but I maintain that, superadded to this, he should receive special preparation for the discharge of his duties, and that if teaching does not require this preparation, it has little claim to the rank of a profession.

Among the reasons which might be given why teaching should receive special preparation, is, that in general education, comparatively little attention is devoted to the study of the philosophy of the human mind, especially with reference to its capabilities, its relations to the means which may be employed to instruct and discipline it, and the natural order in which its faculties develop themselves, or assume a teachable condition.

Another reason why teachers should receive special preparation, is, that otherwise the philosophical method of presenting a subject to the mind of a pupil is apt to be overlooked—that in the eagerness to reach the result, the result only receives attention, and not the gradual development of the subject, or the mutual relations existing between its parts. A traveller whirls along in a car or steamboat, anxious only to reach the end of his journey; so the student, en-