

by these subsidiary sciences, we are able to investigate the teacher's functions (Courses I., II., III., VII., VIII., XII., XIII., XIV.). In making this investigation we are confronted with one aspect of the teacher's work which enhances our difficulty both in the study of theory and in our daily business—we have to care not only for the isolated individual child, but for the community of children in a school. Theories and methods planned to suit the single pupil may prove useless when applied to the needs of a corporate society. You will find that writers on education have oft ignored these conditions—Locke, Rousseau, and even Herbart may here lead us into error. On the other hand our English tradition, of which Arnold is the chief exponent, allows great weight, perhaps to exaggeration, to the corporate influence of youthful society upon the individual.

A fully elaborated exposition of education would probably treat separately of these two aspects, dealing first of all with the unit, and then with the mass as organized in schools. For practical purposes I think it sufficient to devote one course (No. VII.) entirely to problems of organization, and in the other courses to deal with both the single child and the school as occasion arises. You will observe that in discussions on *Physiology and School Hygiene* (Course IV.) and on *Elocution* (Course XI.) this same dual treatment is rendered necessary. We cannot sacrifice the interests of the community to those of the individual, nor (in secondary schools at any rate) are we willing to consult the interests of numbers while neglecting the single child.

This study of the practice of education is confronted with another difficulty to which I must briefly refer. We cannot advance very far upon the road apart from actual dealing

with children. Lecture and discussion about teaching and training in the absence of our subject-matter, the child, is, no doubt, to some extent necessary; but it is obviously incomplete, and sometimes, I fear, this procedure leads to error. I trust, therefore, that my own professed desire to correlate such lecture work with practical school experience may protect me from going very far astray in theory, and, so far as effective demonstration can be employed by a lecturer who has not actual charge of a class, we do make the attempt in all our studies to base theory upon actual experience, which can be observed and verified by the students.

Let us now revert to the first section of inquiry, to the momentous question which, as I take it, stands on the threshold of education: What is our aim? In what terms can we describe the business of the teacher? In the definition we have expressly evaded this inquiry, contenting ourselves with vaguely indicating "the welfare" of the young as the purpose of education. We have done so in order to secure separate and adequate treatment for this issue.

There are two schools of thought which appear to come into sharp conflict. On the one hand we have writers like Alexander Bain, who would limit our responsibility to the intellect of the child. The school-master, they say, has no concern with ethical ideals; the pupil is sent to him for a certain definite purpose—to secure the development of mental faculty by means of lessons. Anything outside of this range is incidental and should be ignored. On the other hand you have the great masters of our craft, from Socrates and Plato down to Arnold and Herbart, urging with the utmost emphasis the opposite doctrine. They urge us to seek the end of education by enlarging our sympathy, by reaching out