The Educational Weekly.

TORONTO, APRIL 23, 1885.

IN Dr. William Matthews' work, *Hours with Men and Books*, is a chapter entitled "Moral Grahamism." Whatever exception we may take to the style in which it is written, or to the manner in which it is handled, we cannot deny that it treats of an excellent and vital question—the relative advantages and disadvantages of a so-called "practical education." Dr. Matthews strongly inveighs against this "practical education" in the sense in which it is commonly understood. "What," he asks, "is this 'practical' education for which so many persons are clamoring? Are there any two persons among them who can agree as to what it is? If by practical education is meant that minimum of teaching which will just enable a man to house, clothe, and feed himself,—to pay his bills and keep clear of the poor-house, which is summed up in the the three R's, 'Readin', Ritin' and Rithmetic,'—then we deny that such an education subserves, in the highest degree, even its own petty and selfish ends. The wretched economy which tries to shift the so-called practical from the true, the good, and the beautiful, fails to get even the good it covets. But the most popular idea of a practical education is that which regards it as a training for a particular calling or profession. Our colleges are begged to treat Smith's son as an incipient tape-seller, Brown's as an undeveloped broker, Thompson's as an embryo engineer, and Jones' as a budding attorney. Well, we admit to the fullest extent the right of Smith, Brown, Thompson, and Jones, juniors, to qualify themselves for any occupation they choose; but we deny their right to demand of the State, or of our colleges, a special training which shall qualify them for buying calico, building bridges, drawing declarations, or speculating in stocks. Young men demand an education which shall make them good merchants, lawyers, and carpenters; but they need first of all, and more imperiously than all things else, to be educated as *men*." And he goes on to say, "of a piece of timber you may make a mast, a machine, a piano, or a pulpit; but, first of all, it must become *timber*, sound, solid, and well-seasoned."

There is much in this to which all will agree; there is also much from which many must dissent. As in so many discussions on intricate subjects, there is apparent the fault of regarding it from one point of view only; of leaving out of consideration many modifying side issues, and of keeping in sight and strengthening one position without calculating the force of that of an antagonistic one.

It is true that before rough-hewn wood—to use Dr. Matthews' own metaphor—can be made into a mast, a machine, a piano, or a pulpit, it must become timber; but it is equally true that a mast cannot be made from rose-wood, nor a piano from Norway pine, and that the seasoning suited to oak is by no means suited to deal.

The question Dr. Matthews has so energetically discussed is, it seems to us, but a part of that wider question whether the field of education should be the *multum* or the *multa*. True, the first need is "to be educated as *men*," but who shall define what the limits and boundaries of such education shall be? Will it not vary with the character of the individual, and with the course of life he is about to embrace? To a Jacob Grimm the calculi are useless, to an Isaac Newton the laws of consonantal transition; but, and this is the nucleus of the question, before a Jacob Grimm or an Isaac Newton branches out into the higher fields of Algebra or Philology, it is necessary for each to undergo a certain course of mental training which is 'education,' but which is not, and ought not to be, 'practical education.' Dr. Matthews is right in eliminating from this part of our education all that comes under the meaning of the term "practical."

It is not the function of our school and university educators to prepare men for particular trades and professions. Their duties are to develope to the utmost the powers that must afterwards be used in such trades and professions. In particular trades and professions particular powers are brought into play. It is the object of the school and the university to mature all the powers equally. Just as our view of any one science is widened by a knowledge of all kindred sciences, so the exercise of any one set of powers is strengthened by that of all others.

This does not, however, by any means deny the value of true practical education in its proper place and time. It should not enter our schools and colleges, nor should it be allowed to take the place of that early training necessary to all minds. That there is nevertheless a tendency in this direction is apparent. Already there are those who wish to introduce technical instruction long before a sufficient length of time has been spent upon steady and continuous mental training. Technical instruction must sooner or later be entered upon, but, in our opinion, the later the better. There are few who do not deplore the short space of time devoted by them to general education. We know of a learned judge who late in life gave up a portion of time daily to the study of Euclid's Elements—no doubt at his time of life a questionable method of sharpening the mind, yet a fact very significant of the truth we are attempting to enforce.

In these days of hurry and impatience the practical side of education will come all too soon; if we could assure ourselves that the longer it is delayed the greater the maturity and power of the mind, we shall have learned no uninstructive lesson.

ART in schools is at the present time evoking not a small amount of consideration. There is a view of art, upon which we are not aware that any particular stress has as yet been laid, viz., that of educating the senses of young children to recognize what is scientifically correct in form and color by means of their surroundings in the school room.

We do not by any means wish to advocate the elaborate decoration of the school room; this would be contrary to one of the first rules of art. "Where you rest, there decorate," says Mr. Ruskin. If we agree to this we shall be careful not to adorn our school rooms with anything that shall distract the pupils' attention from their studies.

Nevertheless, without going to this extreme, we need not at all go to the other. We need not, that is, be careless as to the general appearance of our school buildings and grounds. The senses in youth can be trained to notice and appreciate the beautiful; and the education of the senses should on no account be altogether ignored. They can, and too often are, accustomed to the sight of much that is far from pleasing; and being thus from earliest childhood always brought into contact with the incorrect and the ugly, they soon lose the ability to perceive what is the reverse of this, and consequently to appreciate the beautiful.

It is astonishing how little care is taken in educating the senses of children. It seems as if we totally left out of consideration the fact that they contain anything but minds—and this regardless of the possibility of many of them possessing high artistic faculties which may some day be developed and prove invaluable.

We have, when space is limited, touched on a large subject. Only one suggestion is here possible, viz., this: Let our school buildings be planned and built by those who are thoroughly versed in artistic rules, who shall see that nothing enters that shall in any way be an obstacle to the right development of the artistic sensibilities of our pupils.