

Is there any reason why at any stage, school or university, the education so far given should be the knowledge qualification for a certificate to teach, any more than to practice law or medicine? We go on the theory, in our training of teachers, that professional education consists in training to teach. No other profession takes this point of view. The truth is that the year of special training should be devoted mainly to deepening and widening actual knowledge. This is the great concern. How little can really be done in theory! What barren mockery is most of such work! I do not minimize the value of traditional experience, but it is a mere illusion to think that its value is high at this stage. Observation of actual teaching, friendly intercourse and discussion with one's teachers, when now the whole point of view is changed, are all that can really be had. The acquisition of fresh knowledge should engage the main energies of the teacher in training. If English grammar ever taught any one to speak correct English, or books on etiquette the graces of life, then lectures on methods may be supposed to make a teacher.

In the professional schools, then, men would be found at times studying the same subjects from different points of view, pedagogical or cultural; they would be earnestly endeavoring to systematize and fill up the gaps in their knowledge, and attaining such wider culture as should bind them together in community of intellectual outlook and educational aims. In the secondary schools we should have more homogeneous classes, fewer subjects and some sort of community of aim and culture in the staff. Heads of residential schools craftily look for athletic sympathies in combination with scholarship. What do you think the results would be for the subjects themselves if the English specialist could, as it were, be administered in strong solution to the teachers of science, mathematics, and manual training? Whether the programme of studies which I have hazarded resembles closely that upon which we should ultimately agree matters far less than that we should realise the need of simplification.

Let me turn back now to Aristotle, who helped me into my subject. He would say, first, that President Hadley's administrative, literary and practical types were but the stock classifi-