

dogmatists of a school, who see no beauty and no truth outside of the tenets of their own little coterie. Unfortunately, dogmatic rules have been, and still are, laid down by ignorance, impudence and greed, without any other foundation than self-interest and self-conceit.

I think Descartes, the great founder of the Cartesian philosophy, the author of the memorable axiom, *cogito, ergo sum*, showed his sound sense and true philosophical acumen by first doubting all that had before borne the name of knowledge, and so reasoning *a posteriori*, arriving at the fundamental idea of existence, which seemed to him to be the *one incontrovertible truth*. This very, and, in a sense, only certitude, I take it, proclaims the inherent right of the individual, under certain conditions, to differ, to destroy, to amend, to verify, to create. So thought Origen, the great father of Biblical criticism, the Adamantinos of the early Church. "We are not," he says, "to pin our faith on that which is held by the multitude, and which therefore alone seems to stand on high authority, but on that which results through examinations and logical conclusions from established and admitted truths." Thus only can intellect become progressive, by first striking down the bars of bigotry, to issue from the mew, white-winged, into the great realms of new conceptions and infinite possibilities. If reason be the God-gift, the rudder by which to steer each little bark of life to its desired haven, it cannot prove untrue. 'Tis because the masses do not reason that they go wrong. They are shipwrecked by incompetent pilots. When their own hands should be upon the helm to breast the breakers, they give up the ship to the sophist and the bigot to be whelmed in the swirling waters of unmerited persecution, black despair and infamous death.

Let us examine, by the light of reason and experience, the methods advocated by Kant, to see what of good and what of ill is contained in their individual teachings.

First, the acroamatic method, where the professor simply teaches. This method Kant evidently rejects, as not the most suitable to universal tuition, and why? Not, I suppose, because it is in itself absolutely false or wrong, but because it may be made so by injudicious use. This leads to the question, Is there a use in the method? A very palpable one, I deem. It is the conservator of work in limited time. The lecturer can confine himself strictly to his subject-matter, and illustrate those points alone which demand prominence. He is absolute master of the situation. Therefore is this method especially suited to the class-room of the college, where the intellects are principally adult, where the attention has been trained, and where the note-book is a feature of the institution. But lecture has its uses in far less pretentious halls of learning. What is lecturing but story-telling, and who would not listen to a story well told? If the lecturer be competent, himself awake, himself a believer in the cause he advocates, he shall surely drop some pearl of wisdom that may be gathered and worn by the humblest in his audience. There is too little of story and too much of $x+y$ in intellectual life today, both in the school and out. Ideality with chivalry is dying, and King Addition is tyrannizing in high places and low alike.

Our picture, however, has its reverse. Story-telling may degenerate into 'prosiness or mere matter of amusement. The more elaborate lecture may tend to over-diffuseness, discursiveness, anecdote without definite aim; or, on the other hand, obscurity, through lack of intelligence on the part of the listener. Vigil-