

relationships, though these are sometimes shadowed here by passing clouds of ignorance. In this love is the secret of that vitality which is subject to no such influences as affect the flesh-made body. It ripens, grows to full stature and operation in the loving of God—*i.e.*, in such apprehension of His power who ordereth all things in heaven and earth as makes us look for ultimate satisfaction in nothing which we can touch, taste, or handle. This perfect love quickens us here. It carries us over the borders of mortality, casting out the fear of death or of that which is felt in drinking some mysterious cup of sorrow. There can be no greater love than such acceptance of divine law as we adore with supreme devotion in Him whose last words in doing the will of God were, "Father, into Thy hands I commend my spirit."

—*Good Words*, Sept., 1898.

THE GENESIS OF GEOMETRY IN THE RACE, AND THE EDUCATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

BY BENCHARA BRANFORD.

MANY years have passed since Herbert Spencer, in his work on "Education," made vigorous application of the doctrine—previously formulated by Condillac, Comte, and possibly others; foreshadowed dimly, too, by Plato—that "the education of the child must accord, both in mode and arrangement, with the education of mankind, considered historically. In other words the genesis of knowledge in the individual must follow the same course as the genesis of knowledge in the race." As regards the *form* in which this doctrine is stated, no great acumen is needed to see that, in the use of the word "must," there appears to be a confusion between the possibility or advisability of the parallelism and its necessity: the doctrine, as thus enunciated, clearly cannot rank as a principle; its *role* is rather suggestive. How far the education of the child necessarily follows that of the race, and to what degree, assuming a tendency to the parallelism, it is advisable to modify or even to counteract such a tendency, these are questions suggested, but not answered, by the formula. So far as I am aware, few serious attempts have been made to indicate, with any precision, the germs of truth concealed in the doctrine when liberally interpreted. Turning for guidance to biological science, we find a precisely similar doctrine applied to the physiological aspect of man; but here we are carefully cautioned to interpret the theory very widely. Thus we are told that an organism may take "short-cuts" in its development along ancestral lines; the suggestiveness of this to educational science is obvious. Fenced in with provisos of this kind, the theory appears to be firmly established from a biological standpoint. But the moment we take it from its real birthplace—biology—and inquire as to its application to the *mental* evolution of the child and of the race, we are at once confronted by our extreme ignorance of facts by which to test its validity. What do we know of the human embryo, of ancestral life, *qua* mental? There appear but the merest shreds of knowledge concerning either party between which a parallelism is to be established. Nor does our ignorance stop even here. What scientific knowledge have we of the mental development even of the infant, and to