

Contributions are always acceptable, but at present they are so rare that when they do come they usually create a sensation in the sanctum.

THE establishment of a chair of Education in Acadia, though so vigorously opposed at the outset, is being regarded, at the present time, with more general favor. The light of actual experience, and the logic of facts, as well as a calmer survey of the whole question, has gone far to modify many of the views advanced during the heat of the discussion. The wisdom of the departure is becoming more and more apparent, according as the range and importance of the subjects connected with the chair are being better understood. Many opposed the question in its inception under the mistaken idea that the new professorship would be a mere sinecure, that Didactics was a branch of study entirely too narrow to justify the establishment of a separate chair. According to this view the science and art of teaching, and that alone, would engage the attention of the new professor. No allowance was made for subjects kindred and fundamental to it. An examination of the curricula of colleges where similar chairs have been founded, shows that a chair of Didactics involves the study of a variety of other important subjects. There can be no intelligent and comprehensive study of education apart from a knowledge of Mental Philosophy, Physiology and Psychology. The chair has enabled the Faculty to place these subjects where they properly belong in charge of a professor of the theory and practice of education. In his hands they will be invested with much additional interest. They will be studied, not only on account of the importance of the branches themselves, but because they are preparatory and essential to a proper understanding of the Philosophy of Education which comes during the closing year of the course.

It has been claimed, with some plausibility, that the college has trenched upon the rights of the Normal School in placing education on its

curriculum as a branch of University study. Here there may have been confusion of thought arising out of an equivocation of terms. Perhaps there was hardly sufficient discrimination between teaching as an art, and teaching as a science. It is claimed that the distinctive function of the one is to train pupil teachers in recognized methods, while the other seeks to give education a higher recognition by making it a subject of philosophic inquiry. In the one the work is utilitarian and mechanical; in the other it is historical and scientific. The tendency of the one is to form the schoolmaster, the other the teacher, the educator. Says the Ann Arbor Index: "The mere schoolmaster or drillmaster is good in his place, and even indispensable, but the great educational need of the age is the teacher who is at the same time a scholar, a thinker, a man of ideas, one whose intellectual horizon is wide enough to allow him to discuss educational problems with true catholicity of spirit, and with a good measure of philosophic insight. The creation of this professional spirit and the education of teachers after the requirements of this high ideal are functions of the university. They are beyond the resources of schools of a lower type."

DESULTORY study is one thing, systematic study is another, and a somewhat different thing. Every student feels himself under obligation to devote at least a portion of his time to preparation for the class-room. Even the confirmed shirk endeavors to vary the monotony of his life by a little mental effort. Few students become so indifferent to the opinions of others that they will not attempt to borrow, beg or steal sufficient information to make a respectable appearance. One student will perhaps squander his time in questionable pursuits, and leave the regular assignments for the recitation-room to the mercies of a moment, or trust to some happy accident to supply the deficiency; another will procrastinate the hour for study till time and inclination are both gone, and then enter the class-