

tion possible, and to report at our meeting next year. We would then be in a position to intelligently discuss the subjects, and our findings would be valuable contributions towards the professional training of teachers. If we can prosecute inquiries such as those to which I have referred with zeal, wisdom and intelligence, we will do not a little to confer substantial benefits on all engaged upon one of the most vital of educational questions—the best method of training teachers.

Among the questions referred to a committee might be the following:

1. Should training schools confine themselves to strictly professional work?

Of course all are agreed that the central work of a training school is the discussion of the theory of education, educational values, methods of teaching, comparison of educational systems, and kindred topics, that tend to put the teacher in possession of the philosophy of education, and to give him technical skill in the art of teaching; in other words, to make him thoroughly conversant with professional work. But what is included in professional work? All admit that we must include Psychology. But why exclude Logic? Both are really culture studies, and both are indispensable to a science of education. Logic, especially, as the science which investigates the laws by which knowledge is acquired and communicated, has a special bearing upon the work of teaching. And where shall we place Arithmetic, Grammar and Geography? Shall we include them under professional work? Dr. Harris, the highest educational authority in the United States, says, "that it is evident no matter how well qualified students are for admission to a Normal School, the really professional work is involved in the review of the common or lower branches in the light of the higher. Even the study of Psychology, as such, is not so much of a professional study as is the applied Psychology, formed by reviewing the lower studies in the light of the higher ones. I would call this latter work educational psychology, and the former pure psychology." Another eminent authority says, "that no amount of theory about teaching the various branches can equal a thorough review and study of them in their relation to the teacher and the children to be taught." And, as you know, the German school-men consider academic instruction a necessary branch of Normal School work, and not something which, under changed circumstances, might be dispensed with. By this they do not mean that academic instruction in a training school, should not differ essentially from academic instruction in a High School. They consider that in teaching a subject in a training school attention should be given to its rise and development as a factor in education; that an historical view of the subject should be given in regard to methods, as the best safeguard against a slavish copying of educational devices; that the educational value of the subject receive attention; and that the subject should be considered in its co-ordinate relation to other subjects.

2. The educational value of the subjects of study in public schools:

(4)
(1)
(6)
3.
practi
is the
4.
teache
What
5.
making
6.
teacher
coming
and (4)
The
take up
would t
every m
at the r
therefor
Ano
some sec
more co
subjects
sent sev
taught i
in the fi
sciences,
For insta
How mu
five years
subject of
parents, b
tions may
says: "T
thus find
all our inc
men begin
to be finis
grown as a
existence,
corners, w
little else
usual answ
for Public
studies alre