

Let it be noted that this is both its historic function and the function required of it by the conditions of our present civilization.

It may now be asked whether our universities are not fulfilling this duty, even without making a formal study of education?

Was not the University of Edinburgh, for example, in the full performance of its duty prior to the establishment of the chair of education in 1876? This is a pertinent question, and admits of a satisfactory answer. *Tempora mutantur et nos in illis mutamur.* Changed times require a change in institutions. There have been three well marked and progressive phases of opinion, with respect to fitness for teaching. The primitive conception identified teaching ability with general scholarship; a scholar was, by implication, a teacher; a certificate of scholarship was a license to teach.

A progressive phase of thought was that a scholar needed some special training in his art in order to become fitted for teaching. It must have been observed that good scholars were not always good teachers, and, in many cases, the failure must have been traced to an ignorance of the best methods of doing the work of the school. But, beyond this, there was the fact that teaching had become a special calling, and it was a natural assumption that a trade should be learned before it is practised. The trade of a blacksmith requires strength, but not every strong man is a blacksmith; this strength must be trained into special modes of expending itself. So, technical skill must be added to mere scholarship, in order to fit a man for teaching. Now, the Normal school embodies this second phase of opinion, its purpose being to give a thorough scholastic training, in close connection with instruction in methods of teaching.

The third and final phase of opinion, that which is now emerging, adds a third element to form the preparation of the complete teacher. To knowledge was added skill, and now to skill is added science. The first demand was, What shall I teach? The second, What shall I teach, and How shall I teach it? The third, What shall I teach, How shall I teach, and Why shall I so teach? In other words, the art of teaching has followed the same law that has regulated all the liberal arts; it has passed, or rather is tending to pass, from the empirical into the rational.

The ancient university represented the primitive phase of opinion—that teaching ability was identical with scholarship; and so its masters and doctors were licensed teachers. Since that ancient date, however, the conception of a complete fitness for teaching has been profoundly modified; so that the modern university no longer fulfils its duty to the teaching profession, if it affords its students only the advantages that were offered by the ancient university. In other words, with respect to one of the most widely practised of human arts, the thought of the world has been profoundly modified, and the universities should adjust themselves to the new order of things.

Up to the time of Socrates, the current of human thought had been directed outward in efforts to comprehend the external and the sensible. With Socrates began the reflective movement in human thought. The eye of the soul was turned back upon itself in the effort to comprehend the immaterial and the invisible. Hitherto, thought had been expended on objects lying in the world without. Now, thought took cognizance of itself; thought was employed in the effort to comprehend thought. This arousing of the mind to an examination of its own processes formed an era in the