

have as yet no professional recognition in this country. The whole number of registered medical men in the United Kingdom amounts to about 20,000. Compare that number with 158,000 teachers who appear in the census returns of 1871. We may well feel a sense of surprise that teachers have not yet compelled a distinct recognition of their profession, in order to secure for themselves the embodied strength due not only to their number, but also to the supreme importance of their art. The fault lies with them, and not with the public. The teachers of this country, so far as relates to secondary and higher schools, are self-constituted men, with self-asserted qualifications, offering to the public no guarantees of efficiency. Yet these independent attestations of qualifications form the lines of demarcation between an empirical art and a learned professional recognition in a more or less satisfactory way. Before long, in England and Wales, 30,000 head teachers will be in this position. They will be in charge of schools numbering 120 scholars, and this size of schools will ultimately require 30,000 certificated assistants. So that to begin with, 60,000 certificated teachers, for this one section of the kingdom, offer a broad basis for a professional superstructure. All of these are not trained men, but the want of training is only a temporary exigency. Already seventy-eight per cent. of male teachers, and sixty-three per cent. of female teachers, are fairly trained for primary schools. Though a building is more easily constructed from the base upwards than from the top downwards, I doubt whether this is true in the construction of a profession. Had certificated qualifications begun among the head masters of our great schools, the demand for attested knowledge would soon have spread among the teachers of the country; for fashion filters downwards more easily than it percolates upwards. Still the teachers of secondary schools cannot long remain an unrecognised and uncertificated class, giving no security to the public that they possess the knowledge which it is their life-work to impart. Even if they did not now move to obtain this recognition in their own interests, the State would soon find itself in the position to demand certificates of efficiency, for the need is apparent. Parliament has assumed the right to reform lower education through the primary schools, and also to revivify education in the secondary endowed schools, as well as the higher education of the universities. Can it stop here, and leave unnoticed the large number of middle-class schools in the kingdom? They are the connecting rods between the various sections of the middle-class and the institutions for higher culture. Unless they work well and smoothly, the whole educational machinery of the nation becomes crank and unproductive. Monsieur Cousin foresaw the obligation for State interference as long ago as 1831, when he said:—"The best plans of instruction cannot be executed except by the instrumentality of good teachers, and the State has done nothing for popular education if it does not watch that those who devote themselves to teaching be well prepared."

Now I may presume that the existence of the Teachers' Association indorses the truth of Cousin's words. We may object to the theory of a paternal government, but in practice we see that all governments are forced into paternal acts. Parliament has ordered that Government shall not only look after the health, but also the food of the people. The education of the people in primary schools, in endowed secondary schools, and in universities is already a subject of paternal care. For all these the Government soon will be forced to demand proofs of competency on the part of teachers. Will independent teachers remain outside a certificated profession, which is obviously arising, and be satisfied with their own self-asserted qualifications? We need not fear that Parliament will interfere with free trade in education. But just that it has enacted that no druggist shall sell drugs unless he has a certified qualification of knowledge, so it may enact that no teacher shall be intrusted with the education of youth unless he has proved not only the possession of, but also the power of imparting, the knowledge which he professes to communicate.

It is scarcely necessary to argue that there is a need for securing better qualifications among the great body of secondary teachers, for official investigation has settled the question. The Schools Enquiry Commission, after enquiring into the state of seven hundred endowed schools in England, thus summarises the state of the schools and teachers:—"Untrained teachers, and bad methods of teaching, uninspected work by workmen without adequate motives, unrevised or ill-revised statutes, and the complete absence of all organisation of schools in relation to one another, could hardly lead to any other result." Could a more favourable verdict, notwithstanding bright and honourable exceptions, be anticipated from an impartial commission of enquiry on private-adventure schools?

Neither need I argue the question whether the vocation of the teacher is fitted to constitute a distinct and recognised profession; for it is already so in all great countries except England. There is

nothing in this country which can except it from the judgment of Fichte—"that only the nation which shall first perform the task of educating up to perfect manhood by actual practice, will perform the task of the perfect state." Certainly our practice of securing qualifications from elementary teachers, and neglecting them in the case of higher schools, does not bring England within Fichte's definition of a perfect state. Both classes of teachers ought, in my opinion, to be enrolled in a single profession, for each stage of teaching requires special technics and trained methods. Education from childhood to manhood aims at an equable and harmonious evolution of the mental powers—an evolution which requires much judgment and a varying experience at the different periods of youth. The common incorporation of all classes is, in fact, necessary to the existence of a learned profession. The humble curate may become an archbishop: the clerk at the attorney's office, if he passed at the bar, may sit on the woolsack as Lord Chancellor; and a village apothecary, if he graduate, may be president of the College of Physicians. This general recognition of all classes of a profession does not prevent a separate organisation of its different sections. We see this in the various colleges for the different branches of medicine and in the different societies of medical men.

If a profession of teaching arise, means must be taken to secure a methodical training of the teacher. Heaven-born teachers appear at rare intervals, but training in method is as much required for the great body of teachers as in any other vocation involving the application of knowledge and experience. I hope that our teaching methods are not so bad as in the time of Milton, when he said that the youth of the country were driven "into hatred and contempt of learning, mocked and deluded all the while with ragged notions of battlements, while they expected worthy and delightful knowledge." But when we consider how little methodical training is obtained by teachers of higher schools, may there not be some truth in Milton's sarcasm? While most male teachers enter their calling because they have a vocation for it, I fear that it is impossible to believe the same thing in regard to female teachers in this country. When a man fails in everything else, he becomes a coal merchant; when a woman fails, she takes up school. How otherwise can we explain the startling fact that there are nearly three times as many female as male teachers in England (32,727 males, and 94,020 females)? In Scotland and Ireland their numbers are nearly equal. It is scarcely necessary to cite evidence, either from ancient or modern history, as to the need which great teachers have felt for a long and careful training for their profession. Plato, after studying eight or ten years under Socrates, learned all that he could acquire from the philosophical schools of Egypt, Cyrene, and Tarentum, before he founded his school in the grove of Academus. And Aristotle, after remaining twenty years with Plato, spent a long period in the study of natural history before he founded his school in the Lyceum. Passing to the Christian era, the great Alexandrine teacher, Origen, even before he became a divine, and while preparing to teach grammar, studied all the Greek literature and philosophies of his period. But passing over all such eminent examples of antiquity, it is sufficient to state that, within the last few years, the necessity of methodical teaching has been discussed in England, and living teachers such as Dr. Butler, of Harrow, Dr. Jones, of the Isle of Man, Dr. Abbott of the City of London, and Dr. Donaldson, of Edinburgh, have all argued for a systematic training of teachers, frankly confessing that from not having possessed it, they had won their own experience at the cost of the pupils whom they taught.

This methodical training of the teacher is an obvious necessity, whether teaching be regarded as a mere art, or as an art founded on science. For my purpose it is profitless to discuss whether teaching is based on psychology or physiology. As an art it is doubtless founded on a thorough and broad instruction in the subjects to be taught, and likewise on the ascertained experiences of mankind as to the best methods of imparting them to youth. A teacher must be inefficient, if his knowledge of subjects be limited by the amount to be taught. His fund of knowledge requires to be large, because it is a capital in reserve, upon which he has constantly to draw for illustration and instruction. But this extensive knowledge may be useless, unless it has been acquired with the expressed object of teaching, so that the method and practice of the educator may continually be kept in view. Much evidence on this subject is to be found in the reports of the School Enquiry Commission. As the result of much consideration, the commission recommended that teachers should obtain certificates of efficiency, but they hesitated to recommend the establishment of normal schools for secondary teachers. They adduced the example of the *Ecole Normale* of France, which produces exquisite instructors, though less efficient educators than are obtained in Germany, by combining university education with the teaching of method in a