

Hence Science as an educator has made her experiments *corporibus vilissimis*; the sounder stuff she has not reached. When that golden day arrives, we may see whether Mr. Spencer is right in prophesying that Science will reign supreme, and her haughty sisters sink into merited neglect, or whether on being tried in the balances she will be found wanting.

But there is another branch of Science of which the materials are cheap, the laboratories inexpensive, and the teachers numerous—that is, Philology.

It is on this point that Mr. Spencer ventures his most astounding opinion,—“Since it will not be contended that in the acquisition of languages, as ordinarily carried on, the natural relations between words and their meanings are habitually traced and their laws explained, it must be admitted that they are commonly learned as fortuitous relations.” An admission that no one will allow for an instant, at a time when a shilling book on Philology has a large circulation, and Grimm's Law is found in every manual of language.

Philology requires as high requirements and as much patience in acquisition as any science commonly studied. The large knowledge of literature necessary in this case is obvious, and its prosecution carries us along—

*Quidquid agunt homines—votum, timor, ira, cupido.*

To the scientific mind a Greek choral ode is just as beautiful a thing to say the least of it, as a glacier-scratched rock. If the scratches suggest to the geologist the tumbled ruin of an avalanche, the strophe and antistrophe of the choral ode suggest to the scholar the great many coloured theatre, the solemn choric march, the sway of multitudinous applause.

To those of us to whom men are more interesting than rocks or gases (and there always will be such), the highest scientific culture may be sought in how and why men have spoken, and in what circumstances language was born.

Hence, in any scientific schemes, this science must not be omitted,—nay! for vastness of details, for multiplicity, for interest, what other science can compete with it? To “speech-dividing” men, speech must always be a large thing; and did not an incomplete, purblind, if you will, training in what was said and done in Athens and in Rome produce many of the great scientific men of our time?

Possibly it may turn out, after all, that our forefathers were not so far wrong when they called the man of classical attainment the Scholar, for there is one thing true Mr. Spencer has said in his oft quoted essay,—“The education of most value for guidance must at the same time be the education of most value for discipline.” (p. 42.)

Mr. Spratling was not very much inclined to adopt the lecturer's notion as to the meaning of the term “scholar”; it might possibly apply to residents at universities, but would not include men of business, and men of the world, who might nevertheless possess great literary attainments. He also thought the lecturer's separation of the different departments of study, as conditioning different methods of education, inapplicable to the education of the day, which aimed rather at forming the intellect by many-sided culture, and training the whole man. He quite approved of the introduction of the ancient languages, to a certain extent, into the curriculum, notwithstanding the disproportionate amount of time required for this branch; because he regarded the study of Latin as furnishing a

key to the study of language. But mathematics must have its due place; and so must natural science. In regard to the latter study, it was quite true that there was some danger of listlessness and suspension of active interest on the part of the pupils while experiments were being performed; but he contended that the good teacher would not be embarrassed by this difficulty. The pupils should be taught to some extent to make their own apparatus, and to test in practice—this, in itself, was found to afford a valuable training for the observing powers. And, in particular, the teacher should endeavour to free himself and his pupils from the thralldom of books, and learn to do without them as far as possible. It was found by experience that, when the faculties had been awakened, and the powers of observation sharpened by the study of natural science and kindred subjects, the pupils were not only not incapacitated from taking up the study of language, but rather directly assisted by their previous training in making more rapid progress than would otherwise have been the case.

Mr. Wyand expressed his appreciation of the lecture. He was certainly of opinion that all three branches of instruction which the lecturer had so well described, should be carried on together; and he did not see why a beginning in the proper study of language might be made with the vernacular.

The Chairman thought that the lecturer was entitled to much credit for his boldness in bringing forward what in the present state of education might be deemed heretodox views, however they might have been viewed twenty years ago. There was so much talk at the present day of “practical” education, that it was refreshing to hear a word or two on the other side of the question. It would be a mistake to suppose that the lecturer had advocated a purely classical training; when he had rather, instituting a comparison between three exclusive systems, expressed his preference for the linguistic, or classical, over either of the other two. In regard to the term “useful,” in the title of the lecture, there was no doubt much difference of opinion as to its proper signification; but by the general public it was understood to mean what could immediately be made available for material well-being, in business or otherwise; and it was important to convince parents that, even in this narrow view of the objects of education, popular fallacies prevailed. In the wider sense of the term, and having regard to the mind-training influence of certain branches of instruction, it was a moot point which of them could be applied with the best results; but, granting that they were of equal value, it was clear that the “practical” argument for the exclusion of classical studies from the curriculum was not justified. There was, in his opinion, far too ready an appeal to the senses in the most modern methods of instruction, and what he deemed to be a futile attempt to make things clear which were already well enough understood for all practical purposes. There were certain simple notions which, if not precisely *intuitions* might practically be regarded as such: and it was to little purpose that the attempt was made, in the case of young minds, to prove them to demonstration. The real end of education, however, was the training of the mind, and in this regard no one method could claim a monopoly of utility.—*Educational Times*.

#### Mr. Fitch's lecture on Teaching.

In continuation of the brief notes on these lectures contained in our previous numbers, we may refer to