

tries, is taught by the most distinguished men in their special departments, in the best manner which their wisdom can organise, and with all the practical means of learning which can be purchased or invented.

The University constructs a programme of methodical study, divided into eight groups, as follows:—

1. A course of architecture and building.
2. A course of civil engineering.
3. A course of mechanical engineering.
4. A course of mechanical chemistry.
5. A course of agriculture and forestry.
6. A course for men of science, professors, and teachers.
7. A general course of philosophy, statesmanship, literature, art, and political economy.
8. A preparatory course for bringing up pupils who are behind their contemporaries, especially in geometry, algebra, elementary, physical and chemical science, drawing and languages.

We meet with abundant testimony to the excellence of this foundation. One of its students, a young Englishman, who desired an education in a branch of civil engineering, and found it impossible to obtain that education in England, having passed through its course, returned to England and entered himself in the usual manner as a learner in the works of an eminent engineer:—"Here the advantages of Zurich soon showed themselves unmistakably; his superiority was so evident, that he soon rose over the heads of much older men, and long before his apprenticeship expired he had already been entrusted with heavy responsibilities and important duties, which could not be entrusted to men much older and more experienced, but less skilfully trained and less highly educated."

Here we will pause a minute to survey the field we have traversed. We have shown that the purpose of Technical Education is to increase the quantity and the quality of the handicraft-skill in the nation, and to connect it with the highest attainable intelligence. It is the business of the Technical Educator to teach whatever there is in the science, philosophy, learning, or art of modern times that has any bearing on the practical business of life, to show how the knowledge is to be used, and to discipline the possessor in its application.

We have pointed out that it naturally has four stages or grades. It is at first co-ordinate with general education. It is then auxiliary to, or a continuation of, general education. The principal maxim it puts before its disciples is, work and think, and work again, think and work, and think again. It selects the shrewdest and most handy amongst the young, and devotes them to industry. It assists them, guides them, and watches over them as they embark in their trades and professions, and finally it strives to pick out the exceptional powers to account for the good of industry.

You may probably think I have wasted time in proving what all must acknowledge. Nearly all do acknowledge the importance of a practical education, but I have frequently referred here, with some impatience, to the fact that there are still to be found in our high places of learning scholars and college dons who scoff at the practical applications of knowledge; and I have pointed out that society could not exist if all men acted on what these men profess. There is a method, in mathematics, of finding the value of a form by tracing the result to *infinity*, and we may estimate the worth of the opinions of some of our university teachers by a similar method. If their theories could prevail and be acted on to a large extent, the land would become a prey to poverty and distress, and finally to desolation and death. A friend of mine, more patient than myself, often says, in response to my complaints:—"They mean well, but they do not know. They do not know the meaning of what they say." To my mind no ignorance is so gross as that of the uneducated scholar who despises all that has direct reference to the practical business of life, to the well-being of society, to the commercial prosperity of the people.

JOHN I., 1.

To the Editor of the Canada School Journal.

SIR,—I was a little surprised, on reading your last issue, to find the thesis of my article and the fundamental principles underlying elocutionary analysis so perverted by J. H. Knight, P. S. I.

I trust you will allow me space in your next issue to correct a few errors the gentleman has, perhaps unwittingly, fallen into. In my last article I ventured the opinion that "with God" is only a secondary idea to the capital thought, "The Word was God;" and also that "if the word was God it must have been with God." Mr. Knight dissents from these opinions, and gives as his reason that, according to the Gentile ideas, the word might have been with God, but not God—in other words, might have been a god, but not the Supreme God, that is, he might have been a rival God." I submit that the phrase "with God" ought not to be interpreted according to Gentile ideas, which admitted a plurality of Gods, especially as it was one of the aims of the sacred writer to combat *polytheism* and establish the proper divinity of Christ, and the unity, not of location, but of nature, and authority of the Word with God. He says:—"In the beginning, that is, of the creation (for the writer evidently refers to the first word of the book of Genesis, *bereshith*, the expression here used), was the Word, that is, the word existed at the beginning of the creation, and consequently from eternity. He was when all things began to be; whatsoever had a beginning. And the Word was God, and God was the Word,—namely, before any created being had existed. Therefore, the Word must have been with God, and God with the Word."

The writer tells us, first, that the Word, in the beginning of the world, existed; next, that he existed with God, and, last of all, that he was God, and made all things. Now, taking up the point again, referred to by Mr. Knight, the Word might have been a god, that is, a kind of inferior deity, as governors are called gods. Dr. Doddridge says,—"This construction cannot be put upon it with impunity, that it is impossible he should here be so called, merely as a *governor*, because he is spoken of as existing before the production of any creatures whom he could govern;" and it is to me most incredible, that when the Jews were so exceedingly averse to idolatry, and the Gentiles so unhappily prone to it, such a plain writer as John should lay so dangerous a stumbling-block on the very threshold of his work, and represent it as the Christian doctrine, that, in the beginning of all things, there were *two Gods*, one supreme, and the other subordinate, a difficulty which, if possible, would be yet further increased by recollecting what so many ancient writers assert, that this gospel was written with a particular view of opposing the Corinthians and Ebionites; on which account greater accuracy of expression must have been necessary. On the other hand, to conceive of Christ as a *distinct* and *co-ordinate* God, would be equally inconsistent with the most express declarations of Scripture, and far more irreconcilable with reason. The words, as they appear in the original, *Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*, have induced some to translate the clause, God was the Word. So it was read in the old English translations, authorized by Henry VIII., and thus Luther rendered it in his German translation, "*Gott war das wort*." Now, according to the rules governing emphasis, we must transfer the emphatic stroke to those words in the verse that assert the meaning, viz.:—"In the beginning the Word was God." If Mr. Knight's reasoning is satisfactory to him, I think I am safe in surmising it will be very unsatisfactory to almost any one else. Mr. Knight considers my quotation (The British Empire was a strong nation) unfortunate, and says it (his objection) could not have that effect with "was God," for "once admit the divinity of the word from eternity, and you must admit His divinity to eternity." So we say "God cannot be less than God," cannot "cease to be God," to use Mr. Knight's words, and by parity of reasoning could not begin to be God, hence it is not necessary to put primary emphasis on "with God," for that is all conceded in the fact that he was "God," the main object of the Apostle's teaching. With regard to commentators, and their explanations of difficult passages, I do not doubt but that they are often valuable auxiliaries to the elocutionist in reading a passage, but they are far from being infallible guides when we come to the question of correct emphasis. The commentator may understand the meaning of a passage and not be able to read it, and place the emphasis properly. Take for example the 25th verse of the 24th chapter of Luke, "Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken." Now it is not to be questioned for a moment but that every commentator understands fully the meaning of the verse, and will Mr. Knight have the kindness to refer me to one Biblical scholar who has written on the above passage, and placed the emphasis upon the right words, so as not to pervert the true meaning of the Master. I merely refer to this to show that it is not always safe to follow, or be guided by commentators in reading a passage, especially with regard to emphasis. Their understanding it does not follow that they can always dictate just where the primary emphasis should