

explained by philosophers that the mind naturally seizes upon the general before it can comprehend the particular. We ought also to be especially careful always to proceed from the known to the unknown, for the unknown can only be understood or apprehended by being compared with or explained by the known. Compare always what follows with something that has gone before; or, as Jacotot says, "Learn something thoroughly; and refer everything else to it."

We should have liked, had time permitted, to have said something of abstraction and generalisation, or the powers by which the human mind can take a single feature or quality of an object apart from the rest, and regard it as a separate individual, or by which it may take several subjects, or parts of objects, and conjoin them into a new and distinct whole. These are of great importance, and ought to be carefully trained in education. An intimate knowledge of them, particularly if we regard them as also acting unconsciously, would tend to throw light upon many of the mental phenomena.

We objected to the ordinary division of education as being according to means, and not having a regard to the end,—thus tending to confuse the means with the end. A proper division of the subject would be according to the ends that are to be had in view. The end of all education, is either to cultivate thought, or to develop expression, using this last in its widest sense to include actions and conduct, as well as mere speech or language. All education or teaching must have a regard to one or other of these, the culture of thought, or development of expression.

### AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SYSTEMS OF DEAF-MUTE INSTRUCTION, COMPARED.

BY E. M. GALLAUDET, PRESIDENT OF DEAF-MUTE COLLEGE.

A REVIEW of the history of deaf-mute education reveals the fact that great diversities of opinion as to the most desirable means of instruction have been coexistent with the work itself. A record of controversies, of angry disputes even, appears in a department of labour where from its nature and from the sad condition of its objects one would naturally expect the gentlest feelings of the heart to be ever uppermost.

Those differences seem to have had their origin in opposite conceptions formed of the psychological condition of the deaf-mute. This was thought on the one hand to be an abnormal state of being. Dumbness was considered as a positive quality, the presence of which rendered its subject a monstrosity. The command of spoken language was deemed absolutely essential to a development of the intellectual powers.

The possibility of education was therefore thought to depend on the ability of the pupil to acquire the power of speech.

Hence all labour was directed primarily to the education of the mute from his supposed abnormal state, and his induction, as far as possible, into the normal condition of speaking persons.

By another class of thinkers the deaf-mute was deemed to be a normal creature; that is to say perfect of his kind, although lacking some of the powers of other men. Dumbness was regarded as a negative quality, inability to speak constituting no obstacle to a full and vigorous mental development. Education on this theory, therefore, sought means to adapt itself to the condition and capabilities of its object, the initiatory step in both cases necessarily being the establishment of a competent channel of communication between teacher and pupil.

Heinicke, who founded in Germany, in the year 1760, the method in which the deaf-mute is regarded as an abnormal creature, held to the view that "the written word can never become the medium of thought." That said he "is the sole prerogative of the voice. Without an acquaintance with spoken language a deaf-mute child can never become anything more than a writing machine, or have anything beyond a succession of images passing through his mind." Consistency, therefore, with such a foundation left him no alternative in the use of material for his superstructure.

Speech! Speech! Speech! from base to turret.

De l' Epeé, on the other hand, the author of that method which ascribes to the deaf-mute nothing unnatural or monstrous as to his condition, which sees no inherent obstacles in the way of mental fruitage, took him as he found him; already possessed of a language, imperfect it is true, but of easy acquirement by the teacher, and as susceptible of expansion and perfection as any dialect of spoken utterance.

Denying the dependence of thought on speech, de l' Epeé found a means of communication between himself and his pupils, in a visible language which conveys thought from one to another as surely through the medium of the hand and eye as is done by means of that which employs the tongue and ear.

The theory entering into the construction of this foundation, unlike that of Heinicke, imposed no restriction on de l' Epeé in the use of materials in his edifice, but, on the contrary, left him and his disciples free to adopt whatever means ingenuity might devise or experience recommend, as serviceable in the great work they had to perform.

The real point of difference then, between Heinicke and de l' Epeé is discovered to lie in a purely philosophical question, the

solution of which, in a hundred years of practical labor, proves the former to have been plainly in the wrong, and the latter as clearly in the right.

That much of real good to suffering humanity has resulted from the efforts of both these pioneers in the work of general deaf-mute instruction every candid person will admit; that either was faultless or omniscient none will claim; nor yet, it is to be hoped, will it be maintained that the system of either is entirely destitute of worth.

To that of Heinicke must be accorded the merit, if merit it be, of having the more ambitious aim, though experience has proved his object to have been unattainable; while that of de l' Epeé must be awarded the praise of practical success and much wider applicability.

In reviewing the present condition of deaf-mute schools in Europe, all the systems in use are found to involve one or both of these fundamental methods. In certain places articulation is made the object of transcendent importance; while in some localities it is entirely rejected; and again insitutions are found where attempts have been made to harmonize and combine the once conflicting methods.

The imparting of the power of intelligible oral utterance to one born totally and incurably deaf is an achievement so nearly approaching the miraculous as to dazzle the mind and well nigh unseat the judgment of him who, for the first time, has convincing proof of its possibility.

Indeed one of the earliest recorded instances of deaf-mute instruction in England in the seventh century by the Bishop of Hagulstad, is alluded to in the known work of Bede, as a miracle, when it was doubtless nothing more than has been accomplished by teachers of articulation in latter times.

That toto-congenitally deaf persons have been taught to speak fluently and in tones that could be understood by strangers is an indisputable fact.

The inference, however, drawn by some writers and even, though rarely, by practical teachers that because success is attained with one such case, it is therefore to be expected with all or nearly all, has not been sustained by actual results.

Among more than one hundred instructors recently consulted by the author of this article during his examinations of forty-four of the most prominent deaf-mute schools of Europe, but one was found who claimed that success in articulation might be looked for as the rule among deaf-mutes. And this gentleman, acknowledging that many deaf-mutes, even in respectable German schools where articulation was made the basis of instruction, did not acquire the power of speech, ascribed the failure to a want of skill or industry on the part of their teachers, thus assuming to sit in judgment on the great body of German instructors whose zeal, ability and infinite good temper have received the applause of their most decided opponents.

The subject of teaching deaf-mutes to speak having been discussed at some length in our public journals during the past two or three years, and the claim having been made in certain quarters that the German system of instruction was productive of far more beneficial results than that obtaining in this country, it seemed important, in the tour of examination already spoken of, that special attention should be paid to the matter of articulation in the European States generally, and in the institutions of Germany in particular.

It is this particular line of effort, and this alone, which essentially differences many of the European deaf-mute establishments from those of this country. Hence in the comparison of methods proposed in the title of this paper, attention will be mainly directed towards a consideration of the practicability of teaching deaf-mutes by a system based on articulation as the prevailing principle of instruction.

The metaphysical blunder of Heinicke, the founder of this system, that thought is impossible without speech, is now everywhere acknowledged, even by the most zealous supporters of his practices.

The single instructor to whom reference has been made, as claiming the possibility of teaching all deaf-mutes by articulation is the able and distinguished Mr. Hirsch of Rotterdam, who may be taken as the most extreme and ultra advocate of this method in Europe.

His views on the subject are clearly expressed in the following terms quoted from an address delivered by him before the ninth scientific Congress of the Netherlands convened in Ghent last August.

"The object to be attained is to render possible the admission of the deaf-mute into society by teaching him to see, that is to understand the movements of the lips and to speak in his turn.

"To attain this end the act of seeing or comprehending and of speaking must be made the exclusive principle of instruction, and neither the palpable alphabet nor the language of signs can have any connection with it.

"The daily observations which I have made for more than thirty years that I have devoted to the deaf and dumb have convinced me that the art of seeing speech in the movements of the mouth is the most important of all the branches of instruction and that therefore it should be most sedulously cultivated.

"Next to the art of seeing or understanding, the act of speaking is the principal object of the instruction of the deaf and dumb. By this system ninety-nine out of every hundred deaf-mutes may be taught, and their progress will depend entirely on the talent