

velopment will impose upon our ethical aspirations.

We seek then, first of all, for the stimulus offered to us in the words and examples of the great teachers of the human race. In the Old and the New Testament, in Epictetus and Plato, in the writings of modern teachers like Emerson and Ruskin—in such illustrious teachers of mankind are revealed the lofty heights towards which our steps should bend; but, lest their inspiration should exalt our ambition beyond its proper sphere, we turn now to the child and study him: our kingdom, like the kingdom of heaven itself, can be entered only by those who are content to humble themselves as little children. At this lowly level we shall be safe from the two perils that beset the idealist: learning how limited are the powers of the child, we shall realize the true limits of our sphere of labor; learning something of the richness of the child's moral nature, we shall be saved from the reaction of unbelief and scepticism, which falls upon those who vaguely long after an ideal without the energy to pursue it.

Finally, restrained but encouraged by contact with the living soul of the child, we shall turn with confidence to the example of the great "practitioners" of our own calling, to those who have lived and worked among children, and we shall tread with confidence on the road where they have walked so safely.

Among these leaders of our profession, I have, for various reasons, singled out Arnold in England and Herbart in Germany as especially worthy of our study in connection with this problem of the educational aim. We cannot, however, entirely accept their guidance, for the world has not stood still during the last half century, our doctrines and practice are influenced, for good as for evil, by the development of ideas in every sphere

of life, and our science will not remain true to facts if it ignores these changes. Doubtless it is a formidable task to interpret wisely the forces which are now moving men's minds, and you will not expect any full interpretation from me; I will only venture to point out one or two of the more obvious influences which tend, not to overthrow, but to readjust the older conceptions of the business of the teacher.

The first of these we owe partly to one great man, Froebel, partly to the social movement of our times connected with the advancement of women. The child to us is a more sacred person than he was to our fathers. He has his claims and his rights, *as a child*. Hereafter he may have a great future, as we say, before him; but the present also has its claims; let him live his own child-life in a child-like fashion.

You observe that this readjustment of our aim springs from the source to which we have already alluded—a more careful study of child psychology. I am bold enough to believe that this movement will grow in force as time goes on, until it finally revolutionizes the practice of our schools. Much is being talked—more, perhaps, in America than in England—of the New Education. I do not like the phrase, for it suggests an impertinent contempt for the old education, and in many respects I still think that "the old is better." If, however, that phrase and that movement mean anything at all, they mean just this: that your child has a right to self-development, untrammelled by the ambitions and interests of the adult, and that we teachers have to protect him, not only from his own errors and follies, but from the alien claims of his elders. You wish your child to be successful? Very good, but let his successes be such as accord with his simple