

Germany and in England the most eminent scholars are giving this subject their closest attention. As in every other science, so we may expect there will be progress in the science of education.

With all modesty let me venture to indicate the line along which progress will be made in the future. Let me draw attention to some facts which every true science of education must respect; some truths which every true science will incorporate.

In the first place, a true science of education must have a true and clear conception of the purpose or object of education. This is fundamental. This is what the premise of an argument is to the conclusion. If the premise is wrong the conclusion will never be right. If our theory of education be wrong our practice is not likely to be right. The successful pilot on the sea steers for a definite port. He knows where he wants to land his vessel. The man who builds and equips a mill, knows beforehand what he intends to accomplish. The structure he erects; the machinery he places in it; the men he employs are all selected under the governing idea or purpose in his mind to convert wheat into flour or logs into lumber as the case may be. What then should be the purpose or aim of the educator? What object is he to seek to attain? What is "the chief duty" of the schoolmaster? Am I right when I say that "the chief duty" of the educator is to stimulate and superintend the development of the inborn faculties of the child. His aim should be the complete and harmonious development of all the mysterious and manifold powers and faculties of man. The teacher is to seek the holiness, that is the wholeness, the perfection of the entire nature in harmony with the laws of its own being. Froebel says however we may differ as to the manner and condition in which the first human being came into conscious existence, we are agreed in the fact that all subsequent human beings came into life at zero, and under certain fixed laws evolve into higher and more complex forms. There are these in this germinal form,—a physical nature, a mental nature, and a moral nature, and the business of the educator is to take this bundle of humanity and develop it by appropriate processes and influences into a full-orbed manhood. In this process of evolution from the lowest zero point to the highest result of physical, mental, and moral culture, every faculty and power of body, mind, and soul must have its needed stimulus and direction. The ideal of the true education is a perfected harmonious development of the whole nature.

It follows from this that a true science of education must be evolved from and built up on a true science of man. A knowledge of the physical nature of man, a knowledge of the various faculties of the mind of man, a knowledge of man's moral nature and of the dependence and subtle relations that exist between this trinity of existence—all this is fundamental to a true science of education. Teufelsdröckh's declaration that his teachers were without knowledge of man's nature, or of boys', is a criticism that applies to many of the learned magnates who prepare the curriculum of study for our public schools and universities to-day. The teachers are not so much to blame as those who are over them and who prescribe the course of studies to be pursued. The teachers are no more responsible for the vicious system that environs them than preachers or teachers of morality are for the false system of theology that is imposed on them by their ecclesiastical authorities.

It is only a self-evident truth to say that a teacher, to succeed, must know something of the wonderful nature of the being he is seeking to develop. The artisan must know not only what he is seeking to make—whether it be a plough, a sword, or a watch, he must also know something of the nature of the material he is working on. Much more, it is necessary for the teacher to know something of the nature of the material he is working on and seeking to develop. If he does not, it is the blind leading the blind, and both

will fall into the ditch. "Man, know thyself." Teacher, know thy scholar. What a wonderful creature is a child! Who can know it? We can analyze a mineral and determine its constituent elements, but who can analyze a being made under the laws of animal life and yet made in the image of God, made for a brief day of existence here, and made for an eternity of existence yonder. How true to nature is Emerson, when he says, "The great Pan of old, who was clothed in a leopard skin to signify the beautiful variety of things, and the firmament, his coat of stars, was but the representation of them. O rich and various man; thou palace of sight and sound, carrying in thy senses the morning and the night and the unfathomable galaxy; in thy brain the geometry of the city of God; in thy heart the bosom of love and the realms of right and wrong! An individual man is a fruit which it cost all the foregoing ages to form and ripen."

A true system of education must recognize the fact that the child has a body, fearfully and wonderfully made, and that its mental condition and growth, and its development in morality, etc., probably depend very largely upon its full, healthy, physical development. We must purge our minds from all ascetic St. Simon Stylites' notions of humanity, and develop in its young a respect and reverence for their own bodies. Encourage all games and exercises that tend to develop the body in strength, and grace, and beauty. Anatomy, physiology, and hygiene should surely have a place in the studies of every child.

Then again, a true system of education will recognize the fact that nine-tenths of the human race have to earn their bread by daily toil. Those who are at the head of our educational institutions must give this fact more attention than it has had in the past. This is a utilitarian age. Institutions, governments, schools, churches, are tested by their usefulness. Now there are not a few to-day who say that our schools instead of fitting the young for the practical duties of life, really unfits them. The criticism that practical men make upon our educational system is that the scholar goes out of the school with a distaste and disrespect for honest manual labor. The effort of thousands of young men who are flocking every year into the cities from the country is to get a living by their brains. It has been truly called "the crime of education," that its tendency is to educate the young away from productive labor. Too few are going to mother earth for a living. The noble profession of agriculture is falling into disrepute. The young skillful artisan or mechanic is looked upon with disrespect by mothers who have daughters eligible for marriage, but they will eagerly welcome to their parlors the white-handed young scribe or copying clerk in a down town office. The foundation of all living is productive manual labor. The forces of nature are continually at work converting dead inorganic matter into living organism to supply the wants of man and beast. So man must work continually, converting the native materials of wood, wool, and iron into that which will minister to his own and other's comforts and needs. The starting point, therefore, of all higher education is to educate youth to honest productive labor. Culture is not the first requisite. The ability to live an honest, healthful life; the ability to earn an honest livelihood is a greater necessity. It is more necessary that a girl should know how to cook a beefsteak, or make a digestible loaf of bread, than that she should know how to conjugate a Greek verb, or perform the last musical production on the piano. Bread-winning must always be the work of man, and every child should be taught the nobility of manual labor. And no more forceful criticism could be made on our school system than that it fails to fit the child for the practical business and work of life.

Emerson said something like this: "We send our boy to school, but the boys on the play-ground educate him."—*N. E. Journal of Education*.