

the past year, have initiated a movement to which the State must give the weight of its approval, a "consummation devoutly to be wished."

The profession has suffered because the many bright and shining lights are not in the ascendancy; more leaders are needed. How can they be secured? Manifestly, by the removal of obstacles, by an effort to "make straight paths."

In 1863, twenty-seven years ago, I read, in this city, before the New England Association of School Superintendents, a paper on the "Culture of Teachers," in which I most earnestly advocated the establishment of a collegiate normal school in Boston for the special professional training of college graduates proposing to teach.

If the Normal School has done so well for the preparation of teachers for the schools of grammar and primary grade, why may we not have a school of education, corresponding in grade to the Andover Theological, the Harvard Divinity and Law School, the College of Physicians and Surgeons in N. Y., and others of similar character and rank, whose object should be to give to minds, trained by a college faculty, advanced special training and technical instruction? The average legislator, politician, or business man does not, perhaps, see the need of this. He wants the practical. No money expended on that which is theoretical.

Principals, drilled in the school of experience, alone know the perplexities constantly awaiting them in training the raw recruits for service. The experience of successful teachers can not be purchased by the new and untried. He must, by the same round of mistakes, climb the ladder which leads to success. No record of the past has he to guide him. Why would it not be equally sensible to allow young and inexperienced doctors to acquire their knowledge by experiment and mistake? Many lives

might be lost, but the doctor would gain experience, and, after experimenting on a sufficient number of patients or patient ones, he might become a good practitioner.

Education, as a science, is still in a rudimentary state. The vast amount of thought which has been given to the subject by thinkers and philosophers in many countries is, for the most part, inaccessible to young teachers. Though much of this is purely theoretical, and not the result of practical knowledge, much is of the greatest value, and would be of inestimable benefit to students of pedagogy.

Our army would be but poorly officered if its officers were to be appointed from the ranks, and promoted solely on account of their knowledge of military affairs derived from the service. West Point furnishes it with trained men, competent to take the lead. Not so in the army of teachers. Each man must begin as a private and spend years of valuable time in slowly feeling his way. But let him begin his work with a consciousness of mastery, derived from his thorough drill in the best things in the science of education, and he will waste no time in experiment.

The *Emile* of Rousseau was the beginning of a new departure in educational theories. German writers have made extensive contributions to the literature of education. English writers like Spencer and Bain have likewise contributed to the same. Spencer, for example, has clearly shown the need of suitable food for the brain to work upon—adapted to each stage of its development. Bain has shown it to be the duty of the teacher to stimulate the power of the brain of each pupil to the fullest activity. In the same way many an able writer has given his contribution to the science of education. As a science it is still almost in its infancy and offers a most inviting field for experiment and research.