

of a profession, it has in its keeping human interests of the highest order; it requires the exercise of the highest intellectual gifts; all its processes have a basis in law, and hence its modes of procedure may be scientific; it requires knowledge of a special kind, difficult to obtain, and, therefore, within the reach of comparatively few; the knowledge of the masses is not sufficient to afford a due protection against malpractice, and so there is a necessity for authoritative evidences of fitness. Teaching is, therefore, a possible if not an actual profession, and any measure that can bring forward this consummation deserves the good will of the general public. Now, it is an historical fact that the main strength of the recognized professions is their organic connection with great seats of learning. Law, medicine and theology had never been professions, except on the condition of university recognition and support; nor could their professional character be sustained, if this support were to be withdrawn. The inference to be drawn is obvious; if teaching is ever to have the rank and the consideration of a profession, it must in some way gain university recognition; and the easy and proper mode of such recognition is the making of education a university study, on a par at least with entomology and forestry.

5. The fifth purpose to be served by a professorship of education, is the development of educational science. There is as good reason for investigating and formulating the principles of education, as for investigating and formulating the principles of medicine and of law. In either case, the art grows in value and in dignity in proportion as its co-ordinate science is perfected; and, in each case, the discovery of a new principle introduces a wholesome change into current practice. At the present time, education is chiefly an empirical art; most of

its processes are derived from precedent and imitation, and the greater part of school work is done in absolute ignorance of conditioning principles, and a considerable part of it in violation of such principles. We expect even a Grammar school pupil to proceed scientifically in the solution of an arithmetical problem; we expect him to use the clear light of a principle as his guide through the mazes of his calculations, and we think it to his great discredit if he is the slave to a mere rule. What shall be our judgment of the mature men and women who do the work of the school room by mere rule, without even suspecting that their rules, if good, have a support in some principle psychological, physiological, or ethical? Socrates held up an Athenian to ridicule by reciting this parody of a supposed speech: "I, O men of Athens, have never learned the medical art from any one, nor have been desirous that any physician should be my instructor; for I have been constantly on my guard, not only against learning anything of the art from any one, but, even against appearing to have learned anything; nevertheless confer on me this medical appointment; so, I will endeavour to learn by making experiments upon you." This clever parody was aimed at a young man who aspired to a position of authority, but who was ignorant of the principles upon which just government was based. Now if ignorance of political science was so discreditable twenty-two centuries ago, why may we not count it discreditable for professional teachers to be ignorant of the elements of educational science in this *wonderful period of enlightenment*?

But some one will say a body of educational doctrine has not yet been formulated, as yet there is no science of education.

This is only partially true. From