

# COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.

## OFFICERS OF THE INSTITUTION.

*Patron.*—RUTHERFORD B. HAYES, President of the United States.  
*President.*—EDWARD MINER GALLAUDET, Ph. D., LL. D.  
*Secretary.*—HON. WILLIAM STICKNEY.  
*Treasurer.*—GEORGE W. RIGGS, Esq.

*Directors.*—HON. THOMAS F. BAYARD, Senator from Del.; HON. JOHN T. HARRIS, M. C., from Va.; HON. WILLIAM CLAFLIN, M. C., from Mass.; representing the Congress of the United States. HON. HENRY L. DAWES, of Mass.; HON. WILLIAM E. NIBLACK, of Ind.; Rev. BYRON SUNDERLAND, D. D.; JAMES C. MCGUIRE, Esq.; HON. HENRY D. COOKE.

## COLLEGE FACULTY

*President and Professor of Moral and Political Science.*—EDWARD M. GALLAUDET, Ph. D., LL. D.  
*Professor of Mental Sciences and English Philology.*—SAMUEL PORTER, M. A.  
*Professor of History and Languages.*—EDWARD A. FAY, M. A.

*Professor of Natural Science.*—REV. JOHN W. CHICKERING, Jr., M. A.  
*Professor of Mathematics and Chemistry.*—JOSEPH C. GORDON, M. A.  
*Assistant Professor of History and English.*—J. BURTON HOTCHKISS, M. A.  
*Assistant Professor of Mathematics and Latin.*—AMOS G. DRAPER, M. A.

## FACULTY OF THE PRIMARY DEPARTMENT.

*President.*—EDWARD M. GALLAUDET, Ph. D., LL. D.  
*Instructors.*—JAMES DENISON, M. A., Principal; MELVILLE BALLARD, M. S.; WILBUR N. SPARROW, B. A.

*Instructor in Articulation.*—MARY T. G. GORDON.

## DOMESTIC DEPARTMENT.

*Supervisor.*—JOHN B. WIGHT.  
*Attending Physician.*—N. S. LINCOLN M. D.  
*Matron.*—Miss ANNA A. PRATT.

*Assistant Matron.*—Miss MARGARET ALLEN  
*Master of Shop.*—ALMON BRYANT.  
*Steward.*—GEORGE ERSKINE.

**TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL REPORT**  
**OF THE**  
**COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB.**

**COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF AND DUMB,**  
**KENDALL GREEN, NEAR WASHINGTON, D. C.,**  
*October 28, 1879.*

SIR: In compliance with the acts of Congress making provision for the support of this institution, we have the honor to report its progress during the year ending June 30, 1879.

**NUMBER OF PUPILS.**

The pupils remaining in the institution on the 1st of July, 1878, numbered .....	70
Admitted during the year .....	26
Since admitted.....	22
Total .....	118

Under instruction since July 1, 1878: males, 111; females, 7. Of these, 76 have been in the collegiate department, representing 24 States and the Federal District, and 42 in the primary department. A list of the names of the pupils connected with the institution since July 1, 1878, will be found appended to this report.

**HEALTH OF THE INSTITUTION.**

We are happy to be able to record the fact that no death has occurred in the institution during the year. We have had no serious cases of sickness and no epidemic diseases have made their appearance.

**COURSES OF INSTRUCTION.**

No essential changes have been made in the ordinary courses of instruction pursued in the several departments of the institution; these remain as described in former reports. Examinations conducted at stated periods have given us evidence of the gratifying fact that the average standard of scholarship throughout the institution reached a higher point during the year now under review than ever before.

**INSTRUCTION IN ARTICULATION.**

As was stated in our last annual report, Miss Gordon, who had been for many years an instructor in our primary department, was detailed to the work of teaching articulation. She has devoted her entire time to this branch of instruction, and the results of her labors have been entirely satisfactory. Eight pupils have been under her training, four of whom were born deaf; one became deaf at the age of 18 months; another at the age of 3 years; another at the age of 4½ years. None of

these seven pupils possessed any power of speech when they began receiving lessons in articulation. The other member of the class, now 15 years of age, lost his hearing at the age of 11. This pupil possessed the power of speech in an almost perfect degree. The instruction in his case, therefore, was directed to the correction of certain mistakes in pronunciation, to the improvement of the general management of his voice, and to the acquisition of the power of reading from the lips. In all the other cases it was of course necessary to begin with the elements of vocal utterance. Bell's system of visible speech, with the methods recommended therein, has been closely followed.

The progress made by the pupils under Miss Gordon's instruction has been satisfactory in all cases. No pupil has been dropped on account of inability to improve, and the number receiving instruction in articulation is this year increased to 12.

In our tenth Annual Report were presented the conclusions of the President of the institution, formed after a careful examination of between forty and fifty institutions in Europe. Among these conclusions the opinion was expressed that not more than thirty per cent. of the whole number of deaf-mutes could be expected to attain sufficient proficiency in speech to justify the time and expense necessarily involved in their instruction. Since the report above referred to was published in 1867, quite a number of schools organized especially for giving instruction in articulation have been maintained in this country, and in many of the older institutions classes in articulation have been successfully carried forward. No results, however, have been attained which modify the conclusions of twelve years ago with regard to the percentage of deaf-mutes that may be expected to succeed in articulation. In this institution we shall therefore make only such efforts as are consistent with the conclusions above referred to, and for the present we shall confine this branch of instruction to the primary department.

#### LECTURES.

For several years courses of lectures on subjects of general interest to the college have been given by the members of its faculty, which have proved entertaining and instructive. Similar lectures have also been delivered to the pupils in the primary department during the past year by the instructors in that department. The importance to our students and pupils of such lectures will be appreciated, when it is remembered that they are necessarily cut off by reason of their deafness from the enjoyment of lectures given to the general public.

The lectures given by the Faculty of the College were as follows:

*Beauty: Its Influence on Moral and Intellectual Development*; by the President.

*The Indo-European Family of Languages*; Professor Porter.

*Dante*; Professor Fay.

*Travels in the East, with illustrations given by the aid of the Magic Lantern*; Professor Chickering.

*Oxygen and certain Oxygen Compounds*; Professor Gordon.

*The Inspiration of Columbus*; Assistant Professor Hotchkiss.

*The Manners, Customs, and Daily Life of the Ancient Romans*; Assistant Professor Draper.

In the primary department the lectures were as follows:

*The Constitution and Government of the United States*; Mr. Denison.

*The Geographical Zones*; Mr. Ballard.

*Physiology*; Mr. Sparrow.

## EXERCISES OF PRESENTATION DAY.

The exercises of the regular public anniversary of our collegiate department took place on the 7th day of May, in the chapel of the institution. The President of the United States, in his capacity as patron of the institution, occupied the chair. The exercises were opened with prayer by the Rev. John G. Ames, president of the Young Men's Christian Association of the city of Washington.

The candidates for degrees delivered essays as follows:

*Dissertation: Dr. Samuel Johnson; Jerome Thaddeus Elwell, Pennsylvania.*

*Dissertation: The Educational Value of the Natural Sciences; John Albert Prince, Massachusetts.*

*Oration: Our Railroads; James Joseph Murphy, Wisconsin.*

Messrs. Ellwell and Murphy were then presented by the President of the College to the Board of Directors as candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Mr. Prince was presented as a candidate for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy.

President Gallaudet then introduced President Porter, of Yale College, in the following language:

It is an interesting fact in the unwritten history of deaf-mute instruction in the United States, that among the many hundred colleges for the education of the youth of our country one stands pre-eminent as having furnished, from its graduates, a much larger number of instructors of deaf-mutes than any other.

From the college to which I allude the pioneer and founder of the system of teaching deaf-mutes in America was graduated in 1805. His five successors in the office of principal of the parent institution at Hartford have been chosen from the *alumni* of the same *Alma Mater*.

The second institution in the country and the largest in size, that at New York, has been presided over continuously for nearly half a century by graduates from the same seat of learning.

At this moment five institutions, containing upwards of 1,300 pupils, are under the direction of men who received their educational training within the same classic walls.

And when it is added that, since the teaching of deaf-mutes was commenced in this country 62 years ago, fifty graduates of that college have entered this profession, a majority of them making it their life-work, it will not be surprising that the officers and students of the Deaf-Mute College should rejoice in the opportunity which the present occasion affords of doing homage to that institution of learning by welcoming its distinguished president as their guest. And so we may greet President Porter, of Yale College, if not as a teacher of deaf-mutes, certainly as a teacher of such teachers; while he is a master of masters, at whose feet not only we of this college, but all who work at our side in the broader field of general education, gladly sit as disciples.

President Porter then delivered the following address, which was given in signs to the deaf portion of the audience by his brother, Professor Porter, of our College Faculty:

## PRESIDENT PORTER'S ADDRESS.

*Modern Teaching: its Opportunities and its Perils.*

My theme is Modern Education in the three aspects of *Research, Exposition, and Examination*—or the Modern Instructor as a Student, a Teacher, and an Examiner of the work of his pupils.

I propose to speak freely of the opportunities which pertain to each of these functions and of the special perils of each, in order that I may show how they should be combined in the ideal teacher and the perfect system of instruction. The range of my discussion will extend from the Kindergarten to the University, and consequently many of the thoughts which I shall present must be somewhat general in form, and suppose some familiarity with the actual working of educational institutions and the practical exercise of the teacher's office.

I begin with the teacher as himself a learner, or Education as involving *Research*. It is a truism that we assert when we say that in order to teach one must first have

learned. Clearly, in order to impart, the giver must already have gathered for himself. A little reflection or a very little practice will also convince the most skeptical that the teacher needs not only to learn *what* he desires to impart, but also *how* he may communicate it with the best success. Research in Education covers both these points. In regard to each, some important questions suggest themselves. The first is, how much ought the teacher to know in order to the highest success?

No one will question that the teacher should know something more than his pupil. Exactly how much it is not always easy to decide. Some contend that this something need be very little; indeed, that it is better that the teacher in both the university and the primary school should be only a step or two in advance of his pupil. The opposite doctrine now prevails and in general should be accepted as true, viz, that the more a teacher knows and has thought upon any subject, the more successfully will he communicate to one who has learned and reflected less than himself. It is conceivable, and now and then it is realized in fact, that even the rudiments of a science, a language, or an art may be taught with greater skill and effect by one who is most at home in their remotest applications, if everything else is equal. Those who contend that this should always happen reason thus: The retailer of common-places which he does not comprehend, cannot teach with that authority which only comes from rational conviction. Genuine authority rests only on well-grounded opinions, and is derived from the facts and reasons to which the teacher appeals. A master in his art does indeed often withhold his reasons; but he none the less really follows a hidden logic, which manifests itself in the lucid order of his statements, each of which prepares the way for its successor, and all together justify conviction.

Again it is urged: Teaching itself is an art, a consummate art, which like every other art should blossom out from science as the flower from the root. For this reason, the master of a science should best understand how to teach it with success. He alone can build up the edifice of knowledge from its foundations so that it shall rise like an exhalation in fair proportions, and sometimes even to the sound of music before the instructed intellects and the delighted hearts of his pupils.

From these data the conclusion is confidently drawn by many that only the consummate philosopher is fit to teach the elements of knowledge to infant minds, and that education, even in the nursery and the kindergarten, has much to learn from scientific theories of teaching and training.

Both these conclusions are often dissipated by the stern ordeal of experiment. The consummate philosopher does not always prove to be the most successful defender and expounder even of his own discoveries. The clearest and most logical thinkers are by no means uniformly the best teachers. Why this should be we have not far to seek. The accomplished philosopher is liable to measure the capacities of his pupil by his own. He is of all men the most incapable of anticipating the fickleness of his attention, the feebleness of his memory, and the narrowness of his intelligence. Perhaps his pupil may be slow to apprehend because the facts are unfamiliar or his powers of attention are unformed. To the teacher these facts are as common as the faces of the household circle, and he cites them or refers to them with the most tantalizing familiarity, while to the pupil they are like strange faces in a bewildering crowd. What is true of the facts is still more eminently true of their import and significance, of what they reveal to the intelligence that judges and reasons, that interprets, foretells, and invents. When the master moves at his slowest pace in finding similarities and suggesting analogies, the pupil must often run and pant to keep abreast with what, to himself, are deliberate and often tedious paces. When the instructor makes the simplest and most obvious transitions of thought, to his pupil he appears to take flying leaps over chasms deep and wide, into which his companion falls in helpless discouragement. Most noticeable and disheartening of all, the philosopher too often begins with the remote and general, which he fails to justify and illustrate by the familiar and the individual. He forgets that the learner must invariably move from the individual to the general, from facts to principles, from examples to truths; that is, he must first be guided from starting-post to goal before he can return from goal to starting-post.

We grant that the philosopher is in no sense disqualified for success as a teacher, simply because he is a philosopher. We even contend that ideally he alone is competent to teach, because he alone should understand principles and have the skill to apply them. But we cannot overlook nor deny the fact that he is often eminently unsuccessful, because he fails to distinguish the order of reflection upon knowledge when it has once been gained, and the order of imparting information to those ignorant, or of exciting thought in one who has never reflected. Failures of this sort are by no means confined to teachers by profession. They are observed in lawyers and preachers, in essayists and critics, in conversation and harangues, among those trained in the schools and those schooled only by life. While, of all these classes, it remains forever true that the man who would control the thinking of others must first have mastered his own, it is by no means uniformly true that the man who has mastered his own thinking is the most successful in helping his fellow-men to acquire or to think.

These remarks may explain and justify the statement that one of the great perils of our modern education is, that in aiming to be too scientific in form it often fails to be scientific in fact. Many of our elementary text-books are striking examples of this truth. We observe, now and then, the attempt to teach the alphabet after what is called a truly scientific method. The learner is the simple child of nature, who finds it hard enough at first to connect a sight with a sound and whose uncertain attention can only be caught by some rhythmical euphony of syllables or some pleasing alliteration. This passive and helpless being is at first confronted with some profoundly scientific tabular arrangement of mutes and liquids, or bidden to observe and note the similarities of form or sound between the individual letters which he has scarcely learned to recognize or name. Or if no absurdity so gross as this has yet been attempted in the name of scientific teaching, not greatly less absurd are the devices by which paradigms of noun and verb are built up on scientific principles for beginners in many of our best grammars of Greek and Latin, and the syntax of the sentence is expounded after some metaphysical theory. It cannot be denied that, to many pupils, the mysteries of *parisng* our sweet English tongue seem at first as awful and recondite as these mysteries of old to which novitiates were introduced through tedious preparations of suspense and terror, to be confronted at last with disclosures as empty and disappointing.

From failures, of the kind alluded to, arising from the misapplication of a truly scientific method, and from other infirmities which are often incident to scientific genius, the inference has been reached by many, and urged with great warmth, that the work of teaching ought not to be committed to philosophers, either in the highest or the lowest schools. It is even urged that, in the higher institutions, the most gifted men should be assigned to the special service of scientific investigation and research, and be excused from any considerable service in instruction. The ideal university, it is contended by many, is prominently a school for investigation and research, in which the teachers should occupy a place altogether subordinate to the men of research. Even in schools and colleges specially set apart for teaching, it is proposed to reserve the most gifted and eminent for the service of the most advanced and the most brilliant pupils, and to commit the less gifted and the less advanced to the hands of apprentices in teaching and instructors by routine. Under this arrangement, it is urged, the most gifted can be spared much annoying drudgery and be employed for nobler results, while the work of practical education will be more effectively prosecuted by a class of men who are capable of practicing education as a handicraft with the best success, having neither too much nor too little science to injure them as instructors. I need not say that this presents the subject of education as research in a special aspect, and proposes a division of departments, by assigning a special class of men to a special function.

We do not object to the endowment for the sake of research in institutions especially founded for such a service; as observatories, museums, bureaus of single departments of science, libraries, and societies of literature. Every institution of this kind has its own *raison d'être*. Many, if not all, of these are forward to select for their service men who, like Agassiz or Henry, have already won their reputation as teachers in some school of science or letters, or have shown themselves to be as eminent in administration as in thought.

But for a University whose function is to educate, nothing could be more unfortunate than the endowment of chairs for research alone, with limited obligations to give instruction. Experience is certainly against this theory. The fitful and, in general, the scanty productiveness of the Life Fellowships in the English Universities is strikingly contrasted with the astonishing scientific activity of multitudes of poorly paid German professors. These ample foundations for research, which have been provided for centuries in England, have in the comparison been a constant dishonor and disappointment, when measured by the wealth and other facilities which they represent. The recent revival of scientific activity among the Fellows at Oxford and Cambridge has been largely stimulated, if not almost recreated, by influences from without, notably from Germany, and by an active and unceasing demand for more varied and profound instruction in the new learning and science, within and without the university halls. The ardor of pupils eager to learn, which has been aroused by the erudition, speculation, and science that are everywhere fermenting in the thinking world, has passed from the reading-class to the tutor, and from the common-room to the study. It has awakened many of the sleepy Dons to the necessity of research if they would face their pupils with comfort and answer their many new and puzzling questions. The testimony of Professors Tyndall and Huxley, who are alike eminent as investigators and expounders of science, is emphatic in support of the opinion that science itself will gain more, in the quality of its work of research and in the value of its results, by a close and active contact with living pupils, than it need lose by the distraction of the attention or the lowering of the enthusiasm of its devotees. The examples of Professors Agassiz and Henry are decisive to the conclusion that men born with a genius for discovery, and impelled by an irresistible passion for research, are capable of equal delight and eminent success in the work of instruction.

Did our time allow, we might urge an argument from the interests of science itself, especially in view of the exposures which grow out of its intense and varied activities at the present time, and its splendid and sometimes intoxicating achievements. The field of research is now so vast, that it must be divided and subdivided into microscopic departments, and consequently its vision is in danger of being shortened and narrowed. The demands of each of these departments cannot easily be set aside. The enthusiasms are so absorbing that they will not be denied. Hence the danger that the man of research who is nothing else, will give himself to a single department of thought, and have neither eyes nor ears nor thought for the facts and truths which lie beyond his horizon. It is well for science itself, when one of its devotees is inclined to shut himself up in the narrow cave of his own studies, and now and then perhaps to pay unlawful honors to the idols which are hidden there, that he should be forced to bring his theories into the light of common day by attempting to teach them to others. Many an extravagant hypothesis might have been nipped in the bud, had its romantic originator been forced to state and defend it before the scrutinizing judgment of a class-room of not over-reverential youth. The philosophic conceit that is born of isolation, or the adulation of a mutual admiration clique of associated scientists or *littérateurs*, cannot easily survive a test so trying as the attempt to state and defend, before a quick-witted class, some half-fledged theory of philosophical romance. We dishonor neither the eminent abilities nor the actual services of either Mr. Darwin or Mr. Herbert Spencer, when we express the opinion that they would have rendered far more valuable services to science, had their activities in research been arrested by constant challengings from slow-minded and critical pupils. Whatever may have been true in the past, it is certain for the future that science must fail of a healthy life unless its devotees maintain a close and constant sympathy with the intellectual life of the on-coming generation, as represented in our higher schools. We conclude then that, so far as education is concerned with research, it cannot be too scientific, provided the attention of the teacher is wisely distributed between the matter taught and the method of imparting it. Herein lies the promise and the opportunity of our modern education. Its peril is found in the danger of mistaking the scientific in form for the scientific in fact. The danger is almost equal of overlooking the laws under which the young can be developed to scientific growth, and of the withdrawal of men of scientific genius from the work of teaching.

We have already anticipated our second topic and passed from Research to *Exposition* or *Instruction*. That this is the most important element of the theme will be generally accepted. In the old times the living teacher was indispensable. As long as printed books were unknown, or rare and costly, the pupils of successive generations literally sat at the feet of their teachers and recorded the words that fell from their lips upon their rude tablets or their faithful memory. In modern times the variety of books and illustrations has made the occasion less imperative for a teacher's services. But even now the living teacher is always preferred and often required, and for the following reasons:

1. He is needed to instruct the student as to the knowledge or truth which is accepted and established. We cannot escape the fact nor the necessity that teaching must, at least, begin with authority on the one side, and with confidence on the other. Whatever the matter taught may be, whether it be history or science, whether it be received on testimony or confirmed by experiment and reasoning, the teacher must first deliver to the pupil what he himself accepts as true. Even if the truth be self-evident, it is none the less necessary that he should distinctly declare to the pupil what he will certainly find when he looks for himself. Whether what is declared to be true is uttered in the words of the instructor, or whether he puts a text-book into his pupil's hands, it is all the same. It is the order of nature that the teacher should begin his work with that dictation which exacts confidence. One generation cometh and another goeth, and the generation that goes takes the torch which has been its own light and which it had received from the one already gone and transmits it to the next. In former times when everything taught was unquestioned, the duty of the teacher was simple. He needed only to repeat what the church or the philosopher affirmed, and his task was achieved. But who in these times shall say what is fixed or received? Or who shall venture to predict what will continue to be established in the next generation? Now that everything is questioned, even whether the teacher or pupils belong to the same species or acknowledge the same intellectual laws, or have a real or permanent existence, the trials of teachers and pupils are manifold. When mathematical axioms are questioned, and the possible emergence of new relations of space and number is allowed by high mathematical authority, it would seem that neither personal convictions nor self-evident truths can be the ground of authoritative declarations. What one teacher declares to be a theory universally accepted, is denounced by another as a romantic dream, or, at best, as a passable working hypothesis. What is regarded by one as a verified experiment, is rejected by another with passionate positiveness. The very ardent and hopeful instructor is tempted to anticipate as true some paradox which he thinks the next sixty years may possibly

discover to be true, in order that he may be abreast with the advancing wave of science. Because progress is certain, not a few teach that everything which is received should be questioned. The perils to instruction from these influences are serious and manifold. Even in pure science, instruction lacks positiveness, sharpness, and logical coherence, which are ill-supplied by speculation, conjecture, and romancing.

Much more serious are the perils and difficulties which are encountered when the subject-matter concerns, directly or remotely, the interests or the duties of men, or their hereditary faiths and historic traditions. If the conclusions of science or the discoveries of criticism seem to disturb the sacredness of duty, the authority of law, the permanence of property, the purity of the family, the holiness of worship, and the steadfastness of faith, the conflict is perplexing to every conscientious and truth-loving teacher. Now and then he asks, with earnest solicitude, What can I, what dare I, teach as true, or assert with the authority of personal convictions? The question is still more perplexing when the teacher represents the State, and the inquiry is no longer what the instructor may propound as his individual belief, but what he may declare, on the authority of the commonwealth, to be true in history, in science, and ethics, consistently with the freedom of individual convictions, or without violence to religious traditions. From these perils the modern teacher can find no deliverance, nor can the modern State, except by a more positive recognition of the practical, or what is sometimes called the sentimental, side of scientific theories, as a guide to conviction, and a limit to license of speculation, than is allowed in many circles.

This subject has recently forced itself upon the attention of scientists of high authority in German university life, in an active controversy between Professors Virchow and Hæckel. The threatened application of what are conceived to be purely scientific theories of Psychology and Paleontology, of Psychology and Ethics, of Jurisprudence and Politics to the denial or destruction of all that is most valuable in modern civilization, has distinctly raised the question in scientific circles, when and in what sense can a speculative theory which is capable of a hazardous application be said to be established, in such a sense as to be taught by the authority of the Professor of Science under the protection of the State. In this country we are happily exempt from the necessity of meeting this question in respect to university education by the circumstance that the State undertakes to administer this education only to a limited extent. It remains to be seen whether it will not seriously interfere with the administration of any education by the commonwealth, except that which is strictly elementary and secular, and whether, even within this sphere, the necessity of teaching with authority will not always create serious difficulty. Notwithstanding, whatever may be its speculative or practical difficulties, the principle remains unshaken, that the living teacher, to teach with effect, must teach with authority.

2. The living teacher is needed to impart the truth as it is shaped and colored by his own individuality. Every man who would teach his fellow-man must meet him as a person, and it is through his personality that he can impart what he has to give. Even in setting forth the most abstract truth he cannot lay aside his individual methods of conceiving and presenting it. This must be approached from his own point of view and be arranged in an order peculiar to himself. It must be made fresh and living by illustrations drawn from his personal life, and be warmed by the fervor and sympathy which spring from his own heart. Even the palest abstractions are colored by the prismatic refractions that are ready to break from the driest light of the severest mathematician. The most hard-hearted of metaphysicians will now and then relent into those human sympathies which will draw his pupils towards himself. We can never overlook the fact that teaching must always be a personal activity, and that herein lies the explanation of its usefulness and its power.

At the same time we cannot overlook another fact as patent, viz, that modern teaching, with all its peculiar and undeniable excellencies, has done much to weaken or to eliminate the personal element, and tends strongly to proceed further in this direction. Not a few theorists contend that such a result is greatly to be desired. Their ideal will be realized when the learners of the alphabet are ticketed and numbered like convicts, and gathered in groups, each of exactly half a score, around a teacher whose tones are drilled to the monotony of a hand-organ. They will then proceed to other like teachers to learn the mysteries of reading and spelling, by methods equally mechanical. An admirable example of one of these model schools for young children is furnished in the arrangements for sheltering and feeding chickens who have been hatched by artificial warmth, and are now, as we are told, crammed by machinery, spite of all resistance, with more food than they would seek, and indeed none of which they seek for. From the lower schools the pupils are to be marched and counter-marched around and up the Hill of Science in the same prescribed pathways, and when they are supposed to have reached the summit, they are to be greeted and dismissed with a shout of triumph and congratulation, which shall have been learned and pitched by rule.

The same doctrinaires are especially desirous to set the teacher in the college and the university at the farthest remove from his pupils, on the theory that he will thus



be able to teach as an impersonal and impartial oracle of science, and be delivered as far as possible from the distracting influence of human sympathies.

Not infrequently Nature is too strong for these theories and shows herself eminently rebellious. And so it happens that the lecturer in one of these model colleges emphasizes his individuality by startling novelties, by sensational paradoxes, or extravagant rhetoric. Instead of the simple-hearted teacher trained by nature to be strong in his own convictions, simple in his tastes and rhetoric, unique in his individuality even to his foibles, we have the scientific or literary demagogue who brings down the house by his headlong and audacious speculations, or draws a crowd by showy and sensational rhetoric or by romantic if not atheistic theories of Nature and Society.

3. Most of all is the living teacher required that he may adapt his instructions to the individual capacities and temper of his pupils. The ideal conception of the teacher not only requires that he be a man who teaches what he believes and knows, after the manner in which he has learned or holds it, but pre-eminently that he should study the capacity of each pupil to receive what he can give, and adapt it to his individual genius and temper. For this reason chiefly, in the higher strata of life on the Continent, the private tutor has been thought essential to a consummate education, even where he is supplemented by the class-drill of the Gymnasium and the freer stimulus of the university. In England a careful private and family tuition precedes the struggles of the stormy athletic public school, into which so many of the sons of the wealthy and the nobly born are let loose to gain by rough encounter and patient toil the sturdy virtues of intellect and character. But even the public school and the university, in their theory and best practice, continue to be largely dependent upon the individual guidance of the private tutor. In Scotland the university teacher is largely a lecturer, under whom the early admitted and often the unguided boy must do the best that he can in appropriating to himself the wisdom which is scattered broadcast. Nothing saves this system from being an utter failure except the strong individuality of the Scottish character, and its loyal and sturdy fidelity to the traditions of the household and the parish teacher. In Germany the gymnasium provides for the liveliest intercourse between the teacher and his pupil by the active and searching questionings of the class-room, in which the individuality of every pupil cannot fail to be revealed and provided for. This is one of the most effectual securities against the liberty of that irresponsible selection and attendance that is subsequently allowed to the university life.

That the tendencies of modern education set strongly towards overlooking the individual in the class, will be questioned by few. The influences which tempt the teacher to sacrifice his own individuality to the behests of what he calls science and method, lead him more remorselessly to sacrifice to the spirit of a system, or to his own private convenience, the individual aptitudes and capacities of his pupils.

How this tendency is still further manifested and should be resisted may be considered more advantageously under the next topic, the third office of the teacher, viz: The *Examination* of the work of his pupil. Under this title we include every form or method in which the pupil can be required to reproduce what he has learned, whether it be more than once in a day or only once in a term or a year, whether with the sharp conciseness of an oral reply to a question or the fullness of spoken discourse or the deliberateness of a written disquisition.

That examinations or their equivalents are indispensable to enable the teacher to adapt his teachings to the capacity of his pupils, is too obvious to need any enforcement. That the pupil needs to acquire under the stimulus that comes from knowing that he must retain what he receives and reproduce it when called for, is self-evident. That these examinations should be frequent, and varied in form and thoroughness, ought to be equally obvious. That the teacher is at liberty to make a record of his pupils' performances if he can do this without hindering his own freedom in teaching, is self-evident. This is the explanation as it is also the history of the so-called recitation, a word peculiar to this country, in this special sense. The exercise itself is the natural if not the necessary outgrowth from the original and the best method of teaching, *i. e.*, by conversation; as when Socrates first caught and cornered and then alternately fascinated and tantalized any young man on whom he fixed his eye in the streets or market places of Athens, or when Plato in asking or answering his own questions soared into those flights of mythological wisdom which his auditors could not and would not restrain, or as when Aristotle subjected the pupils with whom he walked up and down to a sharp fire of cross-questioning. When books were rare, and writing was not easy, the teacher could not fail thus to elicit by questions from the learner how far the latter understood and remembered what he had said. This would involve a full *repetition* of the preceding exercise. The next step was for the teacher to give to his pupils a synopsis in writing of his own heads of thought to aid him in the recall and the review. This synopsis was a text-book, or book of texts, from which he had discoursed, which thence afterwards came to mean the principles of a science arranged by the teacher and which the pupil was required to study and expound. Whatever be the form or the appliances of the examination, its theory is the

same, and that is that the learner is bound to make what he has heard or read so far his own that he can explain or reproduce it in his own language and after his own method.

It is one of the improvements of modern education that it lays a greater stress than formerly upon every species of examination. The forms have been varied, their severity has been increased, and greater importance has been attached to them as tests of scholarship and as avenues to offices, honors, and salaries. Much good has come of all this, but the good has not been without alloy.

The first abuse which we notice is the tendency and desire to sink the teacher in the examiner. The teacher gives the pupil his text-book or lecture, refers him to the appliances at command and bids him prepare himself for the searching inquisition at the appointed hour. This procedure becomes an abuse, when the teacher who should be his friendly assistant and guide assumes the place of a suspicious antagonist who watches his victim with a distrustful eye, springs upon him some unexpected question in order to test his absolute thoroughness, or poses him with some single inquiry or problem which he knows will baffle all except the leader of the class. Or it may be he insists on some astonishing feat of memory, to which only now and then a pupil can possibly be equal. Having heard the answers or received the papers, he assigns the following task or dictates a lecture, and dismisses his class for the next examination. This is called academic drill, intellectual gymnastics, impartial because impersonal teaching, whereas it is scarcely teaching at all. Or at best the half and the smaller half of the work is done which pertains to the teacher's office.

Another abuse is the substitution of occasional and infrequent examinations, usually written, for those which are stated and frequent. For pupils who are mature and self-controlled, these formal written repetitions render an admirable service. Even for younger pupils, if constant oral recitations are also required, nothing can possibly be more serviceable than an occasional task of this sort, to test and methodize and fix their acquisitions. It summons and constrains the student to fix his knowledge as he acquires it, to methodize and make it his own, so that he can restate it after his own ways of thinking, and to attach it by living relations to what he already knows, and thus recast it into a compacted system. It is true these advantages cannot be realized at once, and for this reason I would urge that these formal and systematic written reviews should be gradually required of young pupils. Their earliest attempts must of necessity be awkward and imperfect. The mastery of one's acquisitions so as to recall them at the word of command, comes more slowly than unsympathizing examiners imagine, and the power successfully to put what one knows upon paper is at first a left-handed effort. But the advantage is important and the gains are certain. On the other hand, to make these examinations the substitute for the frequent and familiar exhibitions of the pupil's power and attainments to the scrutiny of the teacher, with the opportunity which it brings to the teacher to meet his weakness or strength with help and sympathy, is to limit the teacher's usefulness more than half, and to test the imperfect work of growing boys by trials that are suitable only for full-grown men. But this substitution of occasional written examinations for those which are frequent and oral, cannot be justified by the reason nor the palliation that it alleviates the labors of the teacher. The profession involves labor, and that labor is the work of teaching and training, and not of acquisition. It is not essential that the educator should be successful in study or research, except so far as study and research are the conditions of success in stimulating and enriching the minds of others. Nor should it be his aim to be known as a sharp critic or an acute and merciless examiner, except so far as his acuteness and rigor further the great end of his profession. For this end no labor should be spared. To the promotion of this every needed sacrifice should be made. Nor should it be urged that to examine in this way prevents him from being moved by appeals to his personal sympathy. The office of a teacher should foster rather than repress an active personal interest in his pupils. It requires that he should interpret individual capacity and attainments by trivial indications, and that he be ready to give friendly aid and counsel to those whose work he condemns. A still more serious objection to an excessive reliance on infrequent examinations, whether oral or written, is that they tempt to the neglect of constant work, and weaken the sense of daily responsibility, that they minister to those flattering promises which transfer the impending task of to-day to the ever-receding to-morrow, and thus foster the habit of cramming. For these reasons we cannot doubt that whenever the chief interest of school or college life is concentrated upon the monthly or even the fortnightly examination, the labors of the ordinary student will become fitful and his habits of steady and honest work will be weakened.

As for those well-meant, self-constituted boards of examination which take out roving commissions to examine and give testimonials to whom they may concern, it were better to say nothing than to say anything amiss: that such examinations may be useful now and then, in stimulating to continued courses of study, cannot be doubted; that the certificates given may here and there be of service to their recipients and in-

produce them to situations of usefulness and honor, we may readily believe, without being required to esteem either the examination or the certificate as of any considerable importance in our permanent educational arrangements.

In England, with the commanding position accorded to the great universities, and the limited opportunities for systematic female education, and the great significance of definite and honest attainments in certain departments of knowledge, the local examinations inaugurated by the universities have met a temporary exigency, such as was incident to a condition of transition, and have helped many deserving persons to places of trust. In this country, in which testimonials are easily obtained, both those that are and those that are not deserving of confidence, the work of any single examining bureau must be limited in its influence, and ought to be modest in its pretensions. For the reasons already given, examinations separate from instruction must often be uncertain and capricious. They cannot take the place of institutions for personal instruction. It is questionable whether it is wise that they should usurp any of their prerogatives. The higher institutions have a sphere sufficiently wide and inviting if they aspire to train a host of teachers who shall bring to the schools of the country well-trained and well-provided minds and a fervent and patient zeal. And what should such teachers aim to be? We reply:

Such teachers should combine in harmonious and just proportions the three prime characteristics which we have considered. They must be students, that they may know what to impart. What they learn, they must know in scientific relations, to give order and confidence to their teachings, and to enable them to understand the science of teaching successfully. Most of all should they be aware that a scientific knowledge of the subject taught is one thing, and the scientific knowledge of the way to teach is another.

They should be instructors, not passive conduits or inactive vehicles of communication, but thinking and living agents, who have made their knowledge their individual possession, and so are fitted to adapt it to the individual capacities of their pupils as also to give to their knowledge the coloring and warmth of their individual enthusiasm and sympathy.

They should also be examiners who constantly scrutinize and test the acquisitions and achievements of their pupils, that they may stimulate and aid them most wisely and efficiently. A teacher who combines in himself these characteristics in any just or even reasonable proportions cannot but bring into activity a strong personal enthusiasm. His studies, his teachings, and his examinations must be animated and characterized by an intense personal life.

Modern education has made immense progress in its methods and appliances. There is no limit to the faith of our citizens in the power of education for good, nor to their sensibility as to their duty to provide for it, nor to their zeal and generosity in contributing their wealth to its service. Our chief danger lies in the substitution of methods and machinery in the place of living men who shall have first mastered their science, next themselves, and have in this way learned how to master the minds and win the hearts of the successive generations of pupils, who all their lifetime cannot fail to hold them in love and honor.

The opportunities of modern education are found in the high estimate in which it is held, in the unbounded confidence of the community in its promises and power, and in the magnificent liberality with which its endowments and appliances are furnished. The perils to which it is exposed proceed from an excessive faith in method and machinery, and in what is called the science of teaching, to the neglect and dishonor of that skill which can give teaching efficiency and success. This confidence reaches its climax of absurdity when it rests in the assurance that teaching can itself be taught by rules and systems, and its divine art can be transmitted by formula and charts, by authoritative prescriptions and methods, and whatever else tends to deaden the individual sense of responsibility and to weaken the inspiration and energy of individual enthusiasm. It is pertinently said by a recent English writer, Professor Bonamy Price; "This is the greatest work in education, the development of one human being by another. Books written by great men are great things; but the living man himself is still greater. It is to the imperfect apprehension of this truth that the defective results of English schools are mainly to be attributed. The public feeling of this country does not recognize the extreme value of the specific gift of teaching (even though it was so conspicuously illustrated by the life of Dr. Arnold).

\* \* \* And in what does the gift of teaching consist?—assuredly not in the possession of a large body of solid learning; that is the smallest and least important qualification for educating youth. It consists infinitely more in the power of sympathy, the ability to place oneself in the exact position of the learner, to see things as he sees them, to feel the difficulties exactly as he feels them, to be able to present the solution precisely in the form which will open the understanding of the pupil and enable him in gathering the new piece of knowledge to comprehend its nature and value. \* \* \* This is a work of sympathy and love, of a genuine delight in the pleasure of teaching,

\* Contemporary Review, vol. xxxiv, March, 1878.

a delight which finds its gratification in perceiving that the pupil has taken in and truly apprehends the knowledge that was set before him. That good writers move the thoughts and opinions of many generations is a simple truism. \* \* \* Is it too much to say that a great teacher, or rather a mass of great teachers, may still more profoundly direct and shape minds at ages when docility and impressionableness are the seed bed supplied by nature? Have an Abelard and an Arnold told little upon mankind?"

To this able testimony to the truth of the opinions which I have endeavored to set forth, I would beg leave to add in conclusion: Two earlier names than either Abelard or Arnold occur to us of teachers who have at once illustrated the art of education in its noblest exemplifications, and have forever consecrated it by the tenderest associations. The one was Socrates; the other bore that name which every Christian would rather reverently think of than lightly pronounce.

The first gave to human science its form and birth, by teaching individual men effectually to think. It was Socrates, so far as we know, who first distinctly recognized the supreme importance of the method by which man interprets the secrets of the universe and records his discoveries in what we call science, in the twofold form of induction and definition. But he taught this method in its application to the commonest themes, and by adapting it to the understanding of the pupils to whose service he devoted his best energies. In teaching, Socrates never failed to condescend to the capacities of the most ignorant and unreflecting, while he was more than a match for the imposing pretensions and the inflated phraseology of the most cultivated. No examiner was ever more severe or pertinacious than Socrates in exposing the ignorance or in testing the exactness of his pupils, and yet no man was more kindly and patient in meeting every one on his own ground, or in lending a helping hand to his individual difficulties. Our modern education, however rapid its progress, or luxuriant its growth, can never outgrow the wisdom of Socrates in either research, teaching, or examination.

The Divine Teacher of faith and duty was no less a perfect example to our human teaching. To our research he who partially but confidently revealed the divine mysteries of himself and his truth was eminently a model both of authority and reserve. He who spake as never man spake was an example to our teachings of the wisest and the most varied adaptation under the trying tests which truth and fidelity force every faithful teacher to apply. As our just yet pitying judge, He never failed to manifest that sympathy which is emphatically divine.

This wisdom, sympathy, and justice have ministered unexhausted inspiration, energy, and guidance to multitudes of teachers in all the Christian generations, and so long as the greatest of teachers shall continue to control our modern education He will assuredly save it from its perils.

Rev. J. J. Bullock, D. D., chaplain of the Senate, then dismissed the audience with the benediction.

At the close of the scholastic year, on the 18th of June, degrees were conferred in accordance with the recommendations of Presentation Day.

From the primary department, Lydia Leitner, of Maryland, and Edgar Graugnard, of Louisiana, were graduated with suitable diplomas.

William A. Tilley, of the District of Columbia; William Brookmire, of Pennsylvania; John A. Starkes, of Virginia, and Edward O. Herr, of Kentucky, were promoted to the collegiate department at the opening of the present term.

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

The receipts and expenditures for the year now under review will appear from the following detailed statements:

I. SUPPORT OF THE INSTITUTION.

*Receipts.*

Balance from old account.....	\$1,301 03
Received from Treasury of the United States.....	51,000 00
Received for board and tuition.....	1,240 74
Received from manual-labor fund.....	291 00
Received for books and stationery sold.....	297 19
Received for work done in shop.....	247 80
Received from sale of live stock.....	149 00
Received from sale of gas.....	110 68
Received for damage to grounds by cattle.....	5 50
Received from pupils for repairs to shoes.....	34 93