

The most important contribution which the physio-
crats made towards social philosophy was, however,
their influence upon economic theory in this country
as manifested conspicuously in the writings of Adam
Smith. It marks one of several instances in which
French thought transplanted upon foreign soil has

28.
Adam
Smith.

l'Education, 1851, vol. i. p. 180.) And yet it is to French literature that we are especially indebted for marking the difference which exists between education and instruction. This subject was treated on two memorable occasions, at the time of the first Revolution and again when France had run through its course of three Revolutions, by two men of great ability, representing quite opposed directions of thought: the first was Condorcet, the other Mgr. Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans. The first heralds the going out of the word education, the latter its restitution in French educational literature. Larousse says, in 1870, "Malheureusement plus on avance, plus on semble vouloir identifier l'éducation avec l'instruction." (See for further details a Paper on "Education and Instruction in England and Abroad," by J. T. Merz: 'Proceedings of the University of Durham Philosophical Society,' vol. i.) This phenomenon may be connected with the circumstance mentioned by Lord Morley in his interesting studies on the leaders of French Thought during the Eighteenth Century (see notably his articles on Turgot and Condorcet in the second volume of his 'Miscellanies'). He there points out that both Turgot and Condorcet, in their otherwise memorable and advanced conception of the philosophy of History, laid exclusive stress on the intellectual factor, leaving out of consideration the evolution of moral forces. After

showing that both thinkers advance beyond the static views of Vico and Montesquieu according to which history presents a cycle and human affairs move in a constant and self-repeating orbit, introducing instead a dynamical theory of unlimited progress, he says of Turgot that his "conception of progress regards it mainly, if not entirely, as a gradual dawn and diffusion of light, the spreading abroad of the rays of knowledge. He does not assert, as some moderns have crudely asserted, that morality is of the nature of a fixed quantity; still he hints at something of the kind. . . . And because he could not perceive there to be any new growths in moral science, he left out from a front place among the forces that have given strength and ripeness to the human mind, the superior capacity of some men for kindling by word and example the glowing love and devout practice of morality in the breasts of many generations of their fellows."—('Miscellanies,' ii. p. 106, 107.) And of Condorcet he says: "The freedom of the reason was so dear to him that he counted it an abuse for a parent to instil his own convictions into the defenceless minds of his young children. This was the natural outcome of Condorcet's mode of viewing history as the record of intellectual emancipation, while to Comte its deepest interest was as a record of moral and emotional cultivation." (Ibid., p. 554.)