

learned about it—what has been settled by repeated experiment and observation. It is so of law and medicine, only they have become more emphatically *book* sciences and professions than farming—not from any substantial difference in the professions themselves, but because men have been trained and educated for those professions and have not yet been for farming. When the barbers were the surgeons, there were few if any books about surgery; nor is it likely the barbers could read what there were. Law is perhaps the oldest book profession, but was once an unwritten science, as farming now is. Science is nothing but garnered knowledge; and that men have no better garnered up the treasures of agricultural observation and experience, has not arisen from their being no fixed principles of husbandry, but rather from this, that men have never been taught husbandry as a *science* before they entered upon the practice of it as a *profession*; and perhaps, partly from this circumstance, too, that nature does so much of the farmer's work for him that he has been ashamed to record his own mite. But this state of things is fast passing away; whether it be that nature is growing more churlish, or man more conceited, I know not. Agriculture is fast becoming a written science in the most enlightened States of Europe, and it advances in importance as it does so. "Mr. Colman in his able report on European Agriculture, made in 1844, describes only nine agricultural schools, though others then existed on the continent of which he was not probably aware." Dr. Edward Hitchcock in his report to the legislature of Massachusetts in 1851, on the same subject, reports three hundred and fifty two schools, most of which had come into existence since Mr. Colman.

Men have erred of late years, it seems to me, in the importance they give to some branches of agricultural science. Thus, a patriotic citizen of the State of Georgia lately gave \$20,000 to the Georgia University to endow a professorship of *Agricultural Chemistry*. Now agricultural chemistry is a good thing, but bears about the same proportion to the whole science of agriculture, that contingent remainders and executory devises do to the science of law, or *Materia Medica* to the science of medicine. Agricultural science is made up of the experience men have gained in the culture of the earth; and there are certain fixed principles of that culture, established by experience, just as of any other branch of human knowledge. That there are not more of them, is our shame; and is due mainly to men not studying the theory of ag-

riculture, just as they do the theories of law and medicine, before beginning the practice of it.—How long would it have taken law and medicine to have accumulated facts enough to make book sciences of them, if the Lawyers and Doctors had never looked into a book before commencing the practice, and scorned to look into one afterwards? If we made our attorneys and physicians as we do our farmers, they would make sad havoc of our property and carcasses. Some persons rail at book learning in farming matters: But do these same men think lawyers less worthy of trust in important business, or confide their lives to physicians with less confidence because they have read the books which contain the observations and experience of other lawyers and doctors? Far from it. Then why rail at agricultural reading? If a few conceited asses have read Leibig's Chemistry and committed foolish blunders, does it therefore follow that clever men will derive no profitable knowledge by studying the principles of natural science, which explain the phenomena of the vegetable kingdom? Science is a deep well, from which men draw according to the strength of their understandings. Wisdom lies at the bottom of it, and it takes deep and long draughts to pluck her up. The surface is covered with the intoxicating froth of conceit, which too many have sipped and gone mad, and hence the stupid prejudice against scientific agriculture. As well call the chicanery of the pettifogger the science of law, or quackery the science of medicine, as the blunders of a few smatters in agricultural chemistry the science of agriculture.

All that our fathers knew about farming would now be at our command if agriculture were a book science. Will the sneerers say our fathers knew nothing? Who that has read the early volumes of the old American Farmer will admit it? There is wisdom and experience enough in "Skinner's American Farmer" and in "Ruffins' Farmer's Register" alone, to make agriculture a written science, if we had some agricultural Maury to examine and digest these scattered stores of knowledge, and reduce them to the form of practical farming directions. When Mathew F. Maury modestly applied to the Secretary of the Navy for leave to examine the piles of old moth-eaten log-books which cumbered the Bureaux of the department, who could have foreseen that the "sailing directions" would have been the result of his patient labor? Already has the world derived such advantages from Lieutenant Maury's investigations and discoveries, that his name is ranked among the great-