and when he sees the importance of constant observation of the children whom he has to educate, and of reflection on the methods which he employs. Every lesson he gives will be a lesson to himself. He will form a lofty ideal of the work of a teacher, and will set himself to attain it with earnestness, humility, and enthusiasm.

The natural order of training a teacher might seem to be to first teach him the truths of mental science and human physiology, that he might know the nature of the child whom he has to educate, and then to teach him the art of education itself; but this order is not a feasible one in the case of pupil-teachers, and I question whether it would be judicious in the case even of adults. You cannot learn to swim on dry land by studying the laws of Hydrostatics and Mechanics. Theory and practice must go side by side: practice to supply the facts upon which scientific induction is based, and to test theory; theory to direct the mind to the observation of facts, and to guide practice. Pupil-teachers are too young, when first apprenticed, to begin the formal study of Psychology. They must first learn to practise good methods, and wait for the full understanding of the principles upon which those methods depend until their minds are riper and better informed; though, of course, a good teacher will always try to secure, as far as possible, the intelligent co-operation of his pupil-teachers.

The first thing, therefore, that a pupil-teacher has to do, in order to learn how to teach, is to study the methods already at work in the school in which he is apprenticed, and endeavour to carry them out. To do this he must have sufficient leisure to be present, from time to time, at lessons given by the head-master or other adult teachers of the school; and the head master must have sufficient leisure to see that he is following out properly the methods approved of. Such a condition of things is impossible when a school is worked with a "starvation" staff. No school should be so meagrely staffed that not a single teacher could be spared from his class without inconvenience. I am convinced that a reasonable liberality in the matter of staff is a true economy. The value of "the master's eye" is notorious in every kind of business. It is difficult to exaggerate it in the case of a school. I am far from thinking that the head teacher ought to do nothing but superintend his subordinates; but, on the other hand, I should consider a school miserably organized, if neither he nor his pupil-teachers could ever be spared from the actual work of teaching.

It is not, of course, desirable that the methods of a school should be too rigid and uniform; but, as a rule, every head-teacher has certain methods of maintaining discipline and of teaching which he considers best, and those methods the pupil teacher should carefully follow. Let them be distinctly known and enforced. To take the case of reading. Reading is a subject which may be taught in a hundred different ways, and requires to be taught in very different ways at different stages. Let the method approved of by the head-teacher be laid down in black and white, and let it be like the law of the Medes and Persians. It may not be the best of all possible methods, but it is the outcome of the teacher's experience; it secures a certain unity of procedure in the school as a whole; and, whatever its defects may be, it is almost sure to be better than any method which the pupil teacher can extemporise or elaborate for himself. So with other subjects. A pupil-teacher should not be in a position to say, "I was never told what I had to do, or how I was to do it." The older pupil-teachers may be allowed somewhat more liberty; it may be even expedient to permit them occasionally to make practical experiments of different well-established methods; but obviously apprentices ought, first of all, to carry out the methods of their own master. Raphael must begin by reproducing the excellence of Perugino. By-and-by he will be able to originate new excellences and create a school of his own. When the pupil-teacher goes to see other schools (opportunities for which he should never let slip) or when he goes to College, he will have opportunities of comparing the methods with which he is familiar with those of other teachers. When he is in charge of a school of his own, he will be in a position to strike out new methods. But, if he wishes to rise as a teacher, his aspirations can only be gratified by his first mounting on the shoulders of his predecessors.

The head-teacher, in watching the efforts of his pupil-teacher, will be careful to note his defects, and speak to him about them, either after school or at the time, out of the hearing of the class. Or he will without seeming to supersede the teacher, take the class for a few minutes, and show by example the points in which he wishes him to improve.—*School Guardian.*

On the relation between Learning and Teaching.

Home lessons, or their equivalent, the silent preparation of tasks and exercises by private study, form a most important factor in the work of education. In our old grammar schools, indeed, the work done by the pupil at home, or by private study at school, formed the staple of his education. The master of such a school was, and it is to be feared in too many cases still is, a mere setter and hearer of tasks. In many of this class of schools the master is in no true sense a teacher; he is rather a task-master and examiner. The true teacher is something far above this; he does not merely measure out so much work to be "got up," and withold all explanation and instruction except what is needed to correct the blunders of his pupils whilst reciting their tasks. This indirect mode of instruction, which consists mainly in correcting errors, is far inferior in point of interest and effect to that direct teaching which is given as a means of elucidating the subject and suggesting the best methods of learning it, before setting it as a task to be privately prepared. The taskmaster acts on the principle of setting traps to trip up his pupils, and then lending a helping hand to set them on their feet again; he seems to think that cure is better than prevention. that the correction of blunders when actually made, is a more effectual mode of teaching than that which endeavours to prevent the pupils from falling into error. Nor is the elementary teacher who has been trained in a different school alway free from this mistake. Too often for instance, he turns his "dictation lessons" into an examination merely of the pupils' powers of spelling. Without giving his scholars an opportunity of preparing for the exercise, he selects a difficult passage which is sure to produce a large crop of blunders, and then having found out the weak points he proceeds to apply the remedy. How much more satisfactory in every way if the pupil had the opportunity given him, either at home or at school, of learning the spelling of all the words on a page or two of his reading-book before being called upon to write any part of it from it from dictation! "Prevention," is undoubtly, "better than cure;" the prevention of errors by preparation is much better than curing them by subsequent correction; it is more economical in respect both to time and temper.