

tu le tonnere au lointain? Non, mais j'entends le mugissement des vagues," into such English as "Do you hear it thundering at a distance? No, but I hear the magic of the ogres." It is his teachers, again, who doubt their sanity when they find him deliberately committing to paper the statement that Mary Queen of Scots, was beheaded in England, and died at Edinburgh, or asserting that the Israelites were fed in the desert "by unleavened bread, which fell from heaven," or describing the Mississippi as a river which "has no mouth to let the water out of," and silencing in advance all possible objection to this hypothesis by the convincing explanation, "The sun draws the water up; that is the reason why this river does not overflow its banks." But, if they are wise, they do not treat such efforts of his genius quite seriously. They credit him with sincerity in many blunders, but not in all. Even the bewilderment that perpetual cram in-

duces has its limits; and although we may be disposed to accept as its victim the ingenuous youth who referred Wat Tyler's rebellion to a refusal to pay the income-tax, and even his fellow who declared that the Habeas Corpus Act was passed "because the law used to swindle people who went to it for judgment," and who explained the benefit it conferred on the English nation to be that "a man can now only be judged by persons in the same line of business," human credulity revolts from the demand made on it by the audacious youth who replied to the question whether Elizabeth had descendants, "She was the father of James I." One prefers to regard him as the utterer of a protest, admirable in its way, against the short-sighted policy of a world which had done its worst to convert him into a walking text-book, and which he felt had much better suffer him to remain a boy.—*The Saturday Review*.

EMERSON said something like this: "We send our boy to school, but the boys on the play-ground educate him."

"IF you are a poor teacher you will do most of the talking yourself; if a good teacher, you will have the pupils do most of it." Yes, and if you are a good teacher you will not scold a pupil for stumbling and tumbling before he has learned to talk, nor demolish the bashful boy or girl with a stern "sit down," because he is neither a dictionary nor a grammar unto himself. The good teacher takes his pupils as they are, not as he would have them, *a priori*; that is, as he thinks they ought to be, and builds from the foundation as he finds it. How many teachers fret and fume, and make uncomfortable both the children and themselves, because they find them ignorant where they should be wise, and that their previous training has not obliterated all indications of their descent from old Adam; or, as the biologists will have it, from a dam with an appendage!

THE EDUCATION OF OUR GIRLS.—The old notion that education spoilt our servants lingers among us yet, and many are asking what sort of *wives* and *mothers* are our learned girls likely to make? To say the least, we reply, no worse than the girls made who had not the learning. For wifehood and motherhood depend very largely upon natural disposition, cultured character, and their own mother's influence upon them. To say the most, we reply, better wives, as they are likely to come near to, and sympathise fully with, the *best* in their husbands, and will act from cultured judgment and thought in household affairs, and better mothers, as they can more wisely train their children; as they will be less liable to try all sorts of medical nostrums; and as they will skilfully endeavour to culture in harmony the bodily and mental faculties. It should not be forgotten that much of the advanced education of our girls is *directly practical*, bearing on household claims and duties.—*Ex.*