

different things that might have happened to him—the little things, for which there was no room in the condensed account.

This is not doing violence to the sacred Word; it is merely filling up the outline it gives. That outline is intended to be filled up by the loving meditation of its readers. It has always been filled up thus by readers that are reverent and thoughtful.

Do not say that you have no imagination and cannot do this. What you need to imagine is nothing fanciful; it is only the common, familiar experiences of men and women, boys and girls, like yourself. What would you be likely to do and say, how would you be likely to feel, if you were in their circumstances? This is the question I would have you ask in connection with the study of each Sunday School Lesson, and in answering it you will make the Lesson surprisingly clear and vivid, perhaps for the first time a vital part of your life.

Auburndale, Mass.

### The Art of Questioning

By Professor O. J. Stevenson, D.Pæd.

#### III. KINDS OF QUESTIONS TO BE AVOIDED

All successful teachers are agreed that there are certain types of questions which should, as a rule, be avoided. It is generally well to avoid questions which may be answered by "Yes" or "No." Such questions encourage guessing and do not call for any real thinking on the part of the pupil. If "Yes or No" questions are asked, the pupil should, in most cases, be required to give a reason for his answer. Suppose, for example, that the teacher asks: "Do you think that the prodigal son was really sorry for his wrong-doing?" and the pupil answers "Yes," the next question must inevitably be: "Why do you think so?"

Alternative questions, especially those that suggest the answer or encourage guessing, should also, as a general rule, be avoided. For example, the question: "Was the father of the prodigal glad or sorry to see his son when he returned?" is not a good one. It would be much more effective to ask: "What were the feelings of the father when he saw his son?"

The teacher should be careful also to see that his questions cover only one point and require only a single answer. If the teacher asks a double question, as, for example, "What did the elder son think of his brother's return, and what did he say?" he cannot be sure of a satisfactory answer. The two points involved in the question should be kept separate.

Perhaps, however, the worst type of question is the one which consists in an incomplete statement for which the pupils are expected to supply the missing part. For example: *Teacher*. "Now there came a great —?" *Pupils*. "Famine." *Teacher*. "And the prodigal son would have been glad to do what?" *Pupils*. "To eat the husks that were fed to the swine." To make matters worse, teachers who use this type of question seldom ask for individual answers, and when any one who pleases may supply the missing data the result is a confused medley of answers.

It is hardly necessary to point out, in conclusion, that useless, meaningless questions should be avoided. When an answer is given, it has become a mannerism with some teachers to ask, "How many agree?" Unless the teacher wishes to follow this question up with another, as, for example, "Why do you not agree?" or "What are your reasons for thinking so?" it is generally a waste of time and energy to ask it.

University of Toronto

### Religious Education and General Education

The relations between religious education and general education may be summarized in these three statements: (1) General education that is complete includes religious education; (2) Religious education is general education conscious of its true goal; and (3) General education relates us to the world of effects, whereas religious education relates us to the first cause or ultimate ground.

A little girl of eight was watching her father show the motion of the earth on its axis by a revolving globe. "Papa," she said, "what makes the world turn around really?" Here