

find out the meaning yourselves." I should tell them at once, and so make better use of the time. Still I am of the opinion that a prevailing prominent error in our system of instruction is giving too much assistance—telling too much. It is producing a crop of imitators. The pupil who is helped all along the way will be neither able nor willing to "paddle his own canoe," or if he attempts to do so will be ingloriously capsized.

*How far should a pupil be assisted in the preparation of his lesson?* Just so far that he may know how to go about the preparation of it in a proper way. If the lesson is unusually difficult, it is proper for the teacher to point out the difficulties and suggest their solution, but no more. Pupils should be taught that the lesson is a trial of their strength, and that to fail is to acknowledge defeat, but that to succeed is to score a victory. I think, too, that by helping pupils a good deal, they come to distrust their own ability, and this is, in many cases disheartening and enervating.

*What is the difference between teaching and talking?* Teaching is communicating to another the knowledge of that of which he was before ignorant. It is educating. Talking is familiar or unrestrained conversation. Now, to communicate knowledge or to educate, some conversation is necessary. (And I would say here, in passing, that the conversational plan of teaching is the proper one for quite young people.)

But teaching differs from talking in that the former is not unrestrained conversation. In teaching, conversation has a special aim, and that is to hold the minds of the pupils closely on the subject of the lesson, resolutely refusing to entertain irrelevant thoughts, or give expression to them. In talking restraint is kept at the minimum.

The design is to make all hands

feel free and easy; and this is done by purposely avoiding all mental effort. In teaching, the minds of both teacher and taught are on the alert, ready and eager for *work*, and not play. The subject is developed and presented in a logical way, the end being kept in view from the beginning to the close of the lesson. In talking the mind throws off its guard, throws down its defence, and solicits and gives expression to ideas relevant and irrelevant, sensible and nonsensical. No attention is paid to the critical and logical elaboration of a subject, because that requires effort. Those who are in the habit of playing teacher in familiar intercourse instead of instructing or pleasing their audience usually bore them. The teacher who is in the habit of descending to familiar talk with the class on the lesson in hand, will be considered by the pupils a capital fellow, but no teacher.

In teaching the pupils do most of the speaking. In talking the teacher does the most of it. I have known teachers who, instead of having pupils recite to them, seemed anxious to recite the lesson to the pupils. When the teacher is well prepared, this will assume the form of a lecture, but when unprepared will become attenuated into the air, or degenerate into mere gabble. Sometimes a teacher should talk, once in a while should lecture, but his main business is to *teach*.

*Should a teacher confine himself to the printed questions of the author?* The principle referred to and the remarks made in reply to the question concerning the use of text-book by the teacher in recitation will apply here. Besides, a pupil may answer the printed question correctly, and yet not know the meaning of it. In short, it is better for the teacher to make his own question, even if they are not quite as good as those in the book; because if he depends constantly for his ques-