

should give second-class certificates to pupils whose wretched and confessed inability to analyze comparatively easy sentences at the time of passing the third-class examination, has been augmented by a year of idleness, what is to become of analysis as taught by these students to their un-

fortunate pupils? The argument that during this year of no Grammar the analysis will be done in the Poetry class will satisfy nobody. There is but one right course, and that is to leave the matter as it is; the next best course is to have a paper on *analysis* for second-class candidates.

THE TEACHING OF GEOGRAPHY—WHAT TO AVOID IN TEACHING GEOGRAPHY.

BY WILLIAM M. DAVIS.

THE sub-title given to this paper expresses, as briefly as possible, the general considerations that I wish to present in contrast to those discussed in my first article.* The theme then was, in effect: What should the teacher know? The conviction that he should be informed far beyond the limits of his teaching was illustrated by bringing forward a number of specific examples of the kind of facts that I think every live teacher should have in mind. I shall now consider the opposite side of the question—What is unnecessary, or unimportant, or injurious in geographical teaching? The undesirable elements encountered to a greater or less degree in teaching geography, are divisible into superfluities and errors. I shall consider a number of these in order.

In my first paper, the chief emphasis was given to the importance of storing the teacher's mind with facts and explanations on the physical side of geography; not that other sides should be overlooked, but that I found space for illustration of only one division of the subject. It should now be repeated, as was then said, that knowledge of this kind is not to be discharged by the teacher in a flood,

overwhelming the pupils before they can appreciate it; but that it should be presented only when called for, piecemeal, slowly and chiefly in the way of illustrating or explaining subjects that are more directly pertinent to the usual routine of the study. It is perhaps not often that teachers of geography should be advised to husband their information; and yet I can believe that a well-taught beginner might overtask his class with an exuberance of illustration, making the geographical diet too rich for his pupils. An excess of precision is also to be avoided; minuteness of knowledge is not to be expected in children. Strong, broad descriptions are preferable, in which the chief elements of form, area, climate, resources and population are linked together in a natural and effective way, and emphasized by illustration, whereby the essentials are easily remembered by pupils of ordinary ability. Over-zeal, leading to excess in quantity or precision, is characteristic of first efforts, when the facts of the subject have not taken positions proper to their relative importance. There is a want of perspective in such teaching; matters of detail are brought forward and confused with larger matters of much greater importance; but with

* *Educational Review*, III. 417.