

not to contain the answer, and in putting them, the voice should be so modulated as not to suggest it. If these points are not attended to, the question serves no good purpose—it is simply a waste of time. Such a question as the following is of no value whatever: "Was not Elizabeth of England contemporary with Mary Queen of Scots?" There can be no doubt as to the answer, and the question is useless. Neither should questions, requiring for answers the monosyllables yes or no be introduced except as leading questions, when they furnish the basis of a continued examination. It is to be remembered, moreover, that the chief end of questioning is to stimulate thought, not to call forth mere smartness; hence questioning should be conducted calmly and deliberately paying due regard to the ability of the particular pupil. Many teachers are apt to confound rapid questioning and answers with sure and effective teaching, and to imagine that the largest amount of work is performed where there is most excitement and physical movements. And here I take it upon myself to caution you all against being misled by this too current belief, for, in many instances, the very reverse is probably nearer the truth. There are minds so framed as to think with great rapidity, but the great majority are not so constituted; and as the true teacher should rest satisfied with nothing short of the evolution of thought, he must learn carefully to discriminate between the semblance and the reality of actual thinking.

It may not be out of place in an address of this kind to add a few remarks on the so called "Socratic" method of questioning which used to be much in vogue. I think it is fairly open to doubt whether this mode as commonly understood and practised has been productive of much real good in teaching. If we are to judge from the dialogues of Plato, questioning in the hands of Socrates was a merely controversial device, rather than a means of teaching. It was indeed, a kind of "sophistry" in the modern sense, and it could quite truly make the worse cause appear the better one. Socrates by his questions not unfrequently confused his victims; and then, when he had fairly or unfairly—he did not very much care which—proved them wrong, he dropped his catechising, and made long speeches; that is, he lectured, and lectured right gloriously, if Plato is to be believed. Now Socrates did not usually teach a class of boys or girls, and so we must not discourage our young pupils by a mere patter of questions having confutation as their aim. Need I add that little profit is to be got from mere lecturing. Boys and girls must be induced to work; they must be set to master things, to bring us the proof, and to rejoice in their own power of expression, not in ours. We must not silence them by perpetually talking ourselves, or by prescribing the exact form to be taken by their thoughts when expressed. We must be moderate in our use of questioning as a discipline in instruction, for, as one writer has ad-

mirably expressed it, "the excessive use of questioning is a worship of mere machinery."

In a previous part of this address, I pointed out the necessity of proceeding with deliberation in the process of questioning. Deliberation is still more necessary in the explanation of difficulties to a class, for everything may be spoiled by a little want of patience or by incautious hurry. Is it not far better to do a little thoroughly than to do a great deal superficially and unsoundly? We are all ready to admit the truth of this, but I must confess we sometimes neglect the force of it in our practice. It is much better to give half our intended lesson well than the whole, if only the half can be thoroughly mastered and understood. Let us determine, therefore, that what we teach, be it ever so little, shall be thoroughly learned. Often stop and recapitulate if the class seems indifferent or languid; do not regard that time as lost which is spent in making yourselves sure that what has been said is understood. Pause whenever it is necessary, and put questions to the least attentive members of the class; above all be determined at every step to secure that the whole of the class is advancing with you. I am often surprised to observe how frequently this is overlooked by really intelligent and valuable teachers in their practice. They seem to take it for granted that what is clear to them, and evidently so plain to a few members of the class is therefore communicated to the whole of their pupils, whereas they ought to have evidence of this fact step by step. It should be remembered that attention once lost is a difficult thing to recover, and that very great care should be exercised not to lose it. I am satisfied that more teachers lose the attention of their class by attempting to teach too much, and by going on too fast than they are inclined to believe. That person is the best teacher who is not afraid of the drudgery of repeating, and going back, and questioning in many different forms, and who is content to move slowly provided he can make the duller member of the class move with him. Remember that your progress in a lesson should rather be measured by the dull pupil than by the quick one. As Dr. Fitch has well expressed it, "move with the slower learners, not with the best, and then your pace will be at least sure, even though it may not be so rapid as you could wish." Permit me in closing this paper to bring to your attention the portrait of the Ideal Teacher, drawn by Quintilian nearly two thousand years ago: Above all things let the teacher assume towards his pupils the disposition of a parent, and consider that he takes the place of those who consign their children to his care. Let him not himself commit, or in others suffer, what is wrong. Let him be neither too stern and austere, nor too lax and easy, lest on one hand aversion, on the other disobedience, result. Let him often speak of what is honourable and good; for the oftener he advises, the more rarely will he