

der that that which is correct may be more thoroughly understood and appreciated.

One of the commonest methods of teaching geography is to burden the mind of the pupil with a great deal of unnecessary knowledge, knowledge which is of no present use to him and most probably never will be. This would not be so bad, if it were well taught, but the text-book is commonly used in connection with this cramming method. A certain amount of work is prescribed, and the pupil is commanded under penalty of the direct punishment to commit it to memory. He does so, but what has he gained? Absolutely nothing. Yes worse than nothing, because he has a jumble of confused sounds in his head, each of which when mentioned conveys no distinct idea to his brain, and by constant repetition confuses him still more. The pupil can also give the exact height of every mountain peak in South America, can tell the length to the fraction of a mile of every river on the globe. Now of what avails all this. True the memory is to a small extent cultivated, but is it not at the expense of the powers of reason and imagination. Passing of examinations is not the chief end of man, although to judge from several papers set at the last teachers examination, it would seem to be so. The fact is however patent to all that until examiners improve their methods of examining, the cramming method will continue in our public schools.

Again there is what Professor King designates as the no-study method. By this method, and sorry are we to say that it is a too common one, the teacher comes into class without preparation or forethought and expects to have a vigorous lively lesson. Picking up a text-book he communicates to or draws from the pupils the facts therein contained. Matter outside of the text-book is religiously tabooed, strictly prohibited. In defence of this it is urged that there are more facts in the text-book than the pupils will remember. Why then attempt to burden his mind with more? This however is an utter fallacy. A great teacher once said "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Let the teacher who believes in this method, take a good book on, say South America, and read it to his class and watch the heightened interest taken in the lesson; watch the brightening eye when the lesson

time draws near, watch his own ever increasing interest as the days pass on, and above all watch the immense progress which the class makes. Let him watch all these carefully and be convinced.

Again some teachers go to the opposite extreme. They come before the class laden with facts. They stand on the platform and pour forth a vast accumulation of facts. The pupils sit with open mouths and uplifted eyes and seem to be drinking in with avidity everything that is said. This is a case which Coleridge's famous comparison of the hour-glass is distinctly applicable. It runs in and runs out again. It was a good lecture but a poor lesson. This however is a fault on the right side and one easily remedied.

Another fault is paying too much attention to map work. Many pupils can point out at sight on the map, any place however small or unimportant, yet ask them for instance to describe the Great Central Plain of North America and they are utterly at a loss. The map is an important factor in good teaching, but it is a mistake to place reliance on it.

And now we arrive at a much disputed point in the teaching of geography. Two conflicting systems of teaching here come into prominence, each having its earnest supporters. These are the analytic and the synthetic. The former begins with the world as a whole and passes successively back through the continent, country and province to the home. The latter pursues the opposite course. It commences at home and gradually widens its horizon till the whole world is finally grasped. It is the former of these two methods which we shall here advocate.

(To be continued in our next.)

CORRESPONDENCE.

DILEMMA.—When I was at the Normal School I was taught to teach certain subjects in a particular way. Now the inspector wishes me to teach them another method. Which one should I follow?

Ans.—Neither. Have you not a mind of your own? If you have, get some standard works on these subjects, and work out a method for yourself. Take all the advice you can get from the inspector or any one else, but till you are able to think and decide for yourself you will never make a successful teacher except in the opinion of the person whom you imitate. Your question shows clearly that you are now only looking for some from whom you can copy. If you cannot think for yourself how can you expect to be able to teach a pupil to think for himself?