

is often merely chronological. He leaps from one isolated foothold of fact to another, finding neither rest nor satisfaction in any. And even in the case of those text-books that aim at giving a connected account of the life of the people in its various aspects, the same method of going forward is followed.

To the average child the study of history, as indeed that of any other subject, after this fashion, is uninteresting. His mind refuses to go forward willingly in this will-o'-the-wisp chase after effects. Even if you lead him along a line of the most perfect synthesis, his mind, unless analytically employed at each step of the synthesis, does not follow with a full interest. You have robbed him of the motive for effort—the desire to find the cause of an effect, not the effect of a cause. He is not so much concerned with what this will do as with what caused this, not so much with *how* as with *what*, not so much with *synthesis* as with *analysis*.

Never was a truer educational dictum proclaimed than the Herbartian maxim that the substitution of any other motive for effort other than interest in the subject injures the character of the child. And what is this but another way of saying that there is no real education where interest in the subject is not the motive of the mental effort? To secure this Herbartian interest the learner must be led along that analytical path which the pupil himself unconsciously points out at the birth of thought. It is, alas, too true that the little would-be analyst can be brought to submit quietly, and blindly, to the bondage of the synthetical leading string, lured on, it may be, by the poor hope that he will ultimately reach some light. Childhood is the period of faith. Yes, but a more rational faith than oft attends the child in later school life.

That psychology is not yet dead

that makes much of the child memory and little of the child intelligence. It is psychology of the study, not a psychology of the class-room. It is partly owing to it, that the child of our lower standards is cursed with an *olla podrida* of meaningless facts. And yet in reality he is an embryo discoverer, unconsciously working analytically, and demanding analytical explanations of things.—*Educational News, Scotland*.

THE OLD DISTRICT SCHOOL TRIED BY FACTS.

IN these days of over-teaching it might not be amiss to recall some of the virtues of the old system. The defects of the old system have been harped upon so much, that it would be quite an easy matter to persuade ourselves that it had no virtues; and that the modern improved school has no defects. One glance at national facts, however, will dissipate all this assumption. The greatest generation of Americans that has appeared so far, in the history of the country, the generation that carried the country through the civil war, and gave us that finely disciplined, magnificent volunteer army, the able generals to conduct it, and the wise statesmen to provide for it, was the product largely of the old-time public school. In the stern discipline of the old district school, where the autocratic schoolmaster was the unlimited monarch of all he surveyed, was laid the foundation of that valuable military discipline that ultimately rescued our nation from the throes of dissolution.

The old school had its defects—defects which have been remedied; but it had also its virtues, for which, in my way of thinking, the new school has furnished but scant compensation. The new school makes better