

ward off a single blow. But while the public remunerate the profession, and society rates it, on a scale that does it infinite injustice, is it fair, we ask, to be censorious, or to be severe when even many, it may be, of its members lapse from grace? In all of the professions there will be found the deserving and the undeserving; in none, however, is there so much expected from its members as in that of teaching. The public have reason to be more considerate; and the Toronto

press, particularly, has of late much of which to accuse itself. The two leading papers have fallen into a manner of speaking of teachers which is in the highest degree reprehensible. The *Globe's* sneers at the "school-master" are an insufferable impertinence, and should be resented by every one who respects his profession. But this is a matter that we shall deal with at some future time. Here we must bring the present paper to a close.

OBJECT LESSONS.

WE hear a great deal said about using object lessons in the place of text books, and very well it all sounds. How well it all works, we are not ready to say. For it is very easy for a teacher to present an object to his pupils, and ask a stereotyped list of questions about it, but it does not follow from this that the pupils are greatly benefited thereby. He may not have gained by this any insight into the nature of the object, or any real knowledge concerning it. This or that peculiarity which the object possesses has been pointed out to the child, but his faculties have not been quickened in any degree, no train of thought has been aroused in his mind, and as far as the training of the observing power goes—the real end of object teaching—nothing whatever has been gained.

Now an object is an object simply, and nothing worth mentioning is gained by having it present when some one talks about it, unless the talk is vivifying, awakening, stirring. If the teacher has no knowledge about the object of which he speaks—suppose it is a piece of coral—except what he has gained by a hurried perusal of an article in the encyclopædia, the exercise may be a degree less stupid for the children if he holds up a piece of coral, or passes it around the class—but nothing more is probably gained. The difference between this wooden method of object teaching and that of the teacher whose thorough knowledge and vividness of description

can make the children see an object which is *not* present, is infinite. However, we would not interfere with the object lesson craze. Much good has been and will be done by it, even though much of its teaching is very poor and crude.—*Educational Weekly*.

EVEN the philosophers sometimes have the laugh turned on them. Not long since, in the presence of Herbert Spencer, a little boy said, "What an awful lot of crows!" The philosopher corrected the youth by saying, "I have yet to learn, little master, that there is anything to inspire awe in such a bird as the crow." For once the author of "First Principles" had met his match. The boy replied, "But I didn't say there was; I didn't say what a lot of awful crows, but what an awful lot of crows!" Sound for the boy.—*Harper's Weekly*.

A SUFFICIENT REASON.—A master was explaining that the land of the world is not continuous. He asked a boy, "Now, Jack, could your father walk round the world?" "No, sir," said the boy. "And why?" "Because he's dead, sir."

SCRIPTURE EXAMINATION.—*Question*—What do you know of Jonah? *Answer*—Jonah hid himself for forty days and forty nights in the belly of a whale; at the end of this time he was hungry, and he prayed and said "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian."