

brings to bear on the young, then it must follow as the night does the day that any plan which brings the master-mind of the school most closely in contact with the minds of the pupils is a plan which ought not to be neglected. Hence it should be the aim of every conscientious teacher to bring himself constantly in touch with the intellectual life of his scholars.

But not only is individual teaching thus valuable and important, it is the only safe mode by which we can ascertain that a prescribed task has been performed. Children are easily overlooked in a crowd; and when care is not taken to see that each child does his duty regularly and punctually, temptations are thrown in his way which often prove too strong for his honesty. In Arithmetic, for example, the only mode by which we can test that our explanation has been clearly and thoroughly understood is to single out successive individuals in the class, and cause them to repeat what has been explained. Wherever any explanation of a general principle has been given, the teacher should satisfy himself by questioning individuals that the information has been properly received. Let us therefore bear in mind that the more each child is individualized in our teaching, the greater likelihood will there be of our instruction taking effect, and springing up in the full luxuriance of a rich and abundant harvest.

The term simultaneous as employed in education is sometimes used to denote that the children are taught in classes, and not one by one. In this paper it is employed in opposition to the term individual, to signify that the questions are addressed to the whole class indiscriminately, and that the whole class are invited and expected to answer. Such a plan, if used skilfully and judiciously, has this advantage that it enables the teacher to accomplish a larger amount of work, and to develop to a greater degree the sympathy of numbers than is possible in individual teaching. But the dangers of such a plan in the hands of an unskilful or lazy teacher are manifold and obvious. The unskilful teacher too often deceives himself and does incalculable injury to many of his pupils by failing to perceive that the answers to his questions proceed only from a few pupils, and that too generally from those who were acquainted with the subject, while those who were ignorant of it, and who, on that very account, ought to be the objects of his special care, remain ignorant still. Lazy teachers have recourse to this mode of instruction to save themselves from trouble, and perhaps to conceal from themselves and others the general inefficiency of their teaching. Teaching that is purely simultaneous carries with it little of that direct contact of mind with mind, which gives to education its highest value, for the teacher, who adopts this mode alone, is working to a certain extent, in the dark. Simultaneous instruction, in its own place, is useful, but if used alone, it is utterly pernicious. Its proper sphere is when the teacher is elucidat-

ing general principles, when he is discussing some law or principle, for example, in Geography, when he is explaining some example in arithmetic, or giving some general lesson in Science. So long as a teacher is engaged with the general, he may teach successfully on the simultaneous plan, but the moment he leaves the general and comes to the particular, he should adopt the individual plan. For example, in explaining the process of simple subtraction to a class, the teacher may convey the general principle to his pupils simultaneously; indeed, in my opinion, this will be found to be the true and safe plan. But, if the teacher adheres to the simultaneous mode, when he comes to apply the rule to particular examples, he will make a serious mistake. As soon as he descends to particulars, he must individualize his scholars for the purpose of ascertaining that each member of the class has thoroughly grasped and mastered the explanation for himself. It is to be noted further that one great end of education should be to educe the individuality of each child, so far as this is possible; this end should be kept constantly in view, and as I dread the effect which simultaneous teaching may have on this end, I think it advisable to caution all young teachers to be sparing in the employment of it, and ever aim at the establishment of a living sympathy between themselves and each pupil by bringing themselves daily and habitually in contact with their mental life.

Closely connected with any method of teaching is the art of questioning. Young teachers often prove ineffective through failure to grasp the importance of this art, and it is to assist these that I think it necessary to draw attention to two or three leading principles of this art.

The teacher should first state the question to the whole class; and, when sufficient time for reflection has been allowed, he should then single out some pupil indiscriminately to give the answer. By this plan, the attention of all is kept up, and the examination proceeds quietly and unostentatiously, it may be, but most effectively. As each child is liable to be called upon to answer any or every question, he is thus kept from being indifferent. The time spent in questioning in this way is not greater than in the ordinary mode, but even if it were greater, the adoption of such a plan will amply repay any loss of time, for what seems to be lost in time is compensated for by the entireness and thoroughness of the work. The judicious teacher, by a glance of the eye, will know whom to select to give the answer, and his power over the whole class will be as great as over each unit of the class. Such a mode of questioning, combined with occasional simultaneous questions, will prevent the spirits of the children from flagging and thus sustain the interest unbroken to the close of the examination.

In the second place, questions should be so framed as