

powers equal to those of their own much older and specialized students, who, moreover, spend a much longer time at the subject.

Mr. Stuart, of St. Dunstan's College, Catford, thinks that it is hopeless to attempt to educate the reasoning faculties of the ordinary boy. He regards the use of science in schools as an instrument to teach observation and accuracy; to teach boys not to gain all their knowledge from books; to give them something besides ideas and abstractions. Mr. Stuart also

believes that an elementary course of physics should precede chemistry. He finds qualitative experiments more satisfactory than quantitative ones. His conclusion is: First teach your pupils to observe from experiment, and to observe accurately; then bring before them your arranged order of ascertained facts. In conclusion, Mr. Stuart doubts whether you can teach boys to discover principles; but he believes that you can teach boys to discover facts.

(To be Continued.)

"SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF TEACHING."

(Continued from May number.)

NOW, as before hinted, it is utterly impossible to keep these two alternative methods apart. Nobody in his senses could maintain that we should introduce the Socratic system into our modern life. This would mean that we should burn our books, abandon the stores of knowledge which have accumulated in the course of centuries, and go about cross-examining each other on our abstract conceptions of things, the nature of knowledge, the difference between reality and mere appearance, between the things of the senses and their archetype in the reason—closing our ears all the time to the great throbbing life around us, and regarding the 'march of science as a degradation of the race. On the other hand, no one dreams now of defending the shovelling and cramming business. We know quite well that there is more of it than there ought to be, and that Thring's wail over the worship of examinations and their concomitant evils is only too well founded. But we profess, at least, to teach as intelligent people, who are dealing with

living intelligences, and not with pits into which rubbish may be shot. As in most discussions of the kind, the question is one of degree, and the truth lies between the two extremes. Thring has done good service to education by pleading for a little of the Socratic element; let us see if we cannot apply something of the method for which he pleads in favour of the cause which he condemns.

Take the contention—only too common—that such and such teaching is worthless because it is merely the communication of facts. Now let Socrates have a little to say in the matter. What are facts, and why is the admission of them into the mind worthless? Is a fact such a dead thing that it has no vitalizing energy over the soil which receives it? Are facts inorganic matter crammed into a mind which they overload, but do not invigorate? Let us see more closely. Suppose a fact in history—Julius Cæsar was assassinated, or the English beat the French at the battle of Waterloo. When a boy repeats either of these statements in answer