

can set it forth in proper perspective with some clear definition of its salient features. In the fourth place the fine specimens of map and atlas making which have attended the revolution in the teaching of geography have brought within reach valuable aids to the study of history, although I fear that assistance from these sources is too much neglected. All these improvements in the theory and application of historical teaching in the public schools have been as yet too few to leaven the whole lump satisfactorily. A great deal of light shed upon the study of history in some of our high schools and in fewer of our grammar grades serves to bring out by way of contrast the darkness that obscures knowledge in the public-school system as a whole. From the observation of our schools that I have been able to make and from the output of those schools which comes annually under my inspection, I will venture with much diffidence to offer this analysis of faults in the present system of historical training in our public schools. Scholars fail to perceive causation in history. Frequently I find boys who like algebra or geometry because, as they say, they can reason out each statement, can argue from page to page and leave no chasm in the understanding, but they hate history because they find no continuity in it. When I demonstrate to them some bits of the splendid progress of causation in history, I have never yet in a single instance lost the reward of a kindling look and an interested exclamation, "I see that I have never read history in the right way." Show the pupil that history is an argument, with God and nature for premises and men and women among the conclusions; show him that it is a

drama which involves his own life, and he will not be likely to evince a lack of interest.

In all grades of our public schools, both text-books and teachers of United States history exhibit a defective sense of proportion in their presentation of the subject. They linger lovingly ever the Northmen and over the era of discovery and colonization, for the reason that a little mystery hangs over Leif Erikson, and a little visible romance hovers around Miles Standish and John Smith. I know one young man who began the study of United States history with three successive teachers, and the furthest limit reached under any of them was the French and Indian War. Then there is the tiresomely familiar blunder of stringing American history on the names of the Presidents. This is the worst sin against historical proportion that I know. There is a river of history and there are currents in its waters, but we should not name them by the chips bobbing on the surface of the stream. Scholars do not receive aid as they ought from the correlative studies of language and geography. Either the reading of history or the talking of history requires and should produce a good vocabulary. Our high school pupils are so often afraid of words of more than three syllables that I am continually wondering how they ever ran the gauntlet of composition work. They recognize only what they have previously committed to memory. A new expression, a new imagination, is not an object of interest to them, but of terror and wonder. Are they so crammed with bits of unassimilated knowledge that their minds lose the power of digestion?—*Prof. Charles H. Levermore, in School and College for April.*