

to the realm of Bible study. Professors in our principal American colleges could match this series of answers from the examination papers of students in almost any line of history, ancient or modern. Nor is the confusion of facts in the minds of these pupils more remarkable than that which seems to be in the mind of many a lay or clerical Bible student in the discussion of Christian doctrine. The writer of this paragraph heard one of the more prominent lay teachers of the Bible in the United States, of a few years ago, cite the words of Satan as a proof-text in support of a truth he was emphasizing. And many a clergyman uses, in his sermons, the words of one of the

friends of Job as though they were of equal weight with those of one of the Apostles.

It is obvious that with all that is being done in the way of home instruction, of Sunday-school teaching, and of pulpit preaching, there is still a sad lack of elementary Bible knowledge on the part of many American children who are sharers in all that is secured through these three agencies combined. It is equally clear that no series of Inductive Bible studies, or of lessons according to the Church Year, or of topical treatments of duties or doctrines, would be sufficient to meet the case. Just what is needful is worth thinking about.—*The Sunday School Times.*

THE TEACHING OF SCIENTIFIC METHOD.

THE title of the address which I am privileged to deliver this evening has been advisedly chosen, in order to mark the contrast between the teaching of what is commonly called *science* and the teaching of *scientific method*: it is, I think, to the failure to discriminate between these that the delay of which we so bitterly complain in introducing experimental studies into schools generally is largely attributable.

For years past the educational world has been witness of conflicts innumerable; its time-honoured and most cherished dogmas and practices have been subjected to severely searching criticism, and it cannot be denied that they have oftentimes emerged from the battle in a terribly mangled condition; nevertheless they have hitherto manifested a marvellous recuperative power. Modern subjects, especially experimental science, have as yet barely obtained a foothold in

our schools, and their educational effect has been scarcely appreciable—nay, it is even said, and probably with too much of truth, that the results under our present—may I not say—want of system, are inferior to those obtained in the purely classical days of yore, when the scholars' efforts were less subdivided—when fewer subjects claimed their attention. The net upshot of discussion simply has been that we are intensely dissatisfied with our present position, and that we realize that some change has to be made. What that change is, we are not yet agreed. This, after all, is a very healthy state to be in, and one which necessarily must precede the construction of a satisfactory programme of studies suited to the vastly changed conditions under which the work of the world has been carried on since those two potent agents, steam and electricity, have assumed sway.

In setting our house in order, one