

so, but with no better success than at first. Reluctantly we were compelled to ask aid the second time. The master looked at us with surprise, if not with some irritation. "Why," said he, "I have done that sum for you. Go on to the next." And that was the way we went through the arithmetic.

How often have we seen the scholar hesitating for a word in the midst of a sentence, upon which the whole meaning depended, kindly supplied with that word by the teacher, who never seemed to dream that the pupil in failing to get that had failed in obtaining any idea from the sentence whatever, and that instead of its being a collection of words making complete sense, it was a jumble of words making complete nonsense. Thus: "John, what is English Grammar?" John starts very volubly, and on a very high key: "English Grammar teaches us to read the English language"—teacher interposes, "Teaches how to *speak*, is n't it?"—John readily assents: "Teaches how to *speak* the English language correctly." "But it teaches something else, does n't it?" "Yes sir." "Well what else is it that it teaches?" "Why, sir, I know very well what it is, but I can't just think of it." "It teaches to *write* the language correctly, does n't it?" "Yes, sir! I was just going to say that." Now if the teacher were to ask John, after all this catechising and these leading questions, to give the definition in full, he probably could come no nearer it than at first.

No teacher can be sure that his pupils have an intelligent knowledge of their lessons, unless they can recite the words of the text promptly, and without the straining effort to recollect, that it is painful to witness. Whenever a scholar fixes his eye on vacancy with a dull leaden look, accompanied by knit eyebrows and an evident unconsciousness of every thing going on about him, and runs over the words of his lesson with precipitate rapidity, he should be stopped at once, as he knows nothing more of what he is attempting to recite than though it was Choclaw or Sanscript. He should be compelled to go over the text very slowly, enunciating every word with the utmost distinctness, giving the definition of every word, and at last, the sense in his own language. Even after the subject has been held up, suspended, as it were, in a dry light, so that the pupil can look all around it and has answered every question upon it, the teacher can not feel too sure that it is thoroughly understood. We remember a case in point in our own experience. We were examining a class that we had taught in English grammar, and which, we had a great deal of confidence, understood pretty thoroughly as much of the subject as it had been over. One of the questions was—"What are the three methods of distinguishing gender in English?" The answer, of course, was—"By different words, by different terminations, and by words prefixed or affixed." What was our disgust to find that several of the class had written determinations for terminations, showing by this most ridiculous answer, that they had attempted to commit words to memory without the most remote conception of their meaning. If our friends, who think they are doing remarkably well in their teaching, and are inclined to be puffed up thereat, let them put their pupils through a pretty stiff written examination, and our word for it, they will have the conceit taken out of them pretty effectually.

To return to questions suggestive as helps over hard places. A friend of ours relates that he once was present at the examination in geometry of a graduating class in a young ladies' academy, which proceeded something in this wise:

Teacher.—Miss A., what proposition have you to demonstrate? Miss A. says nothing, and looks embarrassed. "It is to demonstrate that the three angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles, is it not?" "Yes, sir!" Another pause. "You draw the triangle ABC, do you not?" "Yes, sir!" And she draws it. "You then draw the line ED parallel to the line AB, do you not?" "Yes sir," And so on through the whole demonstration! That was a process of unfolding mind, was n't it?

Let us say, in conclusion, if any of our readers have been in

the habit of attempting to help their pupils over difficulties by suggestive questions, reform it altogether as you value your success as teachers.—*Ohio Educational Monthly*.

The Earl of Malmesbury on Popular Education.

The Earl of Malmesbury distributed the prizes at Christchurch, Hants, in connection with the Society of Arts, and after a few introductory remarks, said:—It is almost superfluous for me to talk to you upon the importance of educating the people: there is at the present time but one opinion on the subject. One cannot but recollect with a smile of satisfaction how different the opinion upon this subject is now from what it used to be formerly—say twenty or thirty years ago. I remember a very great man, and at that time a very great Liberal, for he was a truly liberal man—but he was a man of his time—no less a man than Prime Minister of this country—I remember him joking about Education and expressing his belief that it might be carried too far, as he termed it. With his usual wit he described what would happen if housemaids learned to read. Then he said they would read novels in bed and set the house on fire; if they learned to write, they would waste their time in writing letters to their sweethearts. Now, I confess at that time I did not see why they should not write letters to their sweethearts. That is an example of the views of the greatest men years ago as to popular education; but you don't see the same thing now. If you talk of housemaids and servants generally reading or not reading, you know at once that no gentleman would take a servant into his house who could not read. Why, if he gave him half-a-dozen notes to carry out, and the man could not read, how would he know how to deliver them? He would be obliged to ask persons whom he met how this or that note was directed, and thus the whole town would become informed of his master's business. Yet such was the case certainly not more than thirty years ago, that many servants in gentlemen's houses, and certainly the greatest number in the houses of the masters and mistresses of the lower classes, were ignorant of reading and writing. Therefore, I would ask you not to adopt the discouraging tone of some recent speakers of respectability on Education. I have seen some within the last three weeks try to prove that Education was retrograding. That cannot be true, because any man of my age must recollect the state of Education when he was a youth, and how different is now the state of intelligence of the working class of this country from what it used to be. We are improving, we are not retrograding; and it is to meetings like this and to societies like the Society of Arts that such improvement is due. After combating the idea that Governments had been remiss in the matter of Education, the noble Earl said: "When you consider this, that £9,000,000 have been expended within a very brief time, and that 11,500 certificated teachers are at this moment hard at work in the instruction of the middle and lower classes, I say it would not be correct to state that Parliament and preceding Governments have done nothing for the education of the people. We have heard a great deal about compulsory Education. A great many men—good judges of mankind, and men who know pretty well the feeling of the people of this country—think that compulsory Education is the panacea, the great remedy for the evils of the day. If I may give an opinion—and I do not purpose to state it as a decided one—I think that the plan of compulsory Education, although it may be carried on in Prussia, would be altogether opposed and rejected in this country, where a spirit of independence exists which will not allow of people being interfered with in their own homes. But that does not prevent our seeing, and wishing to make all parents feel, the tremendous responsibility cast upon them if they neglect the opportunity of educating their children and making them good citizens." Pursuing his remarks on the neglect of Education, the noble Earl said, "Whatever Government may be in power, I am sure I can answer for the one to which I have the honour to belong, that they will never be indifferent to the subject of the Education of the people, but they will exert themselves to the utmost to solve that problem which has been so ably alluded to by the eloquent gentleman on my left"—*Papers for the Schoolmaster*.

National Musical Education in England.

The following article, having special reference to the proceedings of the Musical Education Committee recently organized by the Society of Arts for the purpose of inquiring into the present condition of Musical Education in England, is from the *Morning Star*:—

"However little we may be disposed to agree in matters political with Mr. Matthew Arnold's glorification of continental 'Geist,' we