

use in his teaching of exactly the kind of exercises which were likely to be set at the examination, would be convicted of incompetency. He should know that the greater the freshness and life with which his teaching is suffused, and the more sympathy he has awakened in his pupil in regard to the thing to be learned, the better able that pupil will be to pass the test required. If one wants to know whether a young child can or cannot read an easy book, write and spell his own language correctly, and work a sum, a very simple testing exercise suffices. It occupies only a few minutes, and the whole process of examining and of marking the 'passes' may easily be described as one of, rather uninspiring routine. But this does not at all imply that the methods in use during the previous year for teaching to read and to write and to count need be unintelligent. On the contrary, where the processes of teaching are most thoughtful, pleasing and varied, there the simple exercises given at the examination are most easily and well performed. The teacher who thinks to obtain 'passes' by fitting his mode of teaching to the mode of examination not only allows himself to lose sight of the higher

aims which should control all educational effort, but fails also to fulfil the lower aim. Even when the only object of arithmetic is to work sums correctly, this object is most quickly attained by teaching the principles of number by the use of simple demonstration, and by such questioning as causes the thought of the scholar to exercise itself on the nature of the problem to be solved before attempting to solve it. Those who assert that mechanical methods of instruction are the best modes of attaining the 'results' which the Inspector with the Code before him seeks to ascertain, either do not understand the art of teaching, or are using the argument as a pretext for relapsing into routine. And, indeed, to a large class of teachers, routine will always seem easier than intelligence. Verbalism and mechanism will, under any possible system of school administration, possess a fatal attractiveness for teachers of a certain order of mind. They will interpret all official regulations in the narrowest sense; will ask—not 'How can I best teach this subject?' but, 'How can I shape my teaching best to the probable mode of examination?'

Ibidem.

SCRIPTURE LESSONS FOR SCHOOL AND HOME.

BY THE REV. J. WYCLIFFE GEDGE, M.A., INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS FOR WINCHESTER, ENG. (NOTES FOR TEACHERS.)

NO. II. THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

INTRODUCTION. This commandment closely connected with eighth—stealing or lying with the hands. That forbade taking neighbour's goods, this forbids taking away his character—and like that, this includes many forms of the sin.

I. THE SIN—*Lying (a) against others.* (Read 1 Kings xxi. 1-13.) An old story—familiar to all. Ahab wanted Naboth's vineyard—how did he get it? Jezebel got these men to bear direct *false witness* of worst kind, because done solemnly in court of justice. Is such a thing ever done now? Often hear of it in law-courts