

tried it very often, but always without any satisfactory result.

It is indeed most difficult to organize the employment of every hour's time in primary schools, particularly in those that are under the direction of but one master which is the case with the greater number. Estimating as we do the full importance of the question on behalf of the master as well as of the pupil, we will proceed to examine the means that lead to a good employment of time and to a regular organization of education in schools.

We trust that in this we will be of service to teachers, and will be able to prove to them all the interest we bear them in the execution of their arduous functions, by reducing as much as we possibly can the difficulties of their task. If according to our own experience we succeed in generalizing the employment of time in the schools, we will esteem ourselves as having added another step towards the attainment of discipline.

If we have studied the subject of discipline such as should exist in the class, it is because it holds, greater importance there than elsewhere, for the children are present in primary schools only during the class hours, and what remains, is to be regarded rather as a question of good breeding than of discipline. Besides, when discipline is attained in class, a great step has been gained and when we shall have succeeded in making of our scholars, children desirous of application, silent, orderly, industrious and obedient, it will be only when we shall have embraced those measures for instilling them with a taste for occupation and for school, by rendering it an agreeable sojourn to them, it will be when we shall have endeavored to inspire them with that affection which makes them lend a glad and willing ear to our words and counsels, when finally we shall have brought them under the influence and exercise of that spirit of good feeling, which is in itself an earnest of our own towards them and one also full of promise for the future. We may entertain every hope of children under such subjection and such guidance; we have led their steps and taken up ours at the entrance of the right path, and all that now remains is to continue in it.

We said, with truth, at the commencement of this article, that discipline in schools was principally one of education and method.

In conclusion to the above, we may add the remark that the foundation of discipline is moreover almost entirely beyond the reach of those ways and means generally practised heretofore, but, on the contrary, resides in what has been considered as foreign to it.

We sought to inspire fear, while we should love and be loved. The school was the centre of weariness, of repulsion while it should be made one of attraction and love to the scholar.

Its little inmates are required to be peaceable, quiet, docile to the strict observance of silence, so that the classes may proceed without interruption in their several duties and the greater number of whom so much is expected, are left in idleness throughout the greater part of the day, consequently abandoned to a sense of distressing weariness and, at the same time, are denied the action of body or limb, one of the most vital demands of their growing years.

If we wish for success in any of the foregoing points we must observe an opposite direction to that already followed.

If, therefore, we would recapitulate the best means of founding discipline in a school, we would do so in the following few words: love the children, interest and occupy them.

Middle-Class Education.

Much has lately been said and written on the subject of what is called Middle-class Education, its errors and its deficiencies. The discussion has arisen in consequence of the recent examinations, by authority of the University of Oxford, of the pupils of sundry commercial and proprietary schools who voluntarily submitted themselves to the ordeal. The test was a severe one; and the advantages to be derived from success reflected from the pupil to the school in which he had studied, and were perhaps of more value to the school-master than to the student. The University of Oxford had so often been reproached with lagging behind the age, that the result of those examinations, showing, as it did, the woeful ignorance of the youth of a class who had oftenest accused the University of its deficiencies, was hailed in Oxford, and in the great endowed schools which feed it, with a feeling of complacency, if not of more positive satisfaction. The late Rev. Sydney Smith, in correcting a printer's erratum in a letter to Sir Robert Peel, took the blame of the error upon his own handwriting, for which he in turn blamed the University of Oxford, which had taught him much Latin and Greek to very little purpose, but which had neglected to teach him how to work the simplest sums in elementary arithmetic, how to write legibly, and how to spell the English language. Long before and after the time at which the reverend humorist levelled his playful but not harmless satire against Oxford, it was a common complaint that University education did not fit the youth of England for the work that England had to do. "Who is that remarkably stupid man?" said Jones to Smith at a dinner party, looking significantly to an awkward and taciturn person at the other end of the table. "That?" replied Smith; "oh, that is the celebrated Mr. A. He was Senior Wrangler at Cambridge this year." "Ah, that accounts for it," said Jones. Such was the kind of joke that circulated at the expense of the Universities; and ultimately the impression became as strong as it was general, that both Oxford and Cambridge were in arrears with the intelligence of the time; that they had fallen asleep in the middle ages, and had never since been thoroughly awakened to their own duties and responsibilities, or to the wants of the world.

Oxford and Cambridge have outlived alike the jest and the imputation, and Oxford may take credit to herself for having to a great extent turned the tables upon her detractors. Yet, after all, what is Oxford or the country likely to gain by the result of the recent examinations? Are we to believe that the education of the middle classes is inferior and insufficient, because so many young men from the proprietary and other schools have proved themselves unable to answer the simplest elementary questions, or even to spell? The middle classes is a wide phrase. If those classes did not to a very large extent support Oxford and Cambridge, those Universities would be deprived of more than one-half, or two-thirds, of their students. The barrister, the physician, or the merchant, receiving £2000 or £3000 per annum, ranks among the middle classes, and so does the shopkeeper or the tradesman clearing his £200 or £250 per annum; yet the education of the sons of these persons may be, and is, very different. The merchant, the physician, or the barrister sends his son to the University, while the tradesman is compelled by his poverty to send his son to the nearest "academy" or grammar school. To say, therefore, that middle-class education is defective in this country is to say that it is defective in Oxford and Cambridge quite as much as in the commoner schools; and those who argue upon such suppositions argue about words and phrases of which they have not previously defined the meaning. Even the word "education" itself needs to be defined. No man can be truly educated at Oxford or Cambridge, or at any university or school in the world. Education begins at the moment of birth, and ends only with our lives. He who at any time thinks or says that his education is complete is a fool. When a man ceases to learn he ceases to be of any use to himself or his fellows, and speedily becomes either a bigot or an idiot. What is commonly called education and school education should more properly be called teaching. Reading, writing, and arithmetic, which are taught in all our schools (the Sunday school excepted), are but the implements given to our youth by which they may educate themselves. And this is what the best of our youths do after they have left school and college; and no one who has attained eminence and distinction, and who has made himself illustrious by his learning or his genius, owes half so much to his teacher as he owes to himself. Many of the senior wranglers at Cambridge have taken no more brilliant share in the business of the world than that which falls to the lot of drowsy country parsons, or barristers without briefs. Many who have carried away the highest honours at Oxford have become drones or pedants if they were slow, and foxhunters if they were fast; and many of the boys