

What is the matter with it? The fact that we have arrived at a negative result, algebraically speaking, shows only that we have assumed some absurd premise, and this premise is solely and simply the assuming that what is theoretical is not practical, and the reverse.

Now the truth is, that trying really to help another teacher by telling just what we do, is like trying to increase the dimensions of an oak sapling by pasting layers of bark around the trunk. Growth can never come in that way; neither can success.

What young teachers want is not methods so much as principles, and they need to go down for these into the region of the so-called theoretical and abstract; and the more theoretical and abstract their work, the more broad will be the life which, blossoming alone in actions, and methods shall inform everything, and make everything alive. I do not mean to say that they should not observe other and wiser teachers; but they should do this, thoughtful more all the time of the principles which underlie and govern the actions, and even the manners, than of the manners or ways themselves.

Especially does this necessity of abstract work exist for the teacher, because education, rightly considered, is not an empirical science. It may be well for the medical student to observe the exact line cut by the knife of the clinical lecturer, as the operation is performed in the worst cases of disease of the hip-joint. Medicine is essentially an empirical science; but it will not do for the student in education to do the same thing, and follow in the same way. He must go down for principles. Out of the region of abstract thinking, can alone come the power to grapple successfully with the practical problems which lie all through his work. His highest function is to mould convictions, not to convey opinions; nor can he ever step off this basis, or lose sight of this aim, without falling into the weakness of arbitrariness and self-will. But this moulding of conviction through which he practically overcomes difficulties, can come only of theoretical work, and he alone is practical who is theoretical.

Let then the educational student who does not see clearly how to overcome daily practical difficulties, give up the vain attempt to conquer by direct attack. Such an effort was made by Hercules, but his strength was of no avail before the life of the Hydra. Let him take them in flank, or, what would be a better figure, let him undermine them by digging down for principles and theories, and when he has mastered them, the practical difficulties which were once great, will seem like toys in the grasp of his toughened thought.

—*New England Journal of Education.*

School Discipline.

SUPT. WILLIAM H. PAYNE.

The strength, or it may be the weakness, of a superintendent or of a principal, is nowhere so clearly shown as in the general discipline of the school. Individual teachers, in cases of extreme difficulty which will occur at intervals, must of necessity rely upon their superior for the enforcement of obedience. At any rate, the head of a school must take some stand in this matter, since pupils or their parents will certainly appeal to him, on occasion, for a redress of wrongs real or imagined.

Teachers will secure that degree of discipline which they are sustained in enforcing, or which they are

required to enforce; and any weakness, indecision, or vacillation in the superintendent will immediately show its effects in the school.

For the maintenance of healthy discipline, it is not necessary that there should be great severity in the punishment of offenses. The absolute certainty that the teacher's authority will be upheld, and that, in case of need, the supreme authority in the school will be invoked, is, in most cases, sufficient in itself to hold the evil propensities of pupils in check. On the contrary, a want of firmness will encourage the spirit of revolt, and make necessary a frequent resort to punishments of one kind or another.

The sense of justice is strong even in the case of vicious children. They know that disobedience and wrong doing in general deserve punishment; and, provided the good intent of disciplinarian is manifest, and the degree of punishment does not exceed its just bounds, no feeling of resentment will be cherished towards him who inflicts the penalty. While children soon learn to feel a contempt for a superior who does not insist on respectful obedience, they instinctively admire that manly energy of character which metes out to offenders their deserved punishment. If, however, pupils are punished in anger or beyond measure, it is probable that evil and not good will be done.

Every effort should be made to convince pupils that they will encounter the consequence of their own wrong-doing; that if trouble must come, they, and not their superiors, will be responsible for it. To this end it is often best to defer a punishment, giving the offender chance to mend his ways. In this case there is danger, of course, that the pupil may presume on such forbearance, and feel encouraged to persevere in his evil ways; but the remedy for this is the well-known firmness of the authority which can afford to wait, but which is neither forgetful nor neglectful.

In what has preceded it is tacitly assumed that there are occasions in which corporal punishment is necessary, and therefore justifiable. While I am conscious that many judicious educators discard this manner of discipline, I am free to express my conviction that it is sometimes the teacher's only available resource to secure to the school and to the offender their respective rights. A school must be preserved from disorder and from the contagion of bad examples; and there is no more sacred duty binding on parents and teachers than to require of children prompt and respectful obedience. Children should be exhorted and encouraged in every proper manner to do right, because the doing of right is in itself a comely and virtuous thing; but when exhortation, expostulation, and admonition have no effect, what is to be done? Manifestly, that degree of force should be employed which will conquer obedience. All will allow that a cheerful, voluntary obedience is the truly desirable thing; but is not an enforced obedience to be preferred to disobedience?

Government is positive, not negative; it does not consist in advising them what to do, leaving the matter, in the end, to their own discretion. It assumes that some will choose to do what ought not to be done, and so places before them a penalty sufficient to secure an enforced obedience. In the absence of internal motives to do right, the law holds forth an artificial motive in the form of a penalty attached to violations of prescribed laws.

As a last resort, therefore, force is justifiable. Now force, when actually brought to bear on an offender, resolves itself into some bodily affection. There is either some restraint put upon the usual bodily activities, or, proceeding to extremities, there is an infliction