

allowed to fall on the wrong-doers. Similarly with the children. Penalties which the necessary reaction of things brings round upon them—penalties which are inflicted by impersonal agency, produce an irritation that is comparatively slight and transient; whereas, penalties which are voluntarily inflicted by a parent, and are afterwards remembered as caused by him or her, produce an irritation both greater and more continued. Just consider how disastrous would be the result if this empirical method were pursued from the beginning. Suppose it were possible for parents to take upon themselves the physical sufferings entailed on their children by ignorance and awkwardness; and that while bearing these evil consequences they visited on their children certain other evil consequences, with the view of teaching them the impropriety of their conduct. Suppose that when a child, who had been forbidden to meddle with the kettle, spilt some boiling water on its foot, the mother vicariously assumed the scald and gave a blow in place of it; and similarly in all other cases. Would not the daily mishaps be sources of far more anger than now? Would there not be chronic ill-temper on both sides? Yet an exactly parallel policy is pursued in after years. A father who punishes his boy for carelessly or wilfully breaking a sister's toy, and then himself pays for a new toy, does substantially the same thing—inflicts an artificial penalty on the transgressor, and takes the natural penalty on himself: his own feelings and those of the transgressor being alike needlessly irritated. If he simply required restitution to be made, he would produce far less heart-burning. If he told the boy that a new toy must be bought at his, the boy's, cost, and that his supply of pocket-money must be withheld to the needful extent, there would be much less cause for ebullition of temper on either side; while in the deprivation afterwards felt, the boy would experience the equitable and salutary consequence. In brief, the system of discipline by natural reactions is less injurious to temper, alike because it is perceived on both sides to be nothing more than pure justice, and because it more or less substitutes the impersonal agency of nature for the personal agency of parents.

Whence also follows the manifest corollary that under this system the parental and filial relation will be a more friendly, and therefore a more influential one. Whether in parent or child, anger, however caused, and to whomsoever directed, is more or less detrimental. But anger in a parent towards a child, and in a child towards a parent, is especially detrimental; because it weakens that bond of sympathy which is essential to a beneficent control. In virtue of the general law of association of ideas, it inevitably results, both in young and old, that dislike is contracted towards things which in our experience are habitually connected with disagreeable feelings. Or where attachment originally existed, it is weakened, or destroyed, or turned into repugnance, according to the quantity of painful impressions received. Parental wrath, with its accompanying reprimands and castigations, can not fail, if often repeated, to produce filial alienation; while the resentment and sulkeness of children can not fail to weaken the affection felt for them, and may even end in destroying it. Hence the numerous cases in which parents (and especially fathers, who are commonly deputed to express the anger and inflict the punishment) are regarded with indifference if not with aversion; and hence the equally numerous cases in which children are looked upon as infatigable. Seeing, then, as all must do, that estrangement of this kind is fatal to a salutary moral culture, it follows that parents can not be too solicitous in avoiding occasions of direct antagonism with their children—occasions of personal resentment. And therefore they can not too anxiously avert themselves of this discipline of natural consequences—this system of letting the penalty be inflicted by the laws of things; which, by saving the parent from the function of a penal agent, prevents these mutual exasperations and estrangements.—*British Quarterly Review.*

(To be continued.)

PEDAGOGY.

ON THE TRUE FOUNDATION OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE.

(Translated from the French of J. J. Rapet, by Mrs. Languedoc.)

III

OF PROPER DISCIPLINE IN SCHOOLS.

(Continued from No. 6, page 84.)

“Endeavor to call forth the affectionate regards of your scholars to get their love,” were the last words of our 2nd

chapter upon the subject discipline, and there is no doubt of your being afterwards able to inspire them with the next great essential, a fondness for school itself.

This fondness or attraction for school is one of the chief points towards attaining good discipline; in fact how can we possibly expect docility and deference to our wishes or commands from scholars who have neither regard nor esteem for us, who even have no desire of showing any, nor wish to render themselves agreeable to us: or why expect that children who feel unhappy in their classes and who come to them with distaste and repugnance, who view with disgust, the course of their daily lessons, should be orderly, attentive and zealous to fulfil their tasks? To expect as much, is expecting impossibilities, and to exact it, is looking for more than we would do from persons of mature mind and judgment.

Now, the number of children who feel an attraction towards school is very few, and who can wonder at it?

There are three principal reasons why children dislike their classes; they feel no taste or inclination to acquire what is taught them; they suffer from weariness, and many remain idle a greater part of the time. Let us investigate each one of these reasons separately.

That children have no taste for instruction is a cry that has become general, nevertheless it is not the less an unjust one under the circumstances. Children have, it is true, little inclination to study, but their objections are not towards instruction itself; on the contrary, they are ever desirous of learning, they delight in acquiring information. We need not go farther to prove this, than by an appeal to every one's personal experience of their natural curiosity, which, many of us may have found at one time or another particularly inconvenient, to say nothing of their constant questioning. They on the contrary love and take delight in acquiring information but not at the expense of study the sole point of their dislike.

Neither does this dislike arise from any natural dread of trouble or fatigue, no more than from any preconceived aversion to instruction. Let us but examine the ardor and perseverance with which children pursue any matter of pleasure or sport; this will suffice to convince us that trouble is their last consideration where there lies a disposition to obtain any object. Now as our plan of instruction falls short of this impression, children dislike the instruction which they are made to accept in a disagreeable form, therefore it is the method and form and nothing else which occasion their opposition.

For my part I cannot condemn them for it; let us take a child just as he appears at school for the first time which is generally about the age of seven or eight years, and the moment at which he is to be carefully initiated with a fondness and attraction for school. What are the first steps taken to win him on his first attendance?

Let us first consider his antecedents. Up to this moment he has lived a life of ease, liberty and independence, he has played his limbs in joyous freedom all unthinking of the hours as they danced along, but his young steps have now re-echoed in the school-room, and from that moment he is suddenly condemned to be the victim of its system. He will have to sit on a bench in strict rigidity of posture twice a day for the space each time of some two or three hours; and we complain if he express discomfort or if his uneasiness occasion him to disturb the order and regularity of the class. We on the contrary consider that children who would uncomplainingly yield strict obedience to such rules might be considered as requiring immediate medical care, for it would no doubt be the mark of a most unhealthy constitution. Under this immobility of position he is set down to studies the most unsuitable to his habits, and most inappropriate to his age and understanding. So far his experience has brought him in contact only with the exterior