

"practical" education might well be taught in other places. But it is not easy to see how our schools can undertake to give any instruction in the methods of agriculture, or of those other industrial trades by which men and women earn their livelihood.

It might be possible to establish in every considerable town a public workshop, into which boys could go out of school-hours and learn the use of various mechanical tools, under the instruction of a competent mechanic. Most school boys in the cities and larger towns have much spare time on their hands, which might well be put to some such use. Perhaps a portion of the funds provided by taxation for public schools could be profitably expended in furnishing such schools as these. To do this would require legislation in most of the States; but it is open to any benevolent gentleman to offer the boys of his own town such an opportunity. If it should be appreciated and improved, the public authorities might be led to adopt the same plan. Beyond some such simple provisions as these, we do not see how industrial education can be furnished to the pupils of our public schools. The handicrafts are so many, and their methods are so constantly changing, as civilization becomes more complex and the practical arts are multiplied and modified, that it would be quite out of the question to teach them all, even if skilled instructors could be obtained, which is equally out of the question.

Besides, it is hardly the function of public schools to impart any kind of special or technical education. We cannot "fit" boys to be ministers, or doctors, or lawyers, or farmers, or carpenters, or shoemakers; we cannot train girls to be artists in pigments, or in music, or in millinery, or in cookery; all we can undertake to do in our public schools is to train the intellect and develop the character of the pupils so that they shall be intelligent, industrious, contented, and virtuous citizens. It ought to be possible to give the pupils of these schools a mental and moral discipline that shall "fit" them for any calling in life, and not more for one honest calling than for another.

The thing to be first sought, and the thing most often neglected in our public teaching, is the development of a sound character in the pupils. The State cannot teach religion, but it can require its teachers to enforce the virtues of industry, self-reliance, truthfulness, purity, honesty, justice, kindness, and courtesy; it can make the inculcation of these virtues a chief part of the teacher's work. The education that neglects or undervalues morality is worse than worthless; it "fits" the pupil to be a malefactor.

The next thing to be sought is to awaken the minds of the pupils, to stimulate their thirst for knowledge, to train them in habits of inquiry. The successful teacher is the one who makes his pupils think patiently and independently, who stirs them up to original investigation. Any pupil who has had this done for him has been "fitted," so far as his mind is concerned, for success in any calling.

—Selected.

LESSONS IN LITERATURE.

There is one idea in particular that a great many teachers of English literature either partly or entirely neglect. It is the ordinal importance of the three elements in a literature lesson. This importance may be stated as follows:—

1. The subject-matter.
2. The author.
3. The style or manner of composition.

Some will demur to this and say that number three is in itself almost the entire lesson, and is more important in teaching literature than either of the others. But the truth is, the learner's natural

mental constitution seeks the instruction in precisely the order stated, that is, *the thing*; thirdly, *how did he make it*?

Not only is it true with pupils, but with all readers, young and old. For example: We open the book at "The Origin of Roast Pork," by Charles Lamb. The controlling proneness of the pupil's mind is not to be informed about Charles Lamb, nor about the style or dictation or literature of the piece, but to know, first of all, the thing talked about, and then let the other matters come up. So if he is suffered to regard natural chronology in his acquisitions, he proceeds at once to enjoy the reliable account of the burning house and the accidental discovery of the esculent quality of roast pig without a thought of Lamb, or his style of writing. It is to cause such absorption in the reader of what is being said that is the aim of the author, and it may be truly said there can be no adequate appreciation of a writing without this absorption of the subject by the reader. The genius of authorship lies in the ability to create this. Therefore, an intelligent appreciation or understanding of *what* is written is the foundation of the literature lesson; the investigation of *who* wrote it and *how* it was done are subsequent.

This much I offer in opposition to the teacher who would, for instance, insist on the pupil's learning a biography of Charles Lamb, and an elaborate analysis of his literary characteristics, preparatory to an attack on his "Origin of Roast Pork."—*N. Y. Sch. Jl.*

DISCIPLINE.

Never threaten, or scold. Never say, "John, if you don't stop that I shall punish you severely." Or, having been so unwise and hasty as to declare an intention to punish, do so. Your failure to carry out your threat will convince the children that you are infirm of purpose and untruthful, and they know by instinct that weakness or falsity can be imposed upon by the daring or disorderly with impunity. Scolding and fretting and impatience are also indications of weakness, and the child who is not tempted by them to trespass on rules afresh is a very exceptional child, indeed.

The general rules of discipline may be varied somewhat for the different classes of children found in different localities, but the qualities they demand in the teacher are in the main always the same. Firmness is needed, also kindness, and absolute self-control. "Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay." Mean what you say, and say what you mean. Seek for a wise and temperate theory, and follow it up with a sensible, consistent practice, and the probabilities are that your difficulties in disciplinary work need no longer imperil your happy success.—*Present Age.*

A consistent advocate of the present unphonetic, irregular style of orthography writes a long letter in defence of the method, and the following is an extract:—Yough kumplein uv psighlent leththerz. Inn yewer igknowrunts, yue phale to purseeve thatte wie haph know cylunt letters. Awl thoughts whitche ue kawll sough arr mierleigh kompowunnt parrits oph buy-litterhal, or try-littorhal, or multigh-littorhal karrhac-turz yewzd too denought cypal vokle elemence. Two illstraight. Thayr iz ay vokle elemunt kommunley rephezentid by thea karuktur u. Butte thysae iz ekwallie rhepthezentid buy *ue*, *eu*, *ew*, *ui*, *ugh*, *ough*, etc., etc. Ay nuther iz rhepthezentid buy *t*; butte yt haz az ekwiphay-lunts *th* (az inn *thyne*), *tw* (az inn *two*), and *phth* (az in *phthisic*). Ai tiurd, rhepthezentid buy *f*, haz atte least won buy-littorhal ekwivaylent, *ph*. Nou appligh theeze prinsipuls too thie spellynge oph ai wurred kombigning awl theighr phokle elemense, anned knowtiss thoe bewt-ful varhietee they opphur two ower chawiss. Wee maigh haph *freet*, or *fruet*, or *frughth*, or *phriewth*, or *phroughphth*. Inn vue ov possigh-bilitiez souch az theeze, whitche ey dough naat preethend tou eggssaut, amme ei naat joustyphyde inn saighing, "Heer's writchness" ?—*Globe.*

"Canada School Journal" given away for 1884. See Special offer.