

lead us on as fast as we ought to go, our conviction of duty should impel us forward.

Then duty as a motive for learning is more imperative than interest? Yes; imperative is just what duty is. But interest is *necessary*. The relation of interest to duty is plain. Interest is the natural and appropriate means leading to learning; and since interest is the appropriate and necessary motive for real and effective study it becomes *duty to develop interest*. We cannot dismiss the matter of our pupil's interest in learning,—or our own,—even if we think we have found as effective a means of causing him to learn, because interest is not *merely* the best *motive* for learning, but it is itself among the primary ends of education. Learning itself is not more important to the man than becoming interested in what is worthy. If interest is the drift and tendency of life, what is more important than that that be set right? This is the aspect of the subject which Herbart and his followers lay emphasis upon. I quote from Ufer:

“Interest is the magic word which alone gives to instruction the power to evoke the spirit of youth, and to render it obedient to the call of the master; it is the long lever-arm of the education, which, easily and joyfully moved by the teacher, can alone bring the youthful volition into the desired motion and direction.

“In the *many-sidedness* of interest the pupil is by and by to find moral anchorage and protection against that bondage which springs from the desires and passions; it shall guard him against all those errors that are the consequence of idleness; it shall arm him against the vicissitudes of fortune; it shall reconcile him with life again, even when a sad fate has robbed him of his dearest; it shall find him a new vocation, when he has been crowded out of the old one; it

shall elevate him to that point of view from which all earthly possessions and all earthly endeavor appear as something incidental, by which our real self is not touched, and above which the moral character stands sustained and free.”

The cultivation of interest, then, ought not to be an *incidental*, but a *principal*, object of instruction and training. Can interest be created? Or, is it only to be developed?

If we are right about the nature of it, the answer is evident. Interest arises *spontaneously* whenever the conditions for it exist. At an early hour of its conscious life every normal child begins to be interested. The development of this incipient interest depends primarily upon the child's inherited qualities and environment, and it is sure to proceed in a natural way through the first months. But it depends secondarily upon nurture, training, and instruction, as well as experience and intercourse, so its later development becomes an *uncertain* and *varying* quantity. It cannot be created nor can it be wholly destroyed; it always springs into activity and grows as the child grows, but it is liable in every life to be perverted and deadened.

The kind of interest that manifests itself earliest, I suppose, is curiosity of a feeble sort, a gentle interest in movements of objects, flitting lights and shadows becoming gradually a more lively enjoyment of sights and sounds and touch-sensations, until it becomes unmistakable interest in things and what they are made of and what they are good for. If conditions are at all favorable, this first kind passes into investigating and speculative interest, and the inquiring child becomes by and by the student.

But the infant's interest in his own performances must arise about as early as the interest in external things. The baby's unconscious interest in his