

raised, is not the actual performance of drudgery the best preparation for and guarantee of its future performance? Does not practice in any line engender the habit of doing work along that line? Certainly practice always tends toward habit or automatism. But man is not mainly a machine; at least, when it comes to drudgery he is very much inclined to act from motive, not unconsciously. The repetition of an act may diminish rather than increase that motive. For instance, the repeated marking of examination papers does not usually make it easier to approach a new set of papers. On the contrary, the motive for not doing such work often far outstrips in growth the cumulative effect of the repetition of the act. Daily attendance at school and daily study tend toward corresponding habits. But in the case of many a schoolboy the distaste for study so far overcomes the force of habit that it finally culminates in the refusal to attend school longer. Thus, whatever is really drudgery may grow more and more irksome, rather than less so; hence it is very unsafe to depend upon performance of drudgery as the fittest preparation for its future performance. The old idea of formal discipline affects our attitude towards this question. We are inclined to develop the faculty or the formal power of drudgery through exercise, as we would the formal power of memory, of imagination, etc. But since it is pretty well established that there are no formal powers either of memory, of imagination, or of drudgery, it is not probable that they can be developed.

It should be remembered that motive cannot be eliminated from drudgery, and that the way to prepare for the latter is to develop, not a formal power, but a strong motive. Motive has its origin in interest. Hence, so far as instruction is concerned, the chief preparation for

drudgery that the teacher can give is a strong and many-sided interest.

As I understand it, the emphasis laid upon interest in this paper is in accordance with Herbart and Ziller. But the standpoint should gain ground or lose it, not because their names are associated with it, but because it appeals, or fails to appeal, to experience and reason. The tendencies of the past are opposed to it; the inherited feeling is very common that that being is most to be admired who hates a good portion of his duty and still performs it. We are almost afraid to declare that the ideal education is that in which a deep love is engendered for the chief spheres of knowledge and for right conduct. But some assurance as to the soundness of this view is found in the fact that the child's attitude toward his teachers has already undergone somewhat the same transformation as is now insisted upon in his attitude toward his studies. In Xenophon's time it was the understanding that children should regard their teacher as their enemy. In the *Anabasis*, book ii. chap. vi. 15, Clearchus is described as one who "had nothing attractive in him, but was always forbidding and repulsive, so that soldiers felt toward him as boys toward their master." Until recent times the teacher was a whipping master, whether he was an instructor or not. To-day, in Germany, mutual affection between teacher and pupil is not usually planned for by the former; he seems to labor under the conviction that his personal influence is greatest when he is stern and distant. The relation of officers in the army to the common soldiers is to a considerable extent the relation of German teachers to their scholars. But in America nothing is now better established than that close mutual friendship between the two is the first condition of a strong influence from the one upon the other. Now, there