

was quiet and deliberate, and the school was orderly and busy. He had no rule in his hand, no heavy boots on his feet, (he had exchanged them for slippers on entering the school,) and no other means of giving emphasis to his words. He kindly requested, never commanded, —and everything seemed to present the strongest contrast with the former scene. The hour of dismissal arrived, and the scholars quietly laid by their books, and as quietly walked out of the house, and all was still.

"How have you secured this good order?" said we to the teacher. "I really do not know," said he with a smile, "I have said nothing about order." "But have you had no difficulty from noisy scholars?" "A little at first; but in a day or two they seemed to become quiet, and we have not been troubled since."

Now the secret was, that this latter teacher had learned to govern himself. His own manner gave character to the school. So it will ever be. A man will govern more by his manner than in any other way.

There is, too, such a thing as keeping a school *too still* by over-government. A man of firm nerve can, by keeping up a constant constraint both in himself and pupils, force a deathlike silence upon his school. You may hear a pin drop at any time, and the figure of every child is as if moulded in cast-iron. But, be it remembered, this is the stillness of constraint, not the stillness of activity. It is an unhealthy state both of body and mind, and when attained by the most vigilant care of the teacher, is a condition scarcely to be desired. There should be silence in school, a serene and soothing quiet; but it should if possible be the quiet of cheerfulness and agreeable devotion to study, rather than the "palsy of fear."

CORPORAL PUNISHMENT.

BY I. M. CLEMENS.

Superintendent James's paper in the October number of the MONTHLY is, it seems to me, a little radical.

Can it be possible that those of us who, in the old log school-house, received our flogging almost daily, are less honest, less truthful, less moral than we would have been had the rod never been used upon us? It is certain that the boys in our schools now, on whom the rod is never used, will become better men than their fathers?

If, indeed, "moral suasion" is the only instrument that the teacher needs to control her school, would it not be well for parents, Sunday school teachers, and even preachers, to learn the secret of its power? Hitherto its power has been unavailing, except in a limited degree, for notwithstanding the efforts that have been made to christianize the world, only a small portion of most communities can be said to be even *moral*.

Is it true, then, that a teacher in a public school can exert a greater moral or religious influence over the child than the preacher or the parent can in their legitimate spheres? It may be possible that truthfulness, love of the beautiful, and other virtues cannot be "whipped into a child," but it is also quite possible that the judicious use of the rod, or other proper form of punishment, may restrain him from the practice of the corresponding vices.

Not many children can be found who always do right, but multitudes can be found who do wrong almost continually, if not restrained; hence it is a rare thing to find a school in which some sort of punishment is not, at times, a necessity. If this be true it is a pertinent question to ask, what kind of punishment shall take the place of the rod? I shall not attempt to answer this question, but will refer to some modes of punishment I have seen used,

which in my judgment were more hurtful than the rod would have been.

Not long ago, I visited an A Grammar school in a neighboring city. When I entered the room the teacher gave me a seat and continued the recitation. A boy who sat in front of me left his seat and handed me his book. I took it and acknowledged his politeness as well as I could. He returned to his seat and showed his interest in the recitation by turning around and looking on with the boy next behind him. This I suppose was forbidden, for the moment the teacher noticed his position she turned upon him and said, "John, are you not gentleman enough to take a proper position at your desk in the presence of strangers?"

That was the cruellest punishment I ever saw inflicted upon a child in school. If the boy had violated a rule of the school, and deserved punishment, sarcasm was not the proper weapon. A moderate use of the rod in private would not have been half so hurtful. The boy did not deserve punishment at all, not even a reprimand. The case shows, however, the means that teacher used to control her school.

Shaking and cuffing are common forms of punishment where corporal punishment is forbidden. Pupils are made to stand in a corner of the room, to sit on the floor, or to stay in at recess, as punishment for wrong doing. On the other hand, instead of using any kind of punishment many teachers coax, flatter, hire, or frighten children to do what they want them to do. Only evil can come from such modes of dealing with children.

There are very few teachers who can govern a school of 40 or 50 boys and girls, coming as they do from the streets, from all sorts of homes, with all sorts of dispositions and habits, without the use of some physical force. Its use may not, ought not, to be frequent, but it must be known to be in reserve. It is far better for the children, that the rod, or other proper instrument of punishment, should be used, than that school should become demoralized by the failure of the teacher to maintain her authority in other ways; so also is it better to use the rod than to coax, to deceive, to do that which will lead to the formation of wrong habits of thought and action.

I do not defend the indiscriminate, nor even the frequent use of the rod, but I do defend the judicious use of it in place of the many vicious and cowardly substitutes now so commonly used. It is the same sort of sentimentality which is seeking to banish all sorts of punishment from the government of children, that carries sweetmeats and other dainties to the cell of notorious criminals, and that showers smiles and flowers upon the culprit at the bar of justice, while the victims of these heartless wretches are scarcely thought of.

It is no kindness to a boy to let him do as he pleases, unless he pleases to do right. It is not the way to make good citizens. There is no doubt but that the responsibility for thousands of wrecked lives lies at the door of the home and the school, and has its explanation in the fact that parent and teacher failed to restrain the evil tendencies of the child. They have suffered the child to form habits of wrong-doing rather than use the force necessary to check him in his downward course. The example of the Great Teacher is a safe one to follow.—*Ohio Educational Monthly*.

EDUCATION—CLASSICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.

[Extract from an address given by Canon Farrar to the Faculty and Students of the Johns Hopkins University, and a large audience at the tenth Annual Opening of the University.]

We sometimes turn from the distinctive phenomena of our times as though they were mere matters of course. The exhaustiveness