

through himself to his pupils; and from this point of view there can be but one answer to the question whether morality ought to be taught at schools. It cannot be set down in the *curriculum*; there is no class letter, X, or Y, or Z, representing qualifications in this branch, and it lies outside the scope and functions of the examining Inspector. But its claims stand above State regulations, and our duty in the matter is derived from a higher law than that of the State. We must decline to allow the State any interference in the matter, such as the attempt, seriously contemplated a few years ago, to issue textbooks, from which the boys of secular schools might learn in a few cut and dried lessons to become good. Of course the question of religion stands on a different footing, and is one on which I do not care to enter. I will only say that religion covers a much wider ground than theology, and if we accept Matthew Arnold's definition of it, as "conduct touched by emotion," it may be a matter with which even State school masters have something to do.

It may have been observed that the main idea of this paper is compromise. I believe that, in practical matters at least, our wisdom will lie in seeking a reconciliation of apparently contradictory views rather than

in pushing either extreme too dogmatically. Compromise, it has recently been said, is the law of the future. Harmony will result from the clash of divergent opinions, whether it be in religion, in politics, in education, or in social problems. The minds which will most powerfully influence the future will not be those whose grasp is as the hard, unyielding grip of large iron pincers, but those which take hold of facts and opinions as the tentacles of a creeping plant. With a delicate touch such minds will cling round the finer points at issue as well as round the bolder matters of controversy. They may be called unstable and incapable of strong convictions; but the faculty of seeing the truth which lies between two extremes is a higher one than that of clinging tenaciously to either. Let us not distress ourselves about formulating special educational theories. The general theory which underlies our art is too manifold and complex to be labelled in parcels. Let the mind always be kept open for new ideas, and if they upset previously-cherished ideas, let there be no hesitation about the sacrifice. Only in this way can the teaching profession become liberal and enlightened, and the reproach of narrowness and dogmatism be rolled away.—*Mr. F. W. Foynt, in New Zealand Schoolmaster.*

AIMS IN TEACHING.

WE have of late (says the *Educational Times*) been calling the attention of our readers to some of the chief reasons for studying the history of education; and we have also pointed out what seems to us to be the relation which should exist between the theory and the practice of teaching. So it is only fitting that we should now add a few remarks on the art of teaching—that art which

theory indicates and practice improves as most effective.

The various aims of teaching group themselves readily under the heads of acquirement of knowledge, development of mental power, and rendering skill efficient. The mental processes connected with these are found to be, briefly stated, taking in, assimilating (including working up of material into new forms), and giving out. It is