

elevate the state and strengthen against temptation, and ennoble the life. But in the absence of true mental culture, this power, where not unused and lost, is too often abused; and hence arises the cry of over-education, while the error lies in under-education, in education ill-directed, in the unreal semblance of education, in taking for ends what are not necessarily even means. It is evident enough that the State cannot, ought not to be expected to give all the highest possible education; but between the desirable *maximum* and the proposed *minimum* there is surely some intermediate point, not too high for attainment not too low for any real efficacy. What we accomplish is not unlikely to fall short of what we aim at, but it is certain not to rise above it. Hence the importance of having at the outset a right standard at which to aim. It is further to be borne in mind that it is not with the State, but with the parents, that the primary responsibility for the child's training rests; and that it is solely, or at least mainly, because parents have neglected this duty, that State interference is justified and required. To form better parents in the coming generations is, then, the great desideratum; and for this end a much higher level of both intellectual and moral training than is commonly, I will not say attained, but even aspired to, or thought possible, is simply indispensable. And when I say intellectual and moral training, I do not mean two quite distinct kinds of training, which may go on, indeed, side by side, but of which either may be taken up at pleasure, and the other left. It is in the blending of the two that the real educational power consists. Few persons perhaps have adequately conceived the extent to which intelligence can be brought in aid of morality, converting good but feeble impulse into firm conviction and steady purpose. This is a very different thing from the common practice of committing moral precepts to memory, and repeating them in the very words of the text-book or catechism, the success of the lesson being estimated according to the fluency and exactness of the verbal recitation. This practice is but slightly more rational than that of some Mahometan tribes in Africa, of whom we are told that with chalk they write on a board texts from the Koran, then wash them off and drink the water, thus literally imbibing the precepts of their prophet. Then there is the direct appeal to the moral faculties themselves, requiring in the teacher a power far other than the prescribing and gauging of task-work.

Need of Moral Teaching.

Everywhere around us we find coarseness of manners, cruelty both to animals and to our fellows, petty dishonesty, disregard of truth, wastefulness, evasion of duty, infidelity to engagements, not to speak of graver forms of wrong-doing; and who believes in his heart that school training can do anything to prevent them? Take cruelty to animals, from pigeon-shooting in *excelsis*, and cock-fighting, for which Cheshire is now as famous as for cheese, to nest-robbing and throwing stones at birds by juveniles of the humbler sort. On this subject it has indeed been thought, late in the day, that some good impression might be made in schools. And how has the attempt been made? Prizes have been held out for the best written essays against cruelty to animals. But what effect can this produce on the few who do compete? It is quite possible to be very ambitious in writing for a prize an essay against ambition; to injure health by writing about it. It is quite possible, especially for the young, to be more intent on trimly-turned sentences and well-sounding phrases than on the moral to be worked out. Contrast this method with an experience of my own.

Some years ago, I accompanied that admirable man the late Dean Dawes on a visit to the National school at Hereford. On entering the playground, I was surprised to see a number of poultry straying about, undismayed by the sports that were in progress. In answer to my question, the master, who fully justified the Dean's encomium, told me that the poultry were among his most efficient means of education. The children watched over them with the greatest care; and if by any chance a newcomer attempted to do any of them an injury, he was at once denounced and deterred by the general voice. But, further, the teacher interested the children in the structure and habits of animals, and they grew to regard them as beings not to be destroyed or tortured ("It is a fine day, let us go out and kill something"), but to be protected, and carefully observed. The Rev. J. O. Wood describes the astonishment of a friend to whom he once showed a caterpillar under a microscope. "Why," said he, "I always thought it was only skin and squash." With very different feelings, as well as thoughts, would he thereafter view the despised caterpillar!

One of the many various aspects of this subject must not be omitted. Nowhere is moral training more needful than in the ordinary economic, financial, or business relations of life. A lady told me a few weeks ago that a journeyman painter asked her to allow him to do in his own time some painting in her house. The bill came in; a week's work was charged, while, measured by hours, the work had not occupied more than two days. He admitted the fact, but contended that as the job would have lasted a week had he been working for his master, he was quite entitled to a week's pay when working for himself. Thus one fraud on his master was used to justify a second on his employer.

But what, I think I hear it asked, has school to do with such things as these? The best answer may be gained by a visit to any of the Birkbeck schools, munificently founded and endowed by Mr. William Ellis of London, especially to that at Peckham, where Mr. Shields has long ago proved that the young mind can be interested in such matters, and guided to right judgment regarding them. Our own practice and conduct depend largely on our present estimate of conduct in others; and whether our circumstances are like or unlike theirs, praise or blame must be rightly or wrongly awarded according to our power intelligently to appreciate the bearings of each case. What we do not understand, what is out of our narrow circle, we are apt to approve or condemn very much at random, or on grounds that have never been carefully surveyed. At a recent public meeting, a clergyman in a rural district asserted that Trades' Unions were, in his opinion, legitimate among mechanics and manufacturing operatives, but on the part of agricultural labourers were wrong. Another clergyman, whom I met lately at dinner, denounced strikes, not as imprudent, unwise, and mischievous, but as rank rebellion and as contrary to the "Sermon on the Mount." My startled inquiry drew forth a reference to the text "Whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also." I will not attempt to fathom the confusion in this gentleman's mind between two very different kinds of striking, if not between striking and being struck. I cite the case merely to show how important it is that moral judgments should be directed by reason and knowledge, and how easy it is for even good general maxims to be misinterpreted and misapplied. Reason must be the guide of sentiment, though not its substitute. Too commonly, neither reason nor sentiment is engaged. Authority is the only standard appealed to, the verbal memory the only faculty addressed, with punishment in the background for failure in the repetition of the words. When