

ness of the greatest number, decided by experience; test the foundations on which rests the authority of conscience and its claim to superiority over the other forces of human nature; we may pursue these and numberless kindred enquiries with our boys, to their profit and ours, but we are not to suppose that we are teaching them morality. What we are teaching them is ethics as a science, a thing which is good for all to know, but which does not affect boy's characters in any more special way than any other ennobling intellectual study. No amount of study of morals as a branch of speculative enquiry will make men moral. We may lecture boys on the subject and examine them from textbooks, without aiding them in the least in doing right in preference to wrong. It is therefore quite an open question whether these things should be introduced into schools, but we must be under no mistake as to the results which we expect to gain from them. As a rule such subjects are not entered on till the University period of a young man's life, when his character has become somewhat fixed, and his moral sense is less likely to be disturbed by contradictory theories as to its origin. But to admit boys to such controversies would be much the same as putting into the hands of a Sunday school scholar a mass of theological disputation, such as the "Essays and Reviews" or the "Tracts for the Times." It would no doubt be a stupid anachronism, and could only be regarded as a despairing shift on the part of those who thought that morality ought to be taught, but did not exactly see how.

But, turning to the other aspect of the question, we can have no sympathy with those who believe that school training has nothing to do with a boy's character apart from his intellect. No true schoolmaster would

dare to divest himself of responsibility in this matter, even if his intercourse with his pupils were restricted to the hours of school work. If a teacher thinks that his business is with the brains of his pupils, and not with their characters, let him recall that profound saying of Aristotle, that a clever man is more dangerous than a dull one if he be bad. It is hardly a comfortable reflection that, by sharpening boys' intellects without giving them any moral guidance for the right use of them, we are whetting dangerous weapons to be turned presently against the heart of society. And we must not suppose that in order to do our duty in this matter there is need of any systematic preaching or sermonizing. Innumerable instances will arise for impressing lessons of truth, honour and purity in a natural way, without making boys feel that they are being preached at. The lessons conveyed are often the direct result of the teacher's own personal influence. There is a way of making boys feel instinctively the finer shades of right and wrong in individual cases. But to produce this effect the teacher's own mind must be schooled and disciplined to the finer moral aspects of things. It is not merely that the example set by such a teacher must have an exalting effect on the pupil's conscience; but still more, that a few words spoken from such a standpoint would strike home more effectually than a long harangue delivered from a vague notion that the occasion ought to be improved somehow. High moral culture and self discipline in teachers pass, like the invisible electric fluid, into the hearts of their pupils, just as strength and grasp of intellect produce a stimulating effect on their minds even without the conscious effort of teaching.

In this way, then, we must feel that the teacher is under a high responsibility, first to himself, and