

It remains that I should speak, however briefly, of the education of the Emotions and the Will, of moral and religious education. Let me put first what can be most shortly stated. I was much struck some years ago by the remark of a successful headmaster of a great school in the north of England, apropos of the question whether a university education should be given as a preliminary to practical life, and especially to a business life, that learning weakened the will-power, and that on these grounds he doubted whether the successful men of business were not better trained by passing straight from school to active life. I would not admit that the objection was fatal then, and I do not admit it now.

But we must, I think, admit that the scholar lacks opportunities for the exercise and development of the will, and we must reckon it among the dangers of a too exclusive attention to the intellect only that the governing powers may be lost temporarily or permanently. No teaching can confer will-power, the natural gift differs perhaps more here than elsewhere; but like all powers it grows by exercise, and the student needs the warning that it is at his peril that he withdraws at any time altogether from active participation in social life. Among the *pros* and *cons* of the battle of Boarding-Schools *versus* Day Schools, the opportunity in the former for exercising the governing powers may fairly claim a high place. As to moral and religious education, I cannot say more than that, while the intellectual apprehension of social duties, of the desirability and necessity of justice, kindness, honesty, temperance, can be evoked by the parent or teacher, from the earliest years, and must be so, what is more important is not the knowledge of good and evil, but the practice of the one, and the eschewing of the other; and that,

again, while the "early custom of education," as Bacon has well called it, can produce the habit of well-doing, there is something beyond which cannot be intellectually apprehended, and which transcends all good habits and good conduct, and that is the love of virtue in itself, the independent choice of the good at all hazards, the enthusiasm of morality, which is communicable indeed, at least the germs of it—let us be thankful that it is so—but not teachable in the strict sense of that word. And therefore I, at least, am content with our present compromise in the education of the people, which leaves religious teaching mainly to the Sunday School and the Church, reads the Bible to the children day by day, trusts to high-minded teachers to enforce, by precept and example, lessons of duty and the art of living, and thus, while minimising the danger of sectarianism, leaves as little room as may be for serious complaints from any side. The teacher in morals and religion comes sooner to the limits of his usefulness than he does in the sphere of knowledge. He can teach definitions, he can illustrate, he can trace consequences, he can teach a prudential morality, he can teach dogmas and catechisms, he can teach the history of morals and religion; and there is a proper time, no doubt, for some of all this—perhaps for all. But it does not take us far. He can teach more by example than by precept, and at times, according to his lights, he may inspire—more often, if he is single-minded and honest, he will do so without being aware of it; but he dare not place "piety" in his prospectus of subjects or his timetable, and he can no more teach "purity of heart" than poor Dr. Keats could. Let us admit—for it is true—that we are never so conscious of the limitation of our learning as when we stand abashed in the pres-