

which is to promote the welfare of society and of the State must be capable of forming good men—it must at least aim at doing so. But to make good men there must be moral teaching and moral training; that is, there must be both instruction in the principles of morality and the effort to see that these principles are acted out by those in attendance on the school. The virtues of truthfulness, purity, gentleness, self control—the virtues which go to make good men—if in any sense native to the soil of our fallen nature, find much in it to retard their growth. They need to be cultivated. The opposite vices—falsehood, selfishness, angry passion—will show themselves more or less in every school-room and every play-ground. They will need to be wisely but firmly repressed. The school, if its aim be to make not simply expert arithmeticians, correct grammarians, but truthful and upright men, pure minded and gentle women, cannot disregard the workings of the moral nature, as these come out from day to day within it, now on their better side, now on their worse. The better must be fostered and encouraged, the worse checked and in some cases punished. The conscience must be appealed to. The sense of duty must be cultivated. The habit of obedience must be taught. It is true that the public school is not primarily a school of morality any more than it is primarily a school of religion, but a teacher charged with the oversight of children for five or six hours a day during the most formative period of life, may not ignore the moral nature, as it reveals itself every hour in his presence. He must rebuke or punish indolence, falsehood, rudeness, malice, even as he must encourage diligence, truthfulness, purity and gentleness. For him to be indifferent or neutral in the conflict between good and evil which goes on in the school-room and the

play-ground as really as in the business mart or the legislative hall, of which the heart of the youngest child is the seat, as undeniably as that of the busiest adult, is virtually to betray the cause of right; and in mercy at once to the child and to society, he must make his sympathy with goodness, with right character and right conduct, clearly and decisively felt. At any rate, if the public school is to be the seed-plot of noble character, of generous virtues, and not simply of scholastic attainments, if it is to furnish society with good citizens, and not simply with smart arithmeticians or possibly with apt criminals, there must be found in it, not only methodical instruction and careful intellectual drill, but amid all else, as the occasion offers or requires, moral teaching and moral influence. The presiding genius in every school, a genius which may be often silent but which should never sleep, ought to be a lofty and generous morality. But (and this forms the last link in the argument against a purely secular system of education) moral teaching, to be effective in the highest degree, or in any degree near to the highest, must lean on religion and be enforced by its consideration. It is this position especially that the apologist for a purely secular system refuses to accept. It is claimed that it is possible to teach morality, and morality of a high kind, without introducing the religious element in any form. Everything turns here on what is meant by the teaching of morality. If by this is meant simply, pointing out in words what is proper and dutiful in human conduct, defining the duties which men owe to each other, then it is possible. The summaries of morals which are found in the agnostic literature of the period not the less excellent that they are, in good part, borrowed without acknowledgment from the Bible, demonstrate it possibility. But to how little purpos