

to separate religious instruction from secular instruction and to place it in a different school, a school connected with the Church. My grounds for this opinion are the following :—

The secular branches of study—reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar and history—require a method of instruction different from that adapted to religious branches. In these secular branches the mind is to be trained to keep all its powers awake. The powers of thinking must be developed, the mind must be taught to be alert and critical, and to take nothing on authority. Faith must be dormant. The child must not commit to memory the rule in his arithmetic, but must see the process and understand the necessity of it so that he can demonstrate it to others. He must understand in geography the phenomena of earth, air and water, and comprehend the industrial and commercial processes by which the products of the world are collected from all and distributed to each. In grammar he must learn to think with accurate definitions, and to understand the logical framework of language; in history he must study the causes of events. Throughout the secular studies the object of the teacher should be to make the development of the thinking power a maximum and the development of the mere memory a minimum.

But with religious instruction faith in authority is to be the chief organ, and the critical faculty of the intellect must be kept everywhere subordinate. This is necessary because religious truth is revealed in allegoric and symbolic form. Moreover, it is revealed by divine authority and is not discovered by us scientifically. Undoubtedly religious truth contains the highest wisdom that the human race possesses—the ultimate ground of all moral and practical direction of life. For this very reason it cannot be

taken up analytically and comprehended by the immature intellect of the pupil in the same way that he comprehends grammar and arithmetic. The analytic power of the mind which is necessary for the comprehension of science is likely to be hostile and sceptical in its attitude towards religious truth.

It is obvious that the mind must not be changed too abruptly from secular studies to religious contemplation. To place a lesson on religious doctrines next after a lesson in mathematics or physical science has the inevitable disadvantage that the mind brings with it the bent or proclivity of scientific study to the serious disturbance of the religious frame of mind. The consequence of placing religious instruction in close connection with secular instruction is to develop habits of flippant and shallow reasoning on sacred themes, sapping the foundation of piety; or else, where the teacher lays very much greater stress on religious instruction than he does on secular instruction, he is prone to introduce the religious method of instruction into his teaching of the secular branches. Accordingly he requires the pupil to memorize the words of the book, and to receive its words as authority without question. All secular branches under this influence get to be taught in the spirit of authority, and critical acuteness and independent thinking are not allowed to spring up in the mind of the pupil. The influence of the dogmatic tone of religious lessons creeps into the secular recitations, and authority usurps the place of original thinking. That this dogmatic method of instruction was universally present in the schools of the olden times there can be no doubt. The Puritan Church was all-powerful in the methods of the schools of New England, and dogmatic authority compelled the memorizing of the