

lect to be formed and furnished, but also a sensibility to be affected and a will to be energized. The education which equips a child for his duties in life is largely that which he imbibes from the influence of home and the community.

It is possible for the school to enforce some mental discipline, but it was never known to cultivate serenity of disposition; it may improve the standard of taste, but it can never quicken into being the dormant sympathies, the innate sensibilities of the boy's soul. In the prosaic of the school days he will never hear the *vox Dei* and the *vox humani* seeking for expression in his life. If the cultivation of the emotions is ignored at the fireside altar the boy begins life bereft of guardian angels. He would grow to manhood "emptied of every sympathetic thrill."

Mr. Ruskin says with startling insistence: "The ennobling difference between one man and another is that one man feels more than another. The essence of all vulgarity lies in the want of sensation. It is in the blunt hand, in the dead heart, in the hardened conscience that men become vulgar. They are forever vulgar precisely in proportion as they are incapable of sympathy."

We all know the story of Faust, how, missing the guidance of the heart, he plays experiments with life, trying knowledge, pleasure, dissipation, one after another, and hating them all; and then hating life itself as a weary, flat, unprofitable mockery.

Lord Byron's life was a passionate, lawless existence because of a lack of parental discipline. In his poetry he said: "And thus untaught in youth my heart to tame, my springs of life were poisoned."

In the home life of large numbers of children there is no moral culture:

they are housed and fed, and occasionally groomed; otherwise they are considered only "a little dearer than the horse, a little nearer than the dog."

There is always in the minds of parents the remedial agency of the schools. It is like the idea of matrimony that Mr. Lecky derides. He says: "The notion prevails to a large extent that the marriage ceremony has a retrospective virtue, cancelling previous immorality." In neither case are the effects of the previous conditions eradicable,—the gravestones in our rear cast lengthened shadows over our future career.

"I looked behind to find my past,
And, lo! it had gone before."

Character is cumulative; as George Eliot expresses it, "We prepare ourselves for sudden deeds by the reiterated choice of good or evil which gradually determines character."

To warm into unfolding, to foster into growth all kindly sympathies towards men, all elevated thoughts respecting the duties and the destinies of life; to cultivate a supreme reverence for the Creator and for the sanctity and inviolability of human obligation and personality,—if this is the duty of the teacher, then how many develop the child committed to their care?

Some of the best mothers regard a child, not as a physiological expression of being, but as a special gift of God; and with this nebulous notion of Deity they expect God to bring it up to "full being," or else the unfortunate "offspring" is little better than an "elementary orphan."

Perhaps the doctrine of *laissez-faire* is an unconscious deduction from the scriptural "Cast thy burden upon the Lord." But it makes of one a sort of parasite of the Omnipresence. There are many things in Scripture which submit to many