

cient. The soul is, after all, though endowed with powers so various a single entity, an indivisible unit. It is scarcely possible to call into play one set of its powers without exercising all the rest, and so strengthening the whole. The Teacher who leads his pupil on step by step in the analysis of a difficult problem in arithmetic, or an intricate passage in poetry, until he comprehends the principles that underlie the one and appreciates the thought that gives force and beauty to the other, is actually cultivating reason, judgment, imagination and taste. Holding then the true end of teaching to be the development of mind or thought power, the question naturally suggests itself, What is the best mode of developing this power, or in other words what studies or classes of studies are best adapted to secure this end? I shall take time to lay down but one or two general principles, leaving it to each to examine and follow them out to their logical results. The first and broadest principle is, it seems to me, that those studies which make the largest demands upon the largest number of faculties, have most educating power. In other words the harder any study compels the child to *think*—and the less capable it is of being pursued mechanically, or made merely a thing of rote, the better instrument is it in the hands of the teacher. But here I cannot insist too strongly upon the difference between rote, and reasoning, between committing to memory other men's thoughts and thinking. Power of independent mental action is the thing to be sought for. The teacher's aim should be not so much to communicate facts and truths as to draw out the latent ability to discover facts and to elicit and test and substantiate truths. In a word not the accumulation of knowledge but the development of power, is education.

I hope I may not be misunderstood when I speak of the teacher's duty in regard to moral training. In these days when creeds are multiplied and multiplying, when freedom of thought and expression is used and abused on every topic, when Christians and moralists are divided and subdivided into a thousand varying shades of opinion, and when rationalism and positivism and atheism even, are in fashion, the subject is a delicate one to broach. I am far from believing that the teacher should feel it his duty to impress upon the minds of his pupils his own peculiar views of religion. Nor do I even say that the teacher is bound to inculcate any particular system of morals either of his own getting up, or of any other man's. What I wish to insist on is this: So long as there exists a right and a wrong in human actions and so long as the power of discriminating between them, and the degrees of self-approbation or remorse attending them, may be indefinitely increased by proper culture, so long that teacher is highly culpable, grossly recreant to the sacred trust committed to him, who leaves these faculties to take care of themselves. It is his to train these moral powers, not by inculcating tenets and dogmas and creeds, but by constantly leading the pupil to reflect upon the moral qualities of actions, and to listen attentively to the voice of conscience. This may be done in many ways with the happiest results. The school-master may seize upon moral questions which often come up, in the school-room or on the play-ground, or he may present imaginary cases and judiciously lead the pupil to examine them in the light of reason, and to try them by the golden rule and to listen attentively to every whisper of that still, small voice which speaks in every ear not totally benumbed by vicious choices. Closely connected, in fact, inextricably interwoven with