

negatively by their neglect, or worse still in a positive manner, by their own example. Such boy or girl must be led to a deep conviction of his errors, and this will never be so effectually done by merely inducing him to practise the "right" as by giving him that power always yielded by moral suasion in affording him abundant reasons why he should execute what you wish him to do.

Perhaps in the whole of Professor Murray's paper there is no paragraph which will carry greater weight with his readers than that in which he says: "One fears lest formal instruction in ethics may produce a host of moral prigs," etc.

Why does Professor Murray fear that "a host of moral prigs" may be produced by "formal instruction" in ethics? Man is not said to be a moral agent at all, simply because he is subjected to certain directive rules of conduct (the brutes would be moral agents in that sense), but because endowed with liberty he freely governs himself by them, or deviates from them in his conduct. The *moral esse* of a human act does not consist in liberty itself, nor in the rules by which liberty is expected to be guided, but in a certain natural habitude, or relation, of the act done, to the Supreme reason, that is to say, to the Divine. The free will is the material or eliciting cause of a human act, but since this free election on the part of the will is toward something antecedently apprehended as worthy of choice, the impulse to the will comes from the apprehending power, or, in other words, from the intellect. How deeply, therefore, does not a practical judgment enter into the subjective morality of every act. Man's free will is informed by his reason. If this latter is perverted, or darkened, or has been developed along crooked lines of thought, there will arise darkness so gross that even light itself will not be seen when light shines. This will be clear to any one who believes, as I do, that human reason does not determine the objective truth or morality of any act or thought, but only recognizes wherein it consists. Persuaded as I am of all this, I cannot put from my mind the modifying action of environment in the moral character of every boy and girl in a school. The intellect is trained to think, and habits are formed by what they see practised around them. How many of those actions are done blindly, inadvertently, through volitional weakness, a spirit of compromise, etc., without any "perplexities of conscience," and yet how little flavored they are with any moral rectitude? There is an evolution of the moral nature of the boy and girl going on all the time, and not only, it may be, the law of heredity, but the law of environment, exercises a very vigorous, diverging influence upon it. If that influence is to be counteracted it must be by a system of wise instructions, and lovingly and patiently guiding them into a different course of conduct.

Will not the time arrive in every life when each one will ask himself the question: Is my moral consciousness a sound one or not? Has it been rightly or duly formed? At such a transition period what answer will be given by those who have left off school and have no hope or desire to enter college, nor any wise and better informed friend to afford wholesome counsel? During this formative period—a period pregnant with awful consequences to the future life, it will be woeful if doubts are banished by arguments—which in their very nature are pernicious, and in their conclusions are

false and misleading. But this will be likely to happen when the ethical "why" has been completely ignored in school days.

I can conceive how one may not only know the truth and pursue it for its own sake and yet be a man of very little moral status in the community. To find the path of righteousness is not necessarily to follow it; but to know the "why" we should follow it is no impediment, but rather an impulse to go on in the way wherein we ought to walk. The law of self-sacrifice is the highest law of living, and if that principle is well and thoroughly produced in school practice it will have an influence for universal well-doing which no one can measure.

[In my paper in the REVIEW for February, page 174, by an error of the printer the word *physical* is substituted for the word *psychical*.—E. P. H.]

For the Review.]

#### In the Schoolroom.

"Toiling, rejoicing, sorrowing,  
Onward through life he goes;  
Each morning sees some task begun,  
Each evening sees its close.  
Something attempted, something done,  
Hath earned a night's repose."

What are the teacher's emotions as she enters her schoolroom every morning? Are the following lines expressive of her sentiments?—

"Uneasy lies the head of all who rule;  
Her's, worst of all, whose kingdom is a school."

Does she long for the mechanical performance of duties, which she terms teaching, to terminate, in order that she and her unfortunate mechanisms may be liberated? Or, on the other hand, does she realize the nobility, happiness and sweetness of rearing "the tender thought," and thus enter upon her daily duties with a kind, loyal, yet thoughtful, heart, knowing that she is teaching for eternity, not merely for the current term?

The teacher who would be a true educator and seek to develop character as well as intellect, adheres to the principles of the "golden rule." She is appreciative and sympathetic. She bears in mind that her pupils—to quite an extent—are her reflectors, and as she wishes for kindness, she's kind. She wishes for truth, hence she's true.

Instead of continually "harping" at the dull, thoughtless boy, she shows her appreciation of the bright, thoughtful one, knowing that if she brands a boy with "bad," or "stupid," he will in all probability live up to the reputation.

She encourages her pupils to confide in her, putting a high premium on sincere, penitent "confessionals."

She does not forget the little courtesies which sweeten social intercourse, viz., "Thank you," "If you please," "Good morning," etc.