

not yet become general, and it is difficult to see how they can be made to appear to be of this character, until the other side of the Christian Church comes to endorse them as such.

The Quarterly with the Review looks, hopes, and prays for a higher position than the Church has yet reached, when there shall confessedly be one shepherd and one fold, one Lord, one faith, and one baptism; and bases its confidence in the memorable prayer of Christ, that his people may be one, as he and the Father are one. What is impossible with man, and impracticable in the ordinary course of human affairs, is possible with God, and practicable in his Church, where Christ lives and the Holy Ghost is shed abroad.

T. A.

ART. II.—PAROCHIAL, OR CHRISTIAN SCHOOLS.

"Ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Eph. 6: 4.*

THESE words furnish the foundation, and the leading thoughts, required in the present Article. We are here taught that children are to be "brought up" religiously—that this is to be done by the combined use of two kinds of means, nurture and admonition, or discipline—that this duty rests upon their parents—and that it is to be done in the Lord.

These are precisely the ideas that lie at the foundation of that system of religious training known under the name of Parochial Schools. In those countries where the State recognizes only one denomination of Christians, a certain district is assigned to a congregation as its limits; this district is called a *Parish*; and the school, under the direction and supervision of that congregation, for the instruction of all the children in that Parish, is called a Parochial School. We retain this name. With us it means a school in a congregation, and under its oversight, for the instruction of all the children in the families of that congregation; and all such others as may desire to embrace the advantages there afforded. It requires that the Bible be read and explained; that the Catechism be used as a form of doctrine; that prayer and singing be heard and taught, and that a religious life be cultivated in the hearts of the children in connection with the development of their minds.

* The above article is the substance of a sermon delivered by appointment at the meeting of the Synod of the German Reformed Church, in October last, in the city of Baltimore. It is now published by request of that body.

It demands that the teacher be pious, and that he labor with, and under the direction of the Pastor; and that to instruction, be added a wise and Christian administration of discipline. In this way the school becomes a Church School, it secures to the children a training in the Lord—a training which includes the two elements of nurture and admonition.

The word *nurture* has a sense of its own, which we will do well to fix definitely in our minds. It is not to be taken as synonymous with the general terms, training, instructing, teaching or educating. Its meaning lies beneath these; in other words, these are the fruits or effects of nurture. The word *nurture* designates that which the mother is to the infant—the medium source of its life—the cause of its growth toward perfection. The word *educate*, and its kindred terms, designates a mere *drawing out* of what is already at hand. Education is a training and trimming of branches, nurture is a feeding of the roots. The word *education* is not used in the Scripture, evidently because the Scriptural view of our nature does not allow the idea that we can become what we ought to be by a mere drawing out, or educating, of what is in us.

Nurture *precedes* in order, education or training. As the germ of the vine is nourished in the bosom of the earth and nurtured out of it, before it can have the training hand applied to it, so the life of nurture is moulding the infant being before it is sufficiently aware of an outward world to be affected by its reasons and its regulations, in such a way as is involved in the idea of education. Hence nurture includes those more hidden, and more delicate appliances which exert so great an influence on the infant being, without its own will, knowledge, or co-operation. Nurture is to the child what the warmth, the moisture and the fat of the earth are to the roots of the infant plant—what the light and love of the mother's eyes, the warmth and nourishment of the mother's bosom are to the unconscious babe which is there—and is there gladly, but knows not, and cares not why.

According to the true sense of nurture, children are to be nourished *in* the Lord, not educated *into* Him. As plants are nurtured in the ground and from it, so children are to be nurtured in the Lord and from him.

Does the Scripture allow us to regard our children as in the Lord? If we are Christians—yes. The covenant and promise bestowed upon parents included their seed. If one of the parents is a believer then are the children holy, says the apostle. By baptism they are planted together in the likeness

of the Saviour's death, that in that position they may rise in the likeness of His resurrection. Those who are baptised into Christ have put on Christ. Those who are baptized are represented as in the same position as Noah was in the ark—saved, if they go not out of it. Those in covenant are saved if they break not out of it. To be nurtured in covenant is to be nurtured in Him. Hence we find that the Scriptures always speak of those that are covenanted in Baptism as His people, as in a gracious position and state, as children and heirs. They are always addressed as such: You are my people, forsake me not—you have a God, seek not other gods—you have promises and hopes, cast them not away.

Children in the Church are represented as planted in the house of the Lord, where they are to "grow in grace," being nurtured into the full stature of men in Christ, by the resources which the Church furnishes. In short the nurture of the Church is to be to the spiritual part of the child, in all its wants, what the nurture of the mother is to the infant in a physical point of view.

Nurture implies the evolution of the *whole being in a uniform way*. Education may refer to the development of some one part of the being, in some one department of knowledge; but nurture is that deeper leaven, which leavens the whole, or that deeper life of the mustard seed, which causes all its roots, its branches, its leaves, blossoms and fruit, to appear in their season, and in their place, not in monstrous distortion, but in beautiful proportion and symmetry.

It can be shown, from the history of Education, that the idea of education in the form of nurture was never understood except by the Church; and that it can never be carried out, but by the Church. As it is impossible, however, in the short space of time allowed for this discourse to treat the subject historically, we must attempt to illustrate the point in a shorter way: By reviewing different systems of Education without any reference to the time of their existence. We shall see that no system ever yet reached the idea involved in nurture in the Christian sense of that term. It will be seen that all these systems were partial, one-sided, fragmentary—a mere outward daubing or patching,—a mere trimming of branches, and generally the trimming of one branch to the entire neglect of all the rest. They make their man as did the ancient Egyptian sculptors, among whom making heads, arms, legs, bodies was each a separate business, separately carried on, by separate

persons—the man was afterwards joined together out of all these separate parts. There was no nurture needed there. In like manner the Christian idea of nurture can have no place in a system of education which proposes to make the real man by a similar aggregation of parts, made to order in separate places, and by different hands.

I. Let us glance at what we will call the Pagan System.

All pagan systems may be characterized in general, as making the spiritual, and the eternal, subordinate to the bodily or the earthly—or, as was often the case, leaving that side entirely out of view. The body must be trained for war, the soul for the state. What they taught of the gods, of immortality, and the future life, was, for the most part, because it was believed that these ideas furnished useful checks upon the minds of citizens, and contributed towards making them better citizens. Eloquence was studied to move the populace to attachment to the State; poetry and history to recount the heroic traditions of their ancestors, to inspire love of country. All centered in the State. Shooting the bow, launching the javelin, and all kinds of athletic exercises, calculated to make the physical system expert for war, stood prominent in their views of education. All was adapted to make them hard and heroic.

No training which would exert a softening or refining influence was allowed. The Egyptians, for instance, regarded Music as a useless, dangerous and mean diversion. Philip, the Macedonian, said to his son Alexander, who sung with skill at a feast: "Are you not ashamed to sing so well." The Romans treated music with contempt. The Greeks, among whom it received most favor, found at last that it combined, with dancing and the stage, to ruin the State.

"In Carthage" says Rollin, "the study and knowledge of youth were for the most part confined to writing, arithmetic, book-keeping, and the buying and selling of goods; in a word, to whatever related to traffic." They were trained to do business, and make money. The Persians, Cretans, and Lacedæmonians did not entrust the education of children to their parents; even the divine order of the family was broken in upon, that the State might train them for its own ends. Their aim was, "To form the soldier and the citizen." Parental responsibility as well as filial duty were in effect abrogated. Lysurgus, "regarded children as belonging more properly to the State than to their parents, and wished that patriotism should be still more carefully cherished in their breasts than

filial affection." His great maxim was: "Children belong to the State, their education ought to be directed by the State, and the views and interests of the State ought in it alone to be considered." In this system of education the children were detached from the families to which they belonged, and gathered together in public establishments, where they were entirely under the care of teachers appointed by the State.

Here there is a conflict between the family and the State. Instead of being citizens of the State *in* the family, they are made citizens of the State *out* of the family. The family is in the State, but is at the same time ignored, and its educating influences declared dangerous. According to the divine order the State is not constituted of individuals *out* of families, but of individuals *in* families—as the family produces individuals for the State, so it is also to educate them for citizenship. In religion filial love and patriotism are not in conflict with each other, but in harmony. The best child will make the best citizen.

We see that in all these pagan ideas, man's immortal nature is left out of view, or at least made subordinate. Earth excludes heaven. Time excludes eternity. The body ignores the soul. The State abolishes both the Church and the family, instead of forming with them, as is done in the divine order, the great *triad*, in which all the help, hope, and harmony of earth are bound up.

In this system man is educated in part, but not nurtured as a whole.

II. The idea of nurture is not reached in another system of education which I will call the *infidel system*.

While the system to which we have alluded, under the previous head, proposes to educate the natural man for natural ends, this proposes to cultivate the natural man, as a natural man, for ends higher and better than nature. The system to which we allude proposes merely to cultivate nature by following nature. It leaves the doctrine of human depravity entirely out of view. It regards human nature as needing, not renovation, but simply reformation; it supposes it to be good in its roots, and that it needs education only to draw it out and make it better. It is not the nurture of a new life of grace in the soul, starting from Christ in baptism, but it is the education of nature starting in nature. That which is to be educated is not the being which is born of water and the Spirit, but it is that which is born of the flesh and which is flesh; and which, when

educated, will be flesh and nature still, which however refined, cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

This system, had, if not as its father, yet as its master expounder, the celebrated Rousseau. He sets out with the proposition: "Our business in bringing up children should be, to second and to call forth nature." We must be careful, according to this system, in no way to forestal or mislead nature. All we dare do is very gently to stimulate nature to develop itself. We must nurture nature, and train up the child, not in the way we think it should go, but in the way it will go. Listen again to the oracle on education: "With great care prevent the child from forming any habits whatever. Prepare him for the enjoyment of liberty, by preserving to him the exercise of his natural abilities, unfettered by any artificial habits." Suppose we should treat the trees in our nurseries thus! "Sacrifice not the present happiness of your child for the sake of any distant advantage." That is, subject him to no discipline; nature must be free! "Be not over-anxious to guard him against natural evil. Seek not to impress him with ideas of duty or obligation." That would be to restrain, or at least to tax his liberty. He must grow up free like a weed; all you have to do is to work nourishment into the soil. A luxuriant monster it would make!

Hear again: "From the hour of his birth till twelve years of age the education of Emulus must be purely negative. Could we bring him up healthy and robust, and entirely ignorant till that age, the eyes of his understanding would then be open to any lesson: free from the influence of habit and prejudice, his passions would not then oppose us; and we might render him the wisest and most virtuous of men. If we can but lose time, if we can but advance without receiving any impressions whatever, our gains are unspeakable."*

All this, in the form in which it is presented by Rousseau, seems not only profane, but nonsensical and ridiculous; but look closely, and you will find that this very system, in substance,

* "Perhaps, in the midst of society, it may be difficult to bring up our pupil without giving him some idea of the relations between man and man, and of the morality of human actions. Let that, however, be deferred as long as possible."

There are various means to be used to keep the child's mind free from the idea that one thing is right and another wrong. One is this: "If the child sees one angry, we should tell him that he was affected with a fit of sudden illness. This will prevent the unhappy effects of the example."

"The first moral notions that should be communicated to the child are those of property."

has been baptized into the Christian name, and reigns under Christian patronage. What else is the educational system of Unitarians, but an attempt at educating nature into grace. In their system, grace is not a basis to educate from laid in baptism, but grace is something to be attained to by education—the beginning is nature, the end reached is grace. A plant without a soil. Education is a leading forth of nature; if not of nature, then of nothing; for according to their view baptism does not lay a basis of grace in the infant heart. May we not say, in refutation of this idea, that which is educated of the flesh, is flesh.

Could Rousseau's idea of keeping the child negative up to twelve years, be realized, what could better suit the Baptist's system? He believes in no grace given in Baptism which warrants the parent in believing that his child may, from that point on, be nurtured in a real divine life, so that no technical experience, or sudden violent transition, is afterward needed to constitute him a Christian. He does not believe that God has made such provision in His system of grace, that a child may be inserted in grace, and may be brought up in the Lord's nurture. He does not believe that the child has gracious life, how can he nurture it? The beginning of that life which is to be nurtured, only begins in the conscious faith of the adult. What then is he educating or nurturing in his child, if he educates anything? What but nature? for nothing else is there, according to his own confession! If there is nothing there to educate, and he educates nothing, then it is his policy to see that the child is kept negative. He cannot train the good in him—he cannot train grace for there is no basis of grace there. He dare not with the Unitarian, train nature, for he believes that to be depraved! and that would only make the case worse! What can he do that is consistent, but adopt the very language of the master of the infidel system, "With great care prevent the child from forming any habits whatever—seek not to teach him ideas of duty or obligation, for whatsoever is not of faith is sin—teach him not to pray, for he has not yet exercised faith, and is therefore unregenerate, and the prayers of such are abomination to God—bring him up healthy and robust and entirely ignorant—his mind must be kept purely negative; for all the progress he makes, is but an evolution of his depraved nature, and an increase of his sinfulness!" Such, without caricature, is this infidel system when set to work under Christian patronage. They begin to

feel it in New England where the system reigns in bleak blue glory. "Our very theory of religion," exclaims one troubled, and a troubler among them *—"Our very theory of religion is, that men are to grow up in evil, and be dragged into the Church of God by conquest. The world is to lie in halves, and the kingdom of God is to stretch itself side by side with the kingdom of darkness, making sallies into it, and taking captive those who are sufficiently hardened and bronzed in guiltiness to be converted." Thus there is no hope for children but their growing up in sin—their habits are formed in unregeneracy—those very years, during which their susceptibilities are tenderest, and when formative influences could most easily do their work, are hopelessly sold to nature and Satan; and in adulthood, when the tide of life, as it has all along flowed, is most determinate in its own direction, the spirit is to be jerked, by a kind of holy violence, into a regenerate state!

Thus the Church lives not by nurture, but by excitements; for in this way only, it is supposed, can adult sinners be reached and conquered. Children in the Church, grown up without Christian or gracious nurture, in adult age, present the appearance of a neglected field overgrown with those weeds, and briars, and thorns which spring up naturally from the earth, which when the summer is past is nigh unto cursing—it is a wilderness of combustible matter, which can only be cleansed by a conflagration—and when the fire has passed over it, how desolate!

Speaking of this system in contrast with the system of true nurture, the same author, just quoted, confesses thus: "We have worked a vein till it is run out. The churches are exhausted. There is little to attract them, when they look upon the renewal of scenes through which many of them have passed. They look about them with a sigh, to ask if possibly there is no better way, and some are ready to find that better way in a change of their religion. Nothing different from this ought to have been expected. No nation can long thrive by a spirit of conquest; no more can a church. There must be an internal growth, that is made by holy industry, in the common walks of life and duty."

This system is mere education, not nurture. In so far as it even seems to be nurture it is nurture *in* nature, and *of* nature, instead of nurture in the Lord. Besides, it excludes entirely one side of education: it admits of no "*admonition*"—restraint

* Dr. Bushnell on Christian Nurture.

or discipline. It insists that nature must be free, all we dare do is to "second" and "call it forth." This system then, however much it may, in some of its details, be favored among some professedly Christian sects, is not a Christian system, and does not reach the true idea of Christian nurture.

III. There is a system of education in which intellectual and religious training are *severed*, and treated as interests that may be separately carried forward. Wherever this idea prevails the true idea of Christian nurture is excluded; for nurture proposes to develop the growth of the entire being in a uniform way—one part of his nature cannot be left to stand still while the other is going on. The intellectual and religious are not different natures, but only different branches of the same nature, and they must be nurtured together in the unity of one life.

The system which we are here reviewing errs in two extremes. When it is attempted to cultivate the religious at the expense of the intellectual; or, when it is attempted to cultivate the intellectual at the expense of the religious.

First, religious culture which overlooks and leaves behind the intellectual. This has in some ages, and in some lands, been the error of the Roman Church. That communion has not, and does not now, value in due proportion the intellectual culture of the masses. In that Church, as we believe, the priestly and kingly offices have too much crowded out of view the prophetic office. We think this will appear as truth from an impartial observation of the cultus of that Church. It may be seen in all their services that the prophetic office stands but faintly in view. In what they do teach there is not full justice done to man's intellect. What they teach is rather something to be believed, than something to be known. That intellect should bow to faith is, of course, all right; but intellect should not be ignored by faith. The Roman Church we believe does not full justice to the intellectual side of its members. In this way it does,—though perhaps not intentionally—give some appearance of reason for charging them with holding the motto that, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion." For some reason or other, there is not, in that communion, a zeal for the intellectual elevation of the masses, such as we believe the best interests of their religious life demand.

In the Greek, and other oriental Churches, this want of attention to the intellectual side of man prevails in a worse, and a wider form. What the masses there are taught, is for the most part a mere by-rote knowledge, and lies in the mind

only as a habit, and as a cold, formal, husky tradition. Their priests are generally themselves ignorant of all except the tread-mill services of which they live, and through which they pass in the most lifeless monotony. Children are taught to say over religious formula, like Mahomedans say over the Koran, without knowing or caring whether it contains any reason or any sense.

The same evil, and the same error of which we are treating, is also found among some of the modern sects. There is however this difference, that while those ancient organizations ignore intellect by faith, these ignore it by feeling. With them feeling is the most prominent part of religion. Knowledge is regarded as dangerous—or at least as being a matter only and merely for this world, and as being of no account in reference to the next world. All wisdom is regarded as the wisdom of this world, just as if there were not also a feeling of this world, as well as a wisdom of this world. This is a partial view of man's nature. It proceeds upon the false principle that the intellectual and religious sides of our nature are in conflict with each other, and that the whole man can be nurtured and perfected by leaving one side of his nature wholly out of sight.

Secondly: There is another extreme into which this error runs; it is when there is an attempt to cultivate the intellectual at the expense of the religious, or independently of the religious. This error proposes to keep the two interests separate. It is admitted that children should have religious culture, but then that is a matter to be separately attended to. The intellectual is to be attended to, and the religious is to be added to it in due time. The school is regarded as having only to do with the intellectual, leaving the religious for the family, the Church, and Christian charity. The child is to take to school nothing but its mind; and is there to be nurtured as a mere intellectual being. This is the error which reigns most extensively on the Protestant side of the Church and has its systematic exhibition in our common public school system.

On this system we must offer some strictures, for it stands more directly, and more formidably than all the others, in the way of Parochial or Christian Schools. In offering what we shall offer on this point, we are not ignorant that many of the best men, with the best of motives, have been, and still are, the zealous friends of this system; neither insensible of the pain, which the conclusions at which we shall arrive, shall cause that class of philanthropists, should they carry the same force

to their minds as they do our own. Nor would we claim the honor of making any discoveries in this department, but desire only to give intelligent or definite expression to what we are sure is fast becoming a general feeling.*

The Common School System makes no provision whatever for the religious wants of children. Religious culture there is studiously excluded and prohibited. The child may have any views, or no views, in religion. It is to be taught nothing in that direction. No book giving religious instruction "shall be used as a school book, nor admitted into school." The Bible is barely tolerated—it may be read, but, "without comment by the teacher." No religious qualifications are sought in the teacher. In short, mind, and mind only, is to come in play, and to be dealt with in the culture of common schools. The system aims only at educating part of man. It aims only at preparing him for the State and for business, not for the Church. It takes in only time and earth, not eternity and heaven.

In this system education is taken out of the hands of the family, and of the Church. Those who have charge of the educational interests, are not the pastor, church officers, and pious school-masters, but "Directors"—a kind of committee for the time, who attend to the duty in the same spirit as they would to laying out a road. The school-house no more stands on the green beside the church—where all religious associations congregate—where the spirit of religion lies, like sweet sunlight on every object around, and where the graves are!—but they are stuck, like milestones, wherever a cold mechanical system assigns them their place. It may happen just as well as not, that the associations of childhood may be bound to the top of a bleak hill; in the region of some miserable marsh with its ponds and mud; or near some gloomy old still-house with its styes and its stench! Parents, whose highest concern it is to have their children's minds expanded in a religious element, are compelled to send them to a place where no pious whisper is allowed, where religious instruction is contraband and unlawful, and where the teacher may be an infidel. Where the director may be any one at all—one whose highest ideas of education are reading, writing and cyphering—one who perhaps cannot read at all. What parent can comfortably submit his children to such a system of miserable orphanage!

* It is proper to premise, that the strictures we make are intended to apply directly only to the Common School System in Pennsylvania, and to the system of State schools in other States, only so far as they are similar to this.

The system of Directorship, as established by law in these schools, however well it may look in theory and in law, does not answer the purpose in practice. All the directors generally do, is to procure a teacher and firewood, and one is generally procured in the same spirit as the other, with least trouble, and at the lowest price. After the school begins directorship in effect ceases—the teacher and the school are then left to direct themselves. The consequence is disorder, which gets ever worse. Already there are many parents who decline sending their children to the common schools, on account of the profanity, vulgarity, and rudeness which are found to reign there.*

It is but a comparatively short time (1835) since the common school system has been established in various parts of our State; yet there is already that in its history which condemns it. Almost every year the school law has been altered and amended. Defects were discovered in its workings, and the Legislature was called upon to remedy them. The history of the School Law in Pennsylvania, reminds one of an attempt to patch the rents of a rotten garment—the contraction required to mend one makes two worse ones. This altered, amended, renewed School Law is sent out with its tables, its charts and supplements, as a guide to Directors to whom it is as unintelligible as the statement of an algebraic equation to a child that just begins to spell. It was the confession of a lawyer, of twenty-five years' practice, to me, that he had evidently given up the idea of ever understanding the Common School Law. The very fact of its constant changings and amendments, shows that it is a system without system—that it is a dabbling in experiments without sure principles to regulate or define. To such a ship of sails without rudder, floating at random, we are to entrust the educational interests of our country. Every successive and ever-changing Legislature is to be permitted to subject the system to its own caprices, and, if they choose, to launch out into new experiments. Think of it! to a system of education which ignores religion in its teachings, a system in the hands of a new Legislature every year—with yearly a new superintendent, new laws, new directors, and generally a new teacher—to such a system we are to entrust the nurture of our children. Who can comfortably build his house on such a foundation of rolling pebbles and floating sand!

* Children learn from example *before* they can understand the grounds and reasons of moral obligation: hence the injury which they receive from the bad examples which are constantly before them in common schools.

We can also show, from the confessions of its warmest friends, that the system is radically defective. The fact they see, but seem not to see the reason of the defect. In 1812 Philadelphia was authorized to establish public schools for the poor. It was soon seen that there was something defective in the business. A committee was appointed in 1816 to inquire into the weak points of the system. They report that many do not attend at all during the year, though \$22,000 were spent to educate them. But this is not the worst; such was the character of these schools that, "Such as were absent suffered less by their inattention than many of those whose morals have been thus undesignedly injured at the county expense." Not the worst yet: "In every view, therefore, of the existing plan of public education, with which your committee are furnished, they are reluctantly and sorrowfully compelled to declare, that from its first establishment to the present time, it has, in their opinion, been not only injurious to the character of the rising generation, but a benevolent fraud upon the public bounty." The patrons of this system forgot that educated mind without religion is educated vice; and that mind can only be stimulated to seek its improvement by something higher, deeper, and more earnest than itself. Now they are reminded of it by the failure of the experiment.

This testimony to the inadequacy of the system which we are reviewing is so much the stronger from the fact that the Christian system is praised in contrast with it by the same committee. I start in quoting farther from the same report at the very next sentence where I left off: "It is a consolation, however, to reflect, that during the last eight years, in the course of which almost \$200,000 have been spent upon a scheme of public instruction so uselessly, there have been in successful operation numerous schools for the free education of indigent children, superintended from the most praiseworthy motives by respectable citizens; and that in these institutions many pupils of charity have had their minds imbued with sound morals, and been otherwise fitted for the proper discharge of their various duties in future life. But for this reflection, the prospect would indeed be gloomy; for in these benevolent labors, it is hoped, a redeeming principle has been established, the happy effect whereof may yet be manifested."

These extracts need no comments. We see in them the difference between education without religion, and education with religion.

The present Common School System in Pennsylvania has only existed some eighteen years. Already it is deeply felt to be wanting. It does not answer the purpose. We will not speak of the general mutterings of dissatisfaction which are heard especially among the Christian community; but we will quote from the confessions of its very foster parents, to show that it bears the elements of degeneracy in its own bosom—that it cannot sustain sufficient interest in itself to carry out its own regulations, and to reach forward towards the securing of its own ends.

I will quote from the Report of January, 1850, by Thomas H. Burrows, the most zealous friend of the Common School System in Pennsylvania: "Whoever shall closely examine the annual reports of the Superintendent of Common Schools, will find, that very soon after the establishment of the system, say about the year 1839, a certain degree of progress had been effected towards its perfection; but that, since that period, little if any improvement has taken place in its most essential particulars. School-houses have, it is true, been erected by thousands, and teachers in the same proportion have been employed; hundreds of thousands of pupils have been brought into the schools, and the gross expenditure of the system has risen to ten millions of dollars; but when he comes to the true test of its efficacy and utility—the *pay of teachers*, and the *duration of teaching* in each year—he finds a sad falling off. In the years 1838, 1839, 1840, teachers seem to have been better paid, and consequently their services better appreciated, than at any time since; and in 1837 and 1838, the duration of teaching was one-fifth greater than in 1847, '48, and greater than in any year between those two eras, or since. These indications are unerring. They point to one or other of two inevitable results—either that a system which thus fails in accomplishing its great object, viz: that of giving sufficient instruction, by means of capable, and, therefore, well paid teachers, must go down; or that it must be so strengthened as to effect its noble purposes."

Again, he says: "But among the evils of the system . . . is the want of an efficient head—a sufficient driving power in the system." That it lacks this, he says, is evident from the falling off just mentioned. "This manifest want of vigor, the committee believe, exists in the head, not in the body of the system."

Here we have the true, and what is worse, the incurable

weakness of the system exhibited. It degenerates—is less efficient by far in 1847 than it was in 1837. It started, like all false systems, with a spasm, and gradually died down to a tame level. The plant shoots up with extraordinary facility, just because it has no real depth of earth, and then pines away for the same reason. It lacks motive power, it lacks vigor, it lacks a head. Thus it lacks all; for what is that worth which has no head, no vigor, and no driving power. All these, which a state system that regards nothing in man but mind, must ever lack, are supplied in a system which connects the School with the Church. Where the Church underlies the School, imparting her nurture to the whole being, regarding him in his eternal as well as temporal interests, there will be head and motive power in abundance. The vigor of her infinite earnestness will be infused into all her educational operations. Then the School Law will be the law of life and grace in Christ Jesus, and not merely the pamphlet laws of an ever-changing legislative body, to be administered by an ever-changing committee of directors. The teacher will be no hireling for a few months, but a functionary of the Church, whose piety insures his faithfulness—a teacher who is not merely asked by a committee, Do you know science? but one whom the Saviour himself asked over and over, "Lovest thou me?" before he gave him the awfully solemn and responsible commission: "Feed my lambs!"

Whoever will read the annual reports of the Superintendent of Common Schools with care, will feel convinced that the evils which are the burden of ceaseless complaint are essentially in the system, and cannot be cured. We hear without end of the "sluggishness of Directors and parents;" and of "the carelessness and unfitness of teachers." In the report of 1849 we read: "The practical effects of the plan are truly deplorable. Scarcely a mail arrives that is not loaded with complaints of the inability of the teacher, of his immoral habits, and of the bad condition of the schools. Petitions to the Superintendent, for redress of grievances over which he has no control, are frequently presented; and expressions of dissatisfaction are not rare against the continuance of the system." Report of 1849.

This indifference and opposition are not to be ascribed to a want of interest in education, but to a want of interest in schools without a soul or a God. There is an instinctive sense of the false principle upon which the system rests; and its

practical exhibitions daily increase that suspicion. Hear the Report of 1850: "Complaints are heard from various quarters that the system has failed to accomplish the purposes for which it was designed, and that the funds of the State are wasted. These expressions of dissatisfaction must not be ascribed entirely to ignorance and prejudice; they come, in too many instances, from honest, intelligent citizens, true friends of Education." Even the zealous advocates of the system betray that they know where the difficulty lies. They feel that the "motive power," which they say the system lacks, could be furnished by religion. "Ministers of the Gospel," says the report of 1848, "could exert an influence, which might reach every fireside, *opening the eyes of the blind, and unstopping the ears of the deaf*, on the subject of rational and moral education." So they might, and so they would, were not they, *in the capacity of ministers*, virtually shut out from the schools. If parents are sluggish in sending their children, how can they be moved to duty except by the higher "driving power" of religion; but this is contraband in the system. Shall ministers be expected to manifest zeal for the education of immortal beings for this world merely? The Common School System can never, in its present form, gain the confidence of the Church and ministry; even if the system did not itself virtually exclude their influence, the false principles which it involves are too radical, and in their practical workings too disastrous, to receive either favor or toleration. The time is not yet, and it never will be, when those, who alone have received the commission, "Go ye, and teach all nations," will surrender their responsibilities into hands which they know are not adequate to the task. They must first forget their own accountability, and lose all respect for the will of Him, whose they are, and whom they serve.

It is all idle. The interests of education cannot be long sustained and vigorously carried forward, unless religion underlies the movement as its motive power. It is well known that colleges do not flourish except under the auspices of the Church. It is Christianity, and that alone, which wakes man to industry and earnestness in every sphere, and consequently also in reference to the cultivation of mind. It is the feeling of immortality that is the impulsive power toward all ambition in expanding the intellectual faculties. It is sin that darkens the mind, and its removal must accompany all attempts to brighten and expand the intellect. All history declares that

religion is the mother of science—that faith is the mother of knowledge.

In the establishment of our Common School System there was professedly at least an aim at imitating the Public School System of Prussia. In 1836 Professor C. E. Stowe, who was about to make a tour through Europe, was requested by a resolution of the Legislature of Ohio, to collect facts in reference to Public Schools. In 1837 he made a long report, in which he dwells principally on the Prussian system, and recommends it in the highest terms; this report was published by order of the Legislature of Ohio. In 1838, the same report was ordered to be published by the Legislature of Pennsylvania. In the same year a large pamphlet of seventy-eight pages was published in Philadelphia, "On the System of Education adopted in the celebrated Common Schools of Prussia." All this was intended to effect a conformation of our system to that of Prussia. But how great is the deception! Almost the only thing in which our schools and those of Prussia are alike, is that they are both public, state schools. Farther than this there is no resemblance at all. How do they differ? In their system religious instruction is included by law; in ours it is excluded by law. In their schools religious instruction is the first thing; here it is not at all. There the religious element pervades every thing connected with the school; here it is contraband in every thing. That is religion as the mother of education; this education without religion. That is nurture in the Lord; this is nurture without the Lord.

"The first vocation of every school," says the law of 1819, (the system went into operation in that year) "is, to train up the young in such a manner as to implant in their minds a knowledge of the relation of man to God, and at the same time to excite in them both the will and the strength to govern their lives after the spirit and precepts of Christianity. Schools must early train children to piety, and therefore must strive to *second and complete the early instruction of parents*. In every school, therefore, the occupations of the day shall begin and end with a short prayer and some pious reflections, which the master must contrive to render so varied and impressive, that a moral exercise shall never degenerate into an affair of habit. All the solemnities of the school shall be interspersed with songs of a religious character." In another section of the law it is enjoined that the Bible and the Catechism shall be used. The New Testament shall be read by the smaller children in the

common language; and by the youths in the gymnasia, in Greek. It is also provided that, "In all the parishes of the kingdom, without exception, the clergyman of every christian communion shall seize every occasion, whether at church, or during their visits to school, or in their sermons at the opening of classes, of reminding the school of their high and holy mission, and the people of their duty towards the school."*

Now contrast with this, our own Public School System. "No catechism, creed, confession, or manual of faith shall be used as a school book nor be admitted into the school." "The Old and New Testament may be used in reading, but without comment by the teacher," 1838. The difference between the Prussian system and our own is that of direct opposites; and yet we are told that "the province of education in the two countries are nearly the same, except that the Prussian system aims at higher objects than the common education of this country." Only this difference! as if this were a matter of no importance! The "higher objects" may be set aside. So think those sages of the State, in the face of all history—in the face of the wisdom of the wisest men that ever lived—and in the face of the holy instincts of all pious parents. "The fear of the Lord, is the beginning of wisdom."

One who, in a publication in 1838, exhibits the Prussian system by way of lesson and example to the friends of the Com-

* It is argued, by those who are in favor of excluding the Bible from the schools, that children become profanely familiar with it, that they are apt to lose all reverence for it, and that it creates in after life a feeling of distaste and even disgust for it. Never was any idea more false. The direct reverse is true. Are not those things that were most common and familiar to us in our childhood the dearest and most cherished by us now? When we, after years, return to the dear scenes which our infancy knew, how strong and affecting are those feelings awakened in our bosoms by the smallest and most trifling things. Every tree, every stump, and every stone, preaches to us silently till we stand and weep. A similar feeling is bound up with our associations in reference to those passages so often read from the Bible, in our school-boy days. Many of us know it by experience; and the Scriptures, when we read them now, have a new glow of warmth and power of attraction, because they connect our present life, deep in our memories, with childhood's happy, happy days. Reading the Bible in school make it tasteless and profanely familiar!—as well might we argue the same of the love of a mother. No, there is a light in which all things are sacred; it is in the light of those impressions which memory receives in childhood. In the language of one who knew better to preach than to practice,

"Long, long be my heart with such memories fill'd!—
Like a vase, in which roses have once been distilled—
You may break, you may ruin the vase if you will,
But the scent of the roses will hang round it still."

mon School System in this country, makes a remarkable confession. After expatiating on the excellencies of the Prussian system, he says: "But if these schools only taught letters and science, if they formed no moral principles and habits; if they took no cognizance of the laws of duty—none of the defenceless state of a mind uninformed of the evil that is in the world—if they never turned the attention of the young to the Providence of God, and his divine attributes; if they never connected the present life to the eternal; if they afforded no expositions of morality; if they presented it only in negations; if they referred it exclusively to the Sunday, the minister, the Church, and the casual Sunday-school, and the self-culture of ripe age—to what mere worldliness and technicality, to what selfishness and implied materialism, to what small effects and low purposes, would they be employed, and how much would they leave undone, which their broad policy, and tried efforts actually accomplish?" Every word of it is true. And every word a just judgment and condemnation of our ten-times helpless, wretched, and ruinous Common School System.

To show how perfectly inadequate our system must be, we need only remark, that even this Prussian system, so thoroughly religious, is pronounced a failure, by Samuel Laing, Esq., an English traveller of much weight, on account of its subversion to the State. Says this learned traveller in 1842: "If the ultimate object of all education and knowledge be to raise man to the feeling of his own moral worth, to a sense of his responsibility to his Creator and to his conscience for every act, to the dignity of a reflecting, self-guiding, virtuous, religious member of society, then the Prussian educational system is a failure. It is only a training from childhood in the conventional discipline and submission of mind which the State exacts from its subjects. It is not a training or education which has raised, but which has lowered, the human character. This system of interference and intrusion into the inmost domestic relations of the people, this educational drill of every family by State means and machinery, supersedes parental tuition. It is a fact not to be denied that the Prussian population is at this day, when the fruits of this educational system may be appreciated in the generation of the adults, in a remarkably demoralized condition in those branches of moral conduct which cannot be taught in schools, and are not taught by the parents, because parental tuition is broken in upon by governmental interference in Prussia, its efficacy and weight annulled, and the

natural dependence of the child upon the words and wisdom of the parent—the delicate threads by which the infant's mind, as its body, draws nutriment from its parent—is ruptured." Page 172. Laing's Notes.

If a system so decidedly religious fails, just because it is a creature of the State, what can we hope for in ours! We believe, however, that Mr. Laing attributes the failure, so far as it is one, to the wrong source. The Church and religion have sufficient prominence in the system to insure complete religious culture; in so far as the system falls short of answering its end, the failure is to be sought in the fact that ever since the system was organized until lately, the Church has been so petrified by the reign of rationalism, as to disable it entirely from infusing a truly regenerating influence into the School System. The school had an inactive Christianity to underlie it—its religious teachings were merely theoretical. But we repeat—if the Christian system of schools in Prussia is scarcely to be saved from condemnation, where must our poor bald, negative system appear!

When the education of children is left in the hands of the State alone, as is done in the Common School System, it is more means to an end—and what is worse, more earthly means to a mere earthly end. But Christian nurture is not merely means to an end—it is means and end in one; and, what is better, heavenly means to an heavenly end.

When religion is excluded from education, what end has education in view? The world in its various interests—an end lower, instead of higher, than the means themselves! When religion is connected with nurture as it is in Parochial Schools, it is viewed as means to an end higher than itself, but the means at the same time as part of the end. This Christian nurture will appear as part of the process of a life constantly progressing from lower to higher—the lower ever terminating in the higher, and becoming complete in it.

That education which is carried on separate from religion offers a constant invitation to the child to look downward to a lower earthly end. For the child will reason, and if not reason, it will feel, thus: If the end of education is not earthly interests, if its end be higher religious interests, why are not those higher interests held forth prominently as the goal of the educational process! Why are the means made to look shy at the end? And why this jealous care to keep the means sep-

arate from the end? If education is to make us better, as well as wiser, why is that better proscribed and kept out of view as though it were ruin to come in contact with it? If education is to lead to the Church, why is the Church ignored and thrust out of sight, and why are we the pensioners of the State? If we are to be servants of religion, as the highest aim of life, why is not religion our master and teacher? If we are now, and are still to be, the children of the Church, why does the Church permit us to be treated as bastards, and turn us over without a sigh, as orphans, to this tax-supported almshouse of the State! If the Church is our mother, why does not she nurture us; and if it is not the design that we shall forget our mother, and be weaned from her, why are we so carefully kept, by legal prohibitions, from hearing her name, from feeling her tenderness, and from sharing in the genial warmth of her love?

Such are the practical contradictions of the system. We do not mean that the child will draw such conclusions, and see these contradictions, intelligently; but the position in which it stands, and the element in which it moves, will lead to this result practically and in fact, with the force of ceaseless, silent, but inevitable necessity. Birds of passage know not why they move as they do; but they are nevertheless under the power of forces which affect their instincts, and which they have no power to resist or control. So in the case before us. Indeed, just as instinct in animals is often a surer guide than reason in man, so the ingenuous and confiding spirit of childhood, will be more easily moulded and led by the silent influences in the midst of which it moves, than by light and logic.

It is the seemingly distant and careless attitude in which the Common School System stands to the Church in the education of children, which is so powerful in weaning their hearts from her. It is not positive opposition, but negative indifference, which is the root of the evil. It is in this, as in other cases, distance, coldness and carelessness, more than all else, that alienates the heart from what it ought to love, and would love, but for that. A child weaned in early infancy, removed from its mother, brought up among strangers, not permitted to hear her name pronounced, except with the uplifted finger of caution, and hearing that it is almost a crime to praise her virtues—such a child can never afterwards have all, if any, of the feelings which belong to the relation of a child to its mother. It is just so when we permit our children to be trained out of the Church, where her name is not heard except in a way which

implies that she needs to be watched, and that her influence is especially to be deprecated in the nurture of man's intellectual nature. Thus the Church is, in fact, a man of hideous face, looking out upon children from the dark, filling their young spirits with secret dread, and causing them to go as far as possible the other way for fear of hidden evil; and, just as those superstitious fears which are awakened in the confiding heart of childhood by thoughtless parents or injudicious nurses, can be removed by neither reason nor philosophy; so the feeling of fear and jealousy toward religion which this false system of education inspires, will present its repulsive images before the spirit, in spite of its better judgment, to the latest hour of life! He that—or any system that—instills in the heart of a child any fear but the fear of God, or raises any doubt or dread but for that which is evil, has made wrong what he never can make right! The sting of a fly, in the infant oak, may, a thousand years afterwards, be the blemish in a plank in the bottom of a ship, which sinks men and treasures! Wo unto him who breaks but a link in the chain of things!

It furnishes no sufficient apology for the system to say that the evil is only negative—that although the instructions of Common Schools impart nothing positively religious, neither do they impart anything irreligious—that they leave the spirit as to religion and morals a *tabula rasa*. This is equally its misery. Indeed it is this plausible angel-of-light-pretense that constitutes the very heart of the danger of this false system. We are not merely to teach them no evil, but we are to bring them up in the Lord's nurture. Negatives are as destructive as positives in this respect. Doing no evil constitutes no saint. Not gathering is scattering abroad. Give a plant no nourishment, no sun, no heat, no moisture, and it will die just as effectually as if you put a worm at its root. Give a child no food, no drink, no air, and its death is as certain as if you give it poison: besides, it dies more cruelly; so, give the spirit no nurture and it dies. The spirit of the child is no dead *tabula rasa*, which you may leave unimpressed at your pleasure, but it is a *tabula vitæ*, which cries in the agony of hunger, Give me food or I die! Let it be considered by the way, that it is this *tabula rasa* philosophy that lies at the root of every false system of education. Rising like a upas in the field of mind, it has cast its killing shadow over ages, and has ever been the tutelary god of an infidel culture. Its tendency has been to hush the infinite in the human spirit. It has done much to

ignore that side of man's nature which fastens him on God and the unseen. It has, to a great extent, fastened him to earth, and compelled him to crawl empirically like a blind spider, feeling his way either by cautious or impetuous experiments. It has taught him to fill his mind with items of knowledge as he finds it, as a boy fills his basket with berries, instead of growing in knowledge, by evolving his nature under the power of the divine out of the infinite in and around him. It has undervalued man's dependence upon the broader life of the general. It has turned the Church into a conventicle or society, and human beings into individuals. It has made education a mere gathering for the mind, instead of a gathering in and by the mind—or an evolution of the mind by nurture. It has cried *tabula rasa* until the human treats itself as such; and the Church, forgetting the deep reason of the Saviour's infancy and growth in body and in mind, forgets also the importance of infancy in general as related to the Church and its nurturing cultus.

In estimating the full extent of those evil results which flow from a system of education, from which all positive religious influences are excluded, we must consider that those formative influences which are visible and tangible, are but a small part of those which actually mould the child's intellectual and moral life. There is an education of *circumstances*—or shall I say an education of *atmosphere*. An education, not so much of the marked influences exhibited in formal instruction, as of the element in which the young life moves and has its being during the time that its education progresses. Our physical growth and health depend generally not so much upon preventive or curative medicines given at intervals, as upon the constant lavings of those silent influences of air, temperature, and other elements which are friendly to vitality and health. So, the mental and moral health of children depend chiefly upon the silent and intangible force of circumstances, example, society, and what may be called, in general, the atmosphere in which they live, breathe and grow. As, in our physical system, every sense,—hearing, seeing, tasting, touching, smelling—is, more or less, though silently, the avenue of health or disease, so are these same senses in their relation to the mind and heart. In this view we discover the true depth of meaning in such passages as, "He that walketh with wise men, shall be wise," and: "Evil communications corrupt good manners." We, by a deep necessity, become like that which surrounds us. We—as the Poet has it—

"We become pure by being purely looked upon."

As flowers are colored in the light of the sun—though silently!—so are the minds and hearts of our children by the educational air in which their faculties are evolved.

These silent educational influences of which we speak, and which affect every period of our human life, are most momentous in early life. Because, then the plasticity of the spirit more easily yields to formative forces from without; and the direction, which is then given to the evolution of the soul, has a longer history before it, either for evil or for good.

A pebble in the streamlet scant,
Has turned the course of many a river;
A dew-drop on the infant plant,
Has warped the giant oak forever!

We see in the case of a plant, that those formative influences which have most to do in shaping it for life, are least open to our inspection: They lie and work behind the tangible, and they do their work before the plant is sufficiently advanced to receive any help from without in the way of training. Its germ grows yellow and languid before we can suspect the cause, in the worm or the ungenial chemical, which has invaded its life at the root. In like manner, the failings and failings in children which often dawn, like a mournful prophecy, upon the attention of anxious parents, have their roots farther back than their eyes can trace, and are lost to view in those delicate attenuations which form the fibres of the infant life. In seeking, therefore for the causes of ill or good in our children, we look not to the things which are seen, but to those which are not seen; for in this sense, too, the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. In this view, the poets paradox reveals one of the deepest of truths:

"The child is father to the man;"

and in this sense the Saviour's axiom may also be applied: "There is nothing hid that shall not be revealed;" we add the converse, by way of legitimate inference: There is nothing revealed that is not first hid.

Is it not clear, then, that immense interests are involved in the early training of our children; not merely in the instruction imparted to them in a formal way, but in the educating influences of position and circumstances. Is it not clear also that

true Christian nurture must underlie all education or training, doing its work before these can properly begin, and animating, pervading, and sanctifying them as their secret life and soul? * Is it not plain also that the Common School System can never afford such educational accommodations as the solemn duties of Christian parents make it necessary to demand for their children? They, if they at all understand their responsibilities to their children, can only be satisfied with church, or parochial schools.

It may be said, Is it it not our duty to provide educational facilities for those that are out of the Church? And how can means be provided for the education of all, if it be not done by the State? State schools cannot be made religious schools, because Church and State are not united; and, on account of the various views of sects, it would be impossible to introduce religious instruction.

We acknowledge the difficulties in all this; but the difficulties of making things right should never reconcile us to that which is wrong. In regard to sects, the difficulty shows only that sects are wrong, and not that a school system without religion is right.

In regard to the duty of educating all, we answer, that it is yet to be shown that the Common School System will accomplish this. The reports complain abundantly that many parents do not send their children. This will ever be so; it rests upon the deep principle that religion alone can foster the education of mind; and that educational interests are *only* sustained where religion underlies them. Where this is not the case, the "driving power" is wanting; and any educational system that has not religion for its soul, cannot enlist sufficient interest in itself to sustain itself in existence. As in the child a sense of dependence, of trust, confidence and faith precedes all developments of intellect; so, in all systems of education faith must precede knowledge and sustain it. A system, therefore, which neglects to foster faith, cuts itself loose from the source which alone can sustain it.

But again. Could even all be educated intellectually as the system proposes, is education without religion a blessing? Is knowledge, the wisdom of this world, as such, praised in the

* What system of Moral Education is like to avail in opposition to the contagion of example and the influence of notions insensibly, yet constantly instilled? It is to little purpose to take a boy every morning into a closet, and there teach him moral and religious truth for an hour, if, so soon as the hour is expired, he is left for the remainder of the day in circumstances in which these truths are not recommended by any living examples.—*Dymond's Essays, Page 264.*

Scripture? Verily no. Unless the life of grace underlies and sanctifies all intellectual activities, their cultivation is but a strengthening of the natural powers of evil. As already said, educated nature is educated vice. Had Paine, Volney, Voltaire, and others, been ignorant men, the world had been more blest. It is the same on a smaller scale. The smallest mischief, that fulfils his sphere of evil in the most obscure country circle, is the worse for his smartness, and is a curse to his neighborhood in proportion to his wit. Unsantified knowledge, like unsantified wealth, is so much influence on the side of evil. Knowledge is power—power for evil, or power for good, according to the wish and will of him who holds it. Knowledge in faith is a power *for* God; knowledge without faith is a power *against* God. When we say, therefore, that it is our duty to educate all, that declaration must be modified and limited thus: *It is our duty to educate all religiously.* It is not our duty to meet the world on its own ground. We are not to “teach all nations” as *they* please, but as our commission directs: “Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever the Saviour has commanded them.” We dare not misread our commission, meet the world on its own terms, and teach them only what will fit them for worldly interests, and worldly ends, engaging that that which Christ has taught them shall be studiously kept out of sight. Such a mode of educating the world has never received the promise, which is appended to the true commission, “And lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world.” Hence we take our stand on the true parochial or church system, and urge all, just as we do sinners to repent and believe, to meet us on the true ground, and to receive at the hands of the Church a true education—an education complete, of heart as well as of mind—for eternity as well as for time—for the Church as well as for the State—for the perfection of themselves as men, and not only as citizens. If they reject this offer, we have performed our duty, and theirs is the peril.

It must be remembered that another duty *precedes* the duty of educating all: It is the duty of educating properly and religiously our own children, and the children that are in the covenant and Church of God. These are placed nearest to us in the order of God, and must be first attended to. As we have opportunity we must do good to all men, but *especially* to the household of faith. When favors were claimed for the daughter of a Canaanitish woman, the Saviour said, “Let the

children first be fed.” We find, hence, that in the Acts of the Apostles, salvation was always offered first of all to the Jews, as the covenant people. So here: our duty to educate all, is subordinate to our duty to educate our own, as families, and as a Church. To manifest zeal for general education, to the detriment of particular education, is to outstep the divine order. He must not go abroad in search of duty who has not finished at home. The Church has no such responsibility to educate all, as requires her either to neglect her own, or to permit them to be educated under a wrong system.

Should even the alternative be to educate the young in general, without religion, in the Common School System, or not educate them at all—which we by no means grant—then it would be the duty of the Church, in the spirit of sacrifice, to submit to the tax required, and at the same time, by voluntary liberality, to sustain her own religious schools besides. This many are in fact now doing, whose conscience, and interest in the religious education of their children, forbids their exposing them to the negative, if not irreligious, atmosphere of common schools. The rich can do this, and do it; many poor would do it if they could. The same principle is here involved, which comes forward so abundantly in history, where Christians by voluntary gifts have sustained their own religious privileges in the bosom of a national Church, while they continued, as good citizens, to pay their tithes to the established religion besides. As long as we regard education separate from religion as a matter of interest to the State, and only negatively evil, we can sustain the Common School System as a system of national education, without a violation of conscience or sacrifice of principle, while we nevertheless decline using it for our own children. If this negative education has any tendency to make better citizens,—if its results are good only so far as the body, the State, and this life are concerned, it may even be a Christian virtue to submit to the tax demanded. We will cheerfully yield to the children of this world the right of having what is *good*; but for our own children—for the children of the Church, whom we wish to bear in the bosom of our faith, and in the holy nurture of the Church, with us into a higher life,—we ask that which is *better*: and, so far as we can, we aim even at that which is *best*. That we do, but we leave not *this* undone. This is our position; and is it not the true one?

Hear then the conclusion of the whole matter, and the sum

of what we need and ask. Give us Christian schools—schools which have a God, a Saviour, a Holy Spirit, a Bible, and hymn-book, a catechism and prayer, a pastor and a pious school teacher—a school between the family and the Church, a school which will carry forward the education of children in the same spirit in which it was commenced by pious parents—a school that will be a nursery to the Church—a school so entirely under the control of the Church, that it may carry out the spirit of its great commission in reference to its own children: “Feed my lambs.”

H. H.

Lancaster, Pa.
