

THE
CHRISTIAN DUTY
OF
EDUCATING THE POOR;

A DISCOURSE DELIVERED IN

ST. PATRICK'S CATHEDRAL,

24TH NOVEMBER, 1844,

IN BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL SCHOOL OF CLONDALKIN.

BY

RICHARD WHATELY, D.D.,

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

PUBLISHED, WITH THE AUTHOR'S PERMISSION, BY THE PATRONS OF
THE SCHOOL.

DUBLIN:

WM. CURRY, JUN., AND CO., 9, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET; AND
GRANT AND BOLTON, 115, GRAFTON-STREET.

B. FELLOWES, LUDGATE-ST., LONDON.

1845.

34421

DUBLIN: PRINTED BY ALEXANDER THOM, 87, ABBEY-STREET.

MY DEAR SIR,

Agreeably to the request of your Parishioners I send them, through you, the MS. of the Discourse delivered in behalf of Clondalkin School, with permission to publish it in aid of that Institution.

The Sermon is sent just as it was delivered.

A few additional remarks have been appended as Notes.

Very faithfully yours,

RICHARD DUBLIN.

To the REV. DR. READE,
Clondalkin.

A DISCOURSE.

“Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.”—*Matt.* xxv. 40.

THIS passage is one out of the very many earnest exhortations to beneficence which occur in the discourses of our Lord and of his Apostles. After alluding to the most common temporal wants and afflictions to which man is liable—hunger and nakedness, sickness and imprisonment—he represents Himself as declaring at the day of judgment that He considers the poor and the distressed as his brethren, and that He regards the kind offices done to them in need as done to Himself, and Himself as neglected by those who neglect the relief of their fellow-creatures. And in other places He contrasts the sort of beneficence taught by Himself, with the narrow and partial sort of kindness inculcated by other teachers, whose maxim was, “Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy;” and who restricted their good offices to those from whom they hoped for a return, or to their personal friends, or men of their own nation, or sect, or party; while He, on the contrary, tells his disciples to “love their enemies,” to “do good, hoping for nothing again,” and to be “kind to the unthankful and the evil:” and when asked what He means by a “neighbour,” selects, as an example, an *alien* and a *heretic*—one of that abhorred nation, the Samaritans,

whom we find surprised at his even asking one of them for a draught of water : “ How is it that thou, being a Jew, askest drink of me, who am a woman of Samaria ? ”

And the Apostles, as might be expected, we find imitating their blessed Master in their earnest inculcations of the duties of beneficence.

All this is what we should naturally look for in the teachers of a pure and exalted morality. But there is this remarkable circumstance connected with such teaching, when coming from one possessed of unlimited miraculous powers, that He evidently shows his principal design to be the moral discipline and improvement of character of the *givers*—the persons who were to *exercise* that beneficence which He teaches. On two extraordinary occasions, and only on those, He miraculously multiplied food so as to feed great multitudes with a few loaves; and on each of those occasions He directs “ the fragments to be gathered up ” and saved, as if on purpose to show that He did not design the habitual *repetition* of such a miracle, either for the ordinary support of his own disciples, or for the relief of the poor. And it is evident from the Gospel narrative that He was in the habit of directing that the poor should usually be relieved out of that common stock from which He and his immediate followers were maintained.

After his departure again, He left his Apostles unprovided with any miraculous supplies for their ordinary wants, and dependent on the contributions of their brother-Christians. These, it seems, were to be thus exercised in the practice of that liberality which was designed to form an essential part of the

Christian character, and were thus to obtain a greater benefit than the recipients of their liberality; according to his own saying, that "it is more blessed to give than to receive." And to this design of our Lord's, we find the Apostle Paul alluding, when he is acknowledging the liberality to himself of his converts the Philippians. "It is not," says he, "that I desire the gift, but I desire the fruit that may abound on *your* account."*

Our Lord's proceeding, in this respect, we may perceive to be in exact accordance with that general law of Divine Providence, which makes man universally dependent for almost every kind of advantage on his fellow-men. The human race would perish but for the care bestowed in infancy and childhood for a far longer portion of time than is requisite for any other animal. And all the arts of life, which to man much more than supply the place of those instincts with which the lower animals are far more liberally endowed, are not left to be devised by each individual for himself, but are communicated from man to man. In all things that concern this present world, we are continually indebted, for almost every thing we possess and enjoy, to each other's services. And this rule of Divine Providence is by no means confined to the case of man's bodily and temporal wants, but extends also to the cultivation of the understanding, and to the formation of the mind and religious character. As men are dependent on each other's services for the maintenance, and care, and support which are requi-

* "*The* gift," not, as in our version, "*a* gift," is the exact rendering of the original.

site for their animal life, so are they also instructed and trained by each other in every art and science, and in the knowledge of their duties to God and to their neighbours.

Without presuming to explain why God has thought fit that in so many even of the most important points the welfare of our fellow-creatures has been thus intrusted to us, and left to depend in great measure on our care, this at least we can clearly see, that we are thus called on by a sense of most awful responsibility to “love, not in word, but in deed”—to bring our benevolent principles into practice, and to *cultivate* and cherish kindly feelings by that habitual and active *exercise* without which they would soon languish and fade away.

As for the modes in which a benevolent character may manifest itself—the different ways of showing kindness and doing good to our neighbour, we cannot doubt that our Lord meant to include all of them, and not to restrict what He said to the particular cases he alludes to, of hunger, nakedness, imprisonment, and sickness. And to different persons different kinds of opportunities are offered of benefiting a fellow-creature. Some opportunity almost every one may find, if he seek for it in earnest. And to many, there are several different channels open, through which their beneficence may flow, if the stream itself of that beneficence be not wanting.

To me it has always appeared, that to aid in giving useful education to the poor is one of the best channels into which our beneficence can be directed; because, both a *greater amount* of good, and also a more *permanent* good, is thus effected, than could be

effected in most other ways at the same cost. Without depreciating the duty of relieving the bodily wants of our poorer brethren, it does seem to me one of the most important of our duties, to feed the hungry and thirsty *mind*—to relieve those whose sickness consists of intellectual and moral disease or infirmity—to clothe those whose nakedness is mental, with whatever sound principles and useful knowledge we can supply to them, and to release them from the bondage of gross ignorance and barbarism, giving free play to the faculties with which man is endowed by his Maker. This is a kind of good, we should remember, which can be accomplished to a greater extent than many others which we are bound to aim at. The distresses of penury and sickness we can relieve in this or that *particular instance*, and we are bound to do so according to our opportunities; but these are evils which can never, with all our efforts, be completely *abolished* in this world. But gross barbarian and brutish ignorance *may*; if all men would but exert themselves as they ought. A whole nation in which indigence and sickness should be unknown, is what evidently could never exist, though benevolent and judicious exertions would greatly mitigate those evils; but the savage ignorance of the totally uneducated is an evil which might be *wholly* eradicated; and it is a disgrace to a civilized and Christian nation that *any* of our countrymen should be left in such a state.

Moreover, in what relates to the relief of the bodily wants of the indigent, we always reckon *that* as the most judicious and effectual kind of help, which puts a man in the way of helping *himself*. If we feed a poor family for a week or a month, and then leave

them as we found them, we do but little good: whereas if we can place them in a situation to maintain themselves, the benefit is lasting. Now it is well known, that, as a general rule, the accompaniments of gross ignorance are, idleness, careless improvidence, and intemperance; and that the fruits of good education—so far as it is good—are in the same degree, generally, a habit of prudent forethought, steady industry, frugality, and temperance. In supplying education, therefore, to the poor, we put them in the way of permanently helping themselves, even in respect of their other wants, and of avoiding or mitigating many of the evils to which their condition is liable.

Again, the benefit of education extends very far beyond the immediate objects of it. A person left in a state of moral and intellectual darkness—in the condition of a mere animal—is not only himself a miserably degraded being, but is dangerous and noxious to those around him. And any one (in whatever station of life) who is, to any degree, well educated, is, so far as he is well educated, a blessing, not only to himself, but to his neighbours, and the whole community. He will be, so far, a better neighbour, friend, servant, master, son, father, subject,—than an illiterate barbarian.

I know, however, that there are some who disbelieve or doubt this last advantage, and who apprehend danger from the diffusion of knowledge among the labouring classes, lest they should make an ill use of what they have learned, and lest they should become puffed up with conceit at their own acquirements, and should feel themselves above the humble toil by which they are to subsist.

Now, that an ill use may be made of this, or of any other kind of advantage, is undeniable. If you give money to the indigent, they may squander it in intemperance, or may become idle and improvident through reliance on your bounty. And restored health and prolonged life may be so employed as to become a curse instead of a blessing, both to the object of your kindness and to others. But shall we then abstain altogether from doing good to our brethren because it is possible for them perversely to turn good into evil?

But in respect of the particular danger now in question,—that of a man's becoming proud of his knowledge, and disdaining an humble station and a laborious occupation,—so far from this danger being increased by the widest possible diffusion of education, this, on the contrary, is one of the best safeguards against it. The evil is much the more likely to occur among a people where gross ignorance is the rule, and education the exception. The humblest rudiments of learning, where the attainment of them is very *rare*, and elevates a man above his fellows, may generate pride and fretful discontent. But no one is likely to pride himself on that which is no *distinction*. No one would be likely to disdain the condition of a labourer, from having only as much knowledge as his fellow-labourers. Nor, again, would any one, however uneducated, be *industrious, through ignorance*, if he could subsist in comfort without labour. What urges a man to labour, is, not want of education, but the necessity of earning his bread, or the desire of bettering his condition. And it would be absurd to suppose that the mass of the population would, if educated, prefer

starving, or subsisting by beggary, or by fraud and plunder, to honest industry. On the contrary, as a general rule, it has always been found that the most idle and profligate of both sexes,—the greatest proportion of beggars and of criminals,—are to be found among the most illiterate and untaught.

Again, it is not in the best educated, but on the contrary, in the most ignorant communities, that men of some degree of knowledge and acquirements and of depraved disposition, are the most likely to obtain a mischievous influence. Such a man is extremely likely to be a *leader* of popular commotions, and of resistance to the laws; but he is not likely to be one of those *led*. The instruments with which such a man works, are the ignorant and unthinking—and therefore easily deluded—populace. The better any one is educated, the more likely he is to understand, not only his duties, but his true interests; and, therefore, the less is he fitted to be a tool of those who would make use of him for their own private interest and ambition.

If, indeed, the labouring population consisted of *slaves*,—governed like domestic animals, not for the general good, but for the benefit of their masters, it might be expedient to enact the law which does actually exist in some slave states, prohibiting their receiving any education. For those who would keep their fellow creatures in the condition of brutes, act consistently in degrading them as much as possible into the character of brutes. But a government, properly so called—*i. e.*, whose object is the welfare of the whole community—will always be best obeyed by those who are best qualified to understand the neces-

sity, and the advantages, of government, and the absurdity as well as wickedness of attempting to improve their condition by lawless outrages.

Then, again, another evil which some apprehend from the diffusion of education,—the propagation, by means of noxious publications, of irreligious and seditious principles—of profligacy, blasphemy, and impurity; this also is a danger which, so far from being increased by making education general, can be combated in no other way. For some there will always be found, able and willing to be the apostles of infidelity and sedition; as some of you are perhaps aware is the case, not only in several parts of England, but in this very city; and the ears, at least, of an illiterate multitude cannot be stopped against such teachers: nor can the poison thus spread through that illiterate multitude be counteracted by the antidote of *useful publications*; which it is vain to circulate among those unable to read.

And what sort of persons will be most easily infected by such poisons—the enlightened, or the ignorant? those who are able to read the arguments on both sides for themselves, or those who are left to hear—and probably to hear uncontradicted—whatever is spoken or read to them by their associates?—those who have been accustomed early to the exercise of their faculties, or those whose minds have been left wholly untrained? Is it, in short, in the light, or in the darkness, that falsehood is the more easily passed off for truth? Vain must be every attempt to secure men by ignorance against meeting with temptations; and never can ignorance enable any one to resist them. It is far the wiser course, to fortify them early, by the best instruc-

tion we can supply, against the trials and dangers which they cannot avoid ; so that unharmed they may “take up the serpents” they will meet in their path, and that “if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them.”

There is another point also in which the mischiefs that may arise from perverted knowledge—the evil influence of those who make a bad use of what they have learned, or whose moral qualities generally do not keep pace with their intellectual attainments—may be counteracted, and can only be counteracted, by the general diffusion of education. There are many humble, yet far from unimportant situations (which I need not instance, as they will readily occur to you) which cannot *possibly* be filled but by such as have a considerable share of education ; if, therefore, there be but few of the lower orders who possess this, our choice being thus limited to a very small number, we are often compelled by the necessity of the case, to place in situations of great responsibility men of doubtful integrity, or of profligate habits, because no others can be found competent. Of this almost every one’s experience may furnish examples : and thus bad men are empowered to do mischief,—vice is kept in countenance, and moral worth discouraged. Whereas, if education becomes very *general*, a wide choice will be allowed us ; and out of the multitude who will be qualified in point of attainments to fill such situations, those of the most unexceptionable and deserving character will, of course, be selected—to the great improvement of the public morals, as well as the advantage of their employers.

I cannot doubt, therefore, that both to the country

we belong to, and to our poorer brethren themselves, and to our heavenly Master, who regards even the least of them as his own brethren, we are strongly bound, to promote, when we have opportunity, the education of the children of those who cannot, unassisted, defray the expense, and to endeavour to impart to all, and to each of them, the best instruction that circumstances will allow.

With regard to the particular school for which I am soliciting your aid, I can safely say,* not only from careful inquiry, but in some degree from my own personal knowledge, that it is highly deserving of support. It is open to, and actually contains children of different religious persuasions, who receive, each, the best instruction that the parents of each permit. Those of our own communion are, as I can testify from my own knowledge, assiduously catechized, and instructed in the religious principles of our Church; and all, of whatever denomination, are taught—in addition to the secular instruction they receive—the most important portions of Sacred History.† But no religious

* It may be needful to advert in this place to a report which has been circulated, (not more groundless, by the way, than several others on the same subject,) that the Provost and myself give little or no attention to the business of the Education-Board, and that consequently the Established Church is not duly represented there.

Were such a rumour confined to Dublin and the vicinity, it would not be worth notice, because it is perfectly well known to all who think it worth while to inquire—and indeed to many who do not—how emphatically it is the *reverse* of the fact. No one, in this city, need be ignorant how very rarely it happens that either the Provost or myself are absent from any meeting of the Board; or how much and laboriously I am occupied at other times also, in business connected with it. But the circulation of the misstatement in other parts of Ireland, and in England, seems to call for this contradiction of it.

† See Note A, page 21.

instruction is forced on any child against the will of its parents.* And it is in this way, surely, that the greatest amount of good is effected that it is in our power to effect.

To use arguments to prove this, is the less necessary, because such a system as I have just alluded to has stood the test of very long experience, and has been sanctioned by very general approbation, at our *University*; which, as you are, doubtless, well aware, admits students of various religious persuasions,—affords secular instruction to all,—and provides religious instruction also to those willing to receive it; but does not force its religious instruction on any who have a conscientious (however unreasonable) scruple against receiving it.† Those, therefore, who approve of the system pursued at Trinity College, and yet profess a conscientious objection to a school for the poor, conducted on the principles I have described, must be supposed—unless, indeed, they would establish one rule for the rich and another for the poor—to be proceeding on some misapprehension of the facts of the case, and to have taken up some mistaken notion as to the system actually pursued in such a school.

The governors, and patrons, and advocates of a University or a school, conducted on these principles, cannot, we may presume, but be convinced that such a course is calculated to effect, as I have said, the greatest amount of good that it is in our power to effect under the existing circumstances of this country. For, any other course that could be adopted would manifestly tend to diminish the benefit conferred. If

* See Note B, page 22.

† See Note C, page 24.

a school (and precisely the same reasoning will apply to the University also) were restricted to members of our own Church, this would cut off a very large portion of our fellow-citizens from the benefit of an education—less perfect, indeed, in our judgment, than we could wish, but incomparably preferable to none at all, or to any other that they would be likely to receive. And as for compelling all persons, of whatever persuasion, to receive instruction in the principles of our own Church, there are three decisive reasons—any one of them alone sufficient—against cherishing such a notion: we have neither the *right*, nor the *power*; and if we had both the right and the power, our labours on such a system would be *worse than useless*.

First, we have no *right* to do violence to any one's conscience, however mistaken his persuasion may be. Our great Master has expressly forbidden the employment of force in his cause, and has left his followers to advance the truth of his Gospel by the meekness of persuasion, and by the influence of good example.

And the *power*, as well as the right, is wanting, of resorting to secular coercion; for though a college or a school might compel all the *pupils* to receive instruction in their own doctrines, the law, as it now exists, will not allow us to compel any one to *become* a pupil; and the attempt to do violence to their religious scruples would induce the far greater part of them to withdraw.

And lastly, even if we had the right and the power to force religious instruction on all, such instructions so given would be even *worse than useless*. For, religious precepts, we should remember, are not like some potent drug, which, whether swallowed willingly

or unwillingly, will operate equally on the bodily system. One may be indeed compelled to make certain religious *professions*, or to commit to memory certain *words*; but religion itself, every one would acknowledge, must be in its own nature *voluntary*. It is "with the heart," says the Apostle, that "man believeth unto righteousness;" and every thing pertaining to religion that is received not with sincere conviction and hearty good will, but with inward disbelief, and contempt or disgust, is not only unprofitable, but tends to alienate the mind from whatever is so learned.*

For these reasons, the governors of any college, or the patrons of any school, conducted on the principles I have been recommending, are justified in deciding that by this course they effect by far the greatest amount of good that is within their power.

And with respect to the peculiar locality of the school to which I am now inviting your support, I believe there is no doubt that you can ascertain, from the testimony of many persons—from several probably of those who now hear me—that the contrast is most striking, and beyond what any one could have hoped, between the present condition of that village and what it was, previously to the establishment of the school, and of other charitable institutions introduced at the same time. It certainly does present a strong contrast (far as it still is from being every thing that we could desire) to several of those degraded, wretched, and barbarian districts which are still to be found, to the disgrace of this country, within a short distance, with

* See Note D, page 24.

the very worst of which it was, I understand, formerly on a level.

Many of the advantages we ourselves enjoy, we are apt, through long familiarity, not to prize as highly as we ought, and with due gratitude to the Providence who bestows them on us. Look at the condition, for instance, of the wandering savages of Australia, or of several parts of America. If you contemplate them, not as pictured in the day-dreams of poets, living a life of pure and happy simplicity, but in the descriptions of those who have *visited* them, you will see people scarcely human in any thing but the form; brutish, and even more odious than the brutes, because *degraded*; ferocious, mischievous, treacherous; living in perpetual insecurity—in constant distress for want of the necessaries of life, and knowing no gratification but disgusting sensuality, and the plunder and slaughter of their fellow-creatures. Such is Savage Man.

Now, what makes the difference between any one of us, my Christian friends, and these debased and wretched beings? Evidently it is *education*. Each one of you would, if by some accident you had been left alone in infancy on the coast of New Holland, and reared among those savage tribes, have grown up to manhood such as one of them. And yet the humblest individual in this congregation, who does but know how to read, has a far greater superiority to those savages than the most eminently learned men in the whole world have to him. Are you then duly sensible of the bounty of that Providence who has thus favoured you? If so, you cannot but rejoice in the opportunity of doing something, according to your

means, towards imparting a like benefit to your poorer brethren.

A truly grateful heart longs for some occasion of testifying gratitude, and of making, if possible, some *return* to his benefactor. But what return can we make to God? What *need* can He have of our gifts and our services? In what way can we testify our thankfulness for all we have, and all we hope for from Him? He himself, my Christian friends, has answered that inquiry, when speaking in his Son Jesus Christ. Our blessed Lord has graciously declared that, "unprofitable servants" as we are, we yet *can* make to Him what He is pleased to reckon as a return: He has declared that He will regard himself as *represented* by the humblest of our poor brethren, whom He condescends to reckon as his own. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Verily I say unto you, forasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it unto me."

NOTES.

Note A., page 15.—The notion that the Scriptures are *excluded* from the schools in connexion with the National Board, and that the children brought up in them, have no means of acquiring any knowledge of what pertains to the Christian religion, has prevailed to a degree which is really wonderful, considering that it never had any foundation in fact, and that correct information on the subject is so easily accessible. For instance, the Rev. Mr. Hefferman of Newport, county Tipperary, states, in a pamphlet lately published, (p. 49–50.) that he, in common, as he believes, with many of his brethren, had till very lately, an entirely erroneous impression as to this point. And yet, he also says (p. 105–106.) “to this post (the living of Newport) I was appointed by the late Bishop of Cashel, a sincere advocate of the National system, after a correspondence—and I record it with double pleasure, as a grateful tribute to his amiable condescension and liberality,—in which he stated his views of the National system, I mine. My last letter contained a distinct and unequivocal declaration, that I could not co-operate with the National Board. . . . His next letter contained not the slightest allusion to our previous correspondence, but a most kind and unqualified offer of the preferment I now hold.”

Yet all the time, Mr. Hefferman's undiminished disapprobation of the system was entirely or chiefly based, it seems, on the above-mentioned misapprehension.

Those who mean by “exclusion of the Scriptures,” the “exclusion of *compulsion*,” have, certainly, a right to state their objections to the system of non-compulsion; but they are surely bound in fairness to express, in plain terms, what it is that they do mean, instead of using an expression likely to be understood in a sense at variance with the truth. (See the Reports of the Commissioners; especially the Ninth.)

It may be worth while to mention also in this place, that some confusion of thought seems to have arisen from a careless employment, or from an indistinct apprehension, of such current phrases as

“the pure word of God”—“the very inspired Scriptures themselves”—“the entire Bible”—“the genuine records of inspiration unmixed with any thing human,” &c. Some persons seem to have thus been led practically to forget that there is no *inspired book* in the *English* language; and that the Scriptures properly so called,—*i. e.* the Hebrew and Greek originals—are not read in *any* school for the poor. Nor is there, I apprehend, any school in which any translation of the whole Bible is read *all through*. The utmost that the children ever read, is, *portions* of some *translations* of Scripture; whether those portions are selected at the option of the master, or in whatever other way.

Some members, however, of our Church, are accustomed to speak of the “authorized version,” as if they understood that version to be the “SCRIPTURE” which is referred to in the Articles as the standard and rule of faith; forgetting that *no version* is ever referred to as inspired, and that the Articles were drawn up *before* the “authorized version” was composed.

Note B, page 16.—Some persons have denied the *right* of parents to debar their children from the Scriptures, or to train them in a false religion; by which, if they mean that the parents are *not right* in thus acting, or in adhering themselves to a false religion, I fully agree with them. But this is not the question. The question is, whether *we* have any right to interfere in religious concerns between parent and child, or to compel any one to profess a religion which he does not believe, and to take part in any religious exercises which his conscience disapproves. A man is not *right* who hoards up all his money, or squanders it in extravagant follies; but if *we* were thereupon to claim the right to dictate to him how he should dispose of his money, we should evidently be seeking to encroach on the rights of property, and to make that property no longer *his*, but ours. Some, however, have even gone so far as to introduce the supposed case (as if parallel to the foregoing), of a parent’s instigating a child to commit theft or murder; which clearly he would have no rightful power to do. I have even seen in a public document, inserted in newspapers, the recognition of a parent’s right in respect of his child’s religious education stigmatized as “the sanction of *unlawful*, because unscriptural, restraint on the part of the parent.”

We ought to consider, however, how far the advocates of such a principle would be led by it, if they should be intrusted with power

fully to follow it out. Having declared that a parent's control over the religious education of his children is "unlawful,"—*i. e.* that it *ought* to be *made* unlawful,—they must of course proceed to advocate a law for *compelling* every parent to *send* his children to their schools. For it is manifest that to leave a man at liberty to train up his children in his own religion at *home*, or in some *other* school, would not effect their object, and would be giving a "sanction to that restraint on the parent's part" which they deprecate, and which they place on a par with inciting his children to steal, or to commit murder.

But the distinction between the two cases (which is fully recognized by the law of the land) is very obvious to any man of common sense, who does but resort to the simple rule of doing as he would be done by. He has only to consider what he would think, (supposing he lived under a Mahometan governor, or of such as professed a different form of Christianity from his own,) of a law compelling him to have his children brought up Mahometans, &c. It would be in vain for him to allege "My religion is true, and Mahometism false." The governor might reply, "*I* think the reverse; and it is *I* that must decide, supposing that *all* things pertaining to human good came within the rightful province of the civil magistrate." No answer could be given, except by maintaining (that which is the right principle) the restriction of the proper department of the secular magistrate to *secular* concerns—to the protection of men's life and property.

This principle, which by some is alluded to as "Warburton's theory," as if it had originated with *him*, was evidently that of Christ and his apostles, and must have been perfectly familiar to the minds of the early Christians for several centuries. For the sacred writers continually exhort their converts, without any express limitation or restriction, to "submit to *every ordinance of man* for the Lord's sake;" teaching that "the powers that be are ordained of God for the *punishment of evil-doers*, and for the praise of them that do well:" and that "rulers are not *a terror to good works, but to evil.*" Yet we know that these rulers were then, and long after, persecuting heathen idolaters; and we are sure that the apostles were not understood, nor could have meant to be understood, as including under "evil-doers" the transgressors of the *laws relating to religion*, and inculcating obedience to the rulers in *those* points. The early Christians, therefore, could not but have understood that the *proper province of civil government* was confined to *secular* matters. Nor could they, with any good reason at least, have supposed that a

Christian emperor had, as such, any more extended rightful control. The Christian emperors, indeed, were often as fierce persecutors as the Pagans had been, of those of their Christian subjects—Athanasians or Arians, as the case might be—who differed in creed from themselves. But it would have been absurd to suppose that the apostles meant that a man should indeed *disobey* the command of the magistrates to renounce *Christianity* for *Paganism*, but should *obey* them if commanded to renounce what he believed to be *pure and genuine* Christianity for what he considered as an heretical *corruption* of it. The apostolical principle, therefore, of placing under the direct and proper control of the civil magistrate secular concerns, and *those only*, must, in all fair interpretation, be considered as of universal application.

Note C, page 16.—I would not be understood to deny the sincerity of those who oppose the system of the National Schools: *i. e.* their sincerely wishing for a different system. But the real ground of their opposition must be something different from that which many of them put forth; *viz.*: a conscientious *scruple against affording any secular instruction* to any one who will not receive what they think the *best religious* instruction. For it would be judging them very unfavourably, and I hope incorrectly, to suppose that they really do feel such a scruple, and yet are willing to stifle it for the sake of emolument to themselves or their friends. Trinity College, Dublin, would lose many students if Roman Catholics and Presbyterians were not permitted, as they are, to receive education there without any interference with their religion; to absent themselves from such religious teaching and exercises as they conscientiously disapprove; and to receive what they do approve from ministers of their own persuasion. And the same may be said of many schools kept by Protestant clergymen, which are open to Roman Catholic pupils on the same conditions. It can hardly be supposed that the tutors and schoolmasters who afford instruction on these terms, really believe such a procedure to be in itself a wicked and ungodly thing, which nevertheless they consent to be parties to, for the sake of private gain.

Note D, page 18.—Mr. Hefferman justly remarks, in his pamphlet, (which is well worth reading,) how much every right-minded clergyman would be shocked at the profanation of permitting—much more, compelling—persons to partake of the Lord's

Supper without any sincere wish to do so, or heartfelt devotion, or inward reverence for the ordinance. And we ought, as he observed, to have similar feelings respecting any similar profanation in regard to all religious exercises and studies. We should remember, as the late Dr. Arnold has observed, with the eloquent simplicity which characterizes his writings, that, "the highest truth, if professed by one who believes it not in his heart, is, to him, a lie, and that he sins greatly by professing it. Let us try as much as we will, to convince our neighbours; but let us beware of influencing their conduct, when we fail in influencing their convictions. He who bribes or frightens his neighbour into doing an act which no good man would do for reward, or from fear, is tempting his neighbour to sin; he is assisting to lower and harden his conscience—to make him act for the favour and from the fear of man, instead of for the favour and from the fear of God: and if this be a sin in him, it is a double sin in us to tempt him to it.

EXTRACTS

FROM THE

RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION, AND DIRECTIONS FOR MAKING APPLICATION FOR AID.

AS TO GOVERNMENT OF SCHOOLS WITH RESPECT TO ATTENDANCE AND RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

1. The ordinary School business, during which all Children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend, is to embrace a specified number of hours each day.

2. Opportunities are to be afforded to the Children of each School for receiving such religious instruction as their parents or guardians approve of.

3. The Patrons of the several Schools have the right of appointing such religious instruction as they may think proper to be given therein, provided that each School be open to Children of all communions; that due regard be had to parental right and authority; that, accordingly, no child be *compelled* to receive, or be present at, any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object; and that the time for giving it be so fixed, that no Child shall be thereby, in effect, excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the School affords. Subject to this, religious instruction may be given either during the fixed School hours or otherwise.

4. In Schools, towards the building of which the Commissioners have contributed, and which are, therefore, VESTED in Trustees for the purposes of National Education, such pastors or other persons as shall be approved of by the parents or guardians of the Children respectively, shall have access to them *in the School-room*, for the purpose of giving them religious instruction there, at convenient times to be appointed for that purpose, whether those pastors or persons shall have signed the original application or otherwise.

5. In Schools NOT VESTED, but which receive aid only by way of Salary and Books, it is for the Patrons to determine whether religious instruction shall be given *in the School-room* or not; but if they do not allow it in the School-room, the Children whose parents or guardians so desire, must be allowed to absent themselves from the School, at reasonable times, for the purpose of receiving such instruction ELSEWHERE.

6. The reading of the Scriptures, either in the Protestant Authorized or Douay Version, as well as the teaching of Catechisms, comes within the rule as to religious instruction.

7. The rule as to religious instruction applies to Public Prayer and to all other religious exercises.

8. The Commissioners do not insist on the Scripture Lessons being read in any of the National Schools, nor do they allow them to be read during the time of secular or literary instruction, in any School attended by Children whose parents or guardians object to their being so read. In such case, the Commissioners prohibit the use of them, except at the times of religious instruction, when the persons giving it may use these Lessons, or not, as they think proper.

9. Whatever arrangement is made in any School for giving religious instruction, must be *publicly notified* in the School-room, in order that those Children, and those only, may be present whose parents or guardians allow them.

10. If any other books than the Holy Scriptures, or the *standard* books of the Church to which the Children using them belong, are employed in communicating religious instruction, the title of each is to be made known to the Commissioners.

11. The use of the books published by the Commissioners is not compulsory; but the titles of all other books which the Conductors of Schools intend for the ordinary School business, are to be reported to the Commissioners; and none are to be used to which they object; but they prohibit such only as may appear to them to contain matter objectionable in itself, or objectionable for *common* instruction, as peculiarly belonging to some particular religious denomination.

12. A Registry is to be kept in each School of the daily attendance of the Scholars, and the average attendance, according to the Form furnished by the Commissioners.

MISCELLANEOUS.

1. It is the earnest wish of Her Majesty's Government, and of the Commissioners, that the Clergy and Laity of the different religious denominations in the country should co-operate with one another in conducting National Schools.

2. When any School is received by the Commissioners into connexion with them, the inscription, "NATIONAL SCHOOL," *and no other*, shall be put up conspicuously on the School-house; and when a School-house is built, partly by aid from them, a stone is to be introduced into the wall having that inscription cut upon it.

3. The Commissioners require that no use shall be made of the School-rooms for any purpose tending to contention, such as the HOLDING OF POLITICAL MEETINGS IN THEM, or bringing into them political petitions or documents of any kind for signature; and that they shall not be converted into places of PUBLIC WORSHIP. The Commissioners require the School-rooms to be used *exclusively for the purposes of Education*; and any breach of this Rule will be held to be a violation of the principles of the National Education System.

4. The Commissioners require that the principles of the following Lesson, or a Lesson of a similar import, be strictly inculcated in all Schools admitted into connexion with the Board, and that a copy of the Lesson itself be hung up in each school.

Christians should endeavour, as the Apostle Paul commands them, to "live peaceably with all men;" (Rom. ch. xii. v. 18), even with those of a different religious persuasion.

Our Saviour, Christ, commanded his disciples to "love one another." He taught them to love even their enemies, to bless those that cursed them, and to pray for those who persecuted them. He himself prayed for his murderers.

Many men hold erroneous Doctrines, but we ought not to hate or persecute them. We ought to seek for the truth, and to hold fast what we are convinced is the truth; but not to treat harshly those who are in error. Jesus Christ did not intend his religion to be forced on men by violent means. He would not allow his disciples to fight for him.

If any persons treat us unkindly, we must not do the same to them; for Christ and his apostles have taught us not to return evil for evil. If we would obey Christ, we must do to others, not as they do to us, but as we would wish them to do to us.

Quarrelling with our neighbours and abusing them, is not the way to convince them that we are in the right, and they in the wrong. It is more likely to convince them that we have not a Christian spirit.

We ought to show ourselves followers of Christ, who, "when he was reviled, reviled not again," (1 Pet. ch. ii. v. 23,) by behaving gently and kindly to every one.

5. The Commissioners regard the attendance of any of their Teachers at Meetings held for *political purposes*, or their taking part in elections for Members of Parliament, except by voting, as incompatible with the performance of their duties, and as a violation of rule which will render them liable to dismissal.

6. Should the Commissioners consider any Teacher employed in a School under the Board unfit for his office, or otherwise objectionable, they require that he be dismissed and another provided. Teachers are also liable to be fined or suspended, at all times, when the Commissioners shall deem it necessary, on sufficient cause being shown.

7. The Commissioners by themselves, or their Officers, are to be allowed to visit and examine the Schools whenever they think fit. Those who visit on the part of the Commissioners are furnished with credentials under their Seal.

INSPECTION OF SCHOOLS.—ADMISSION OF VISITORS.

1. The public generally must have free access to every National School, during the hours devoted to secular instruction,—not to take part in the ordinary business, nor to interrupt it—but as Visitors, to observe how it is conducted.

2. Every Teacher of a National School is to receive courteously Visitors of all denominations, to afford them free access to the School-room, and full liberty to observe what books are in the hands of the Children, or upon the desks; what tablets are hung up on the walls,

and what is the method of teaching; but they are by no means required to permit any person to interrupt the business of the School, by asking questions of Children, examining classes, calling for papers of any kind, or, in any other way, diverting the attention of either Teachers or Scholars from their usual business.

3. Should any Visitors wish for information which they cannot obtain by such an inspection, it is the duty of the Teachers to refer them to the Patrons or Managers of the School for it.

4. Every Teacher is required to have his Visitors' or Daily Report Book lying upon his desk, that Visitors may, if they choose, enter remarks in it. Such remarks as may be made, the Teachers are by no means to alter or erase; and the Superintendent of the district, is required to transmit to the Commissioners copies of such remarks as he may deem of sufficient importance to be made known to them.

5. As the religious instruction of the Children is under the control of the Clergyman or lay person communicating it with the approbation of their parents, the Commissioners can give no liberty to any other Visitor, whether Clergyman or layman, to interfere therewith.

AS TO APPOINTMENT, CONDUCT OF TEACHERS, &c.

1. The appointment of Teachers rests with the Local Patrons and Committees of Schools. But the Commissioners are to be satisfied of the fitness of each, both as to character and general qualification. He should be a person of Christian sentiment, of calm temper, and discretion; he should be imbued with a spirit of peace, of obedience to the law, and of loyalty to his sovereign; he should not only possess the art of communicating knowledge, but be capable of moulding the mind of youth, and of giving to the power which education confers, a useful direction. These are the qualities for which Patrons of Schools, when making choice of Teachers, should anxiously look. They are those which the Commissioners are anxious to find, to encourage, and to reward.

2. The Commissioners have provided a Normal Establishment in Marlborough-street, Dublin, for training Teachers and educating persons who are intended to undertake the charge of Schools; and they do not sanction the appointment of a Teacher to any School, unless he shall have been previously trained at the Normal Establishment; or shall have been pronounced duly qualified by the Superintendent of the District in which the School is situated.

3. Teachers selected by the Commissioners for admission to the Normal Establishment, must produce a Certificate of good character from the officiating Clergyman of the communion to which they belong; they must also take the oath, or make a solemn declaration of allegiance, before a Magistrate, and in the presence of the Commissioners; and they pass through an examination in the Books published by the Commissioners. They are to be boarded and lodged at an Establishment provided by the Board, for the purpose, at

Glasnevin, in the immediate neighbourhood of Dublin, to which an Agricultural department is attached. They are to receive religious instruction from their respective Pastors, who attend on Thursdays at the Normal Establishment; and on Sundays they are required to attend their respective places of Worship; and a vigilant Superintendence is at all times exercised over their moral conduct.

4. They are to attend upon five days in the week at the Training and Model Schools, where lectures are delivered on different branches of knowledge, and where they are practised in the art of Teaching. They are to receive instruction at Glasnevin, particularly in Agriculture, daily, and they attend on Saturdays at the farm which is conducted under the direction of the Commissioners, and where they see theory reduced to practice. They undergo a final examination at the close of their course, and each will then receive a certificate according to his deserts. The course of training at present occupies a period of four months and a half, and for a considerable time previous to their being summoned, they are required to prepare themselves for the course.

5. Teachers of Schools unconnected with the National Board, if properly recommended, are also admitted to attend the Normal Establishment, as day pupils, without any charge for tuition; but such persons maintain themselves at their own expense.

DUBLIN :

PRINTED BY ALEXANDER THOM, 87, ABBEY-STREET.