

mention may be made of it as a most objectionable course, and one ever sure to injure all the parties concerned in it. The teacher and the school felt its bad effects for a short time only; but the other, the unhappy little mortal who played the leading part, suffered for years. And the painful process of undeceiving him—a process never thoroughly effected left him no inclination to return to study in the ordinary fashion.

Bear in mind this saying—"He that favours is unfit to rule." Little needs be added on this subject. Every child in the school, no matter what are his dispositions, his habits, or his circumstances, is entitled to the full measure of fair play. Of course, this fair play or justice does not forbid you to recognize and commend deserving pupils. But when a teacher, without regard to merit singles out one of them for his companion, and uses him as a spy, or as a person to be spoken to when speaking of (or, as is sometimes said talking at), the rest, he reveals a weakness, and shows that he is but imperfectly qualified to govern children.

It is unfair to set any child as a spy upon his school fellows. The person so employed, if continued in office any length of time, will, after the manner of favorites, presume upon his patron and give offence. Sooner or later he must be degraded and punished; and from that time he will look on the teacher with dislike, justly regarding him as the author of his disgrace.

If you desire to govern your pupils with ease and credit, you must not favour any of them. So long as your measures have no object other than the securing of what is agreeable to yourself, and conducive to your own case, so long will you be at strife with your class.

X.

And now, a very few words on the most unpleasant topic discussed in the pages—the annoyances teachers suffer out of school from pupils and others. To pass it over without comment could serve no good purpose. The better course is to examine the evil calmly, and enquire how it may be remedied, and to what extent.

When assailed by persons who have never attended his school, it ought to give him very little concern, since he is in no way accountable for their misconduct. But if those who offend him are, or have been, under his care, he should at once perceive and acknowledge that the cause of the grievance is his own faulty management; and further, that while he pursues an arbitrary and unreasonable line of conduct in school, where, in a great measure, the children are in his power, he must expect that (upon obtaining the mastery, as to a like extent they do, on leaving school, and meeting him in public) they will repay his injustice with interest. They will call aloud after him in the street, chalk his name upon gates and walls, coupling with it ill-chosen adjectives, and, perhaps, adding his caricature.

(To be continued).

The Social Status of the Schoolmaster.

The social status of the schoolmaster, and his claim to be considered as belonging to a distinct and separate branch of the learned professions, are likely before long to give rise to discussions which can only have one result—namely, to the advantage of the educational profession. At present, besides the three recognised "learned professions" of the Church, the Bar, and Medicine, there have grown up outside them various callings, each of which demands skill, training, practice, and ability of its own as great as any required for success in those

three established roads to honour and wealth. There are, for instance, to name the most obvious, the profession of civil engineer, that of chemist, physicist, or natural philosopher, that of journalist, and that of schoolmaster or teacher. For each of these pursuits are required qualities and gifts different indeed in kind from those wanted in the study of law or theology, but no less important. With the last of the few named, which is the only one with which we have to do, must be found, in order to ensure not only an eminent but even a moderate success, scholarship adequate to the nature of the teacher's position in the profession—that is, a great deal deeper and broader than anything he will have to teach; there must be found good temper of a very unusual kind, self-command, self-reliance, courage and perseverance, sympathy, and, above all, adaptability, which is an indirect function of sympathy. The schoolmaster must be a *flexible* man, able to adapt his own mind, and his own way of looking at a thing, to the minds of boys; and he ought to possess that power of illustration and comment which only comes from wide reading and careful thought. And then he must have the practice of years before he can use his powers, however great, with any efficiency. Learning, technical skill, and practice—what more is required to make a profession? And yet, until the last few years, the only schoolmaster who was even commonly respected was the head master of a public school; while the position of the assistants was sufficiently determined by the contemptuous epithet of usher. The reasons of this contempt are many. First of all, the old barbarities of flogging, against which Erasmus and Montaigne in vain lifted up a remonstrant voice, were alone sufficient to disgust men of sensitive minds with the calling, and were probably the reason why it came to be regarded as peculiarly the refuge of poor scholars. Secondly, what was perhaps the greatest cause why the country came to regard the profession with suspicion and dislike was that so-called "academies," the places to which the great mass of the middle class boys had to go, were generally kept by men who, without learning, without enthusiasm, without any fitness whatever for office, either bought, inherited, or opened a school as a pure matter of commercial speculation, and often as a *demier ressort* after experiencing a series of failures in various lines of business. The schoolmaster of fifty years ago is depicted by Dickens, not only in *Nicholas Nickleby*, but, with colours less exaggerated, in *David Copperfield*. It was the only schoolmaster that he, essentially a middle class man, ever knew. And although things have changed for the better, some of the old feeling lingers behind, and there are too many middle class families who would still rather see their boys starving as underpaid city clerks than making an honorable livelihood as professed schoolmasters.

Another thing that has grievously militated against the *distinctness* of the profession is that it has been too much regarded as a part of the Church's duty to teach. Of course, the Church has not really anything whatever to do with education as such, save to watch that religious considerations are duly cared for; but by a long course of accidents, dating many hundreds of years back, education fell almost exclusively into the hands of the clergy. Architecture, music, statesmanship, law—all these have at one time or other been attached to the cloister.

The social status of schoolmasters may be raised in two ways—by themselves, first, in endeavouring to force all persons engaged in teaching to obtain first of all a degree, diploma, or certificate of competent knowledge; and in constantly claiming, on all occasions, their position as members of a learned and important profession. To those that ask it is given. They must remember that