

tinguished ecclesiastics who have taken to teaching, than schoolmasters in the ordinary sense of the word. If we take a wide and impartial view of all the facts, we have to admit that there is a great deal of truth in what Max O'Rell says. It would, of course, be going much too far to say that schoolmasters as a whole are treated with contempt in England, or that any marked social stigma was placed on them. A man does not lose caste, however good his birth, by becoming a schoolmaster. Still, schoolmasters in England are a somewhat "disconsidered" class. Perhaps the best way to put it is that men are not as proud of being schoolmasters as they are, say, of being barristers or architects or engineers. They are not, of course, in the least ashamed of being engaged in teaching, but any schoolmaster who has thought about the matter would probably admit that strangers very often took trouble to show him that *they* at any rate were enlightened enough not to think him "a muff," or the member of a body of pedantic prigs and bores, because he was a schoolmaster. But such voluntary symptoms of sympathy on the part of strangers are a sure sign that people think the world is not quite fair to the class in question. It is not, however, necessary to labour the point. Every one who considers the subject will have to admit that, rightly or wrongly, schoolmasters suffer in England from a certain slight sense of being disregarded. It is very slight, and it is not carried to the point of prejudice; but still there is "a something" in the way in which we treat schoolmasters. An instant way of proving this fact is at hand. Note the inflection of voice and manner with which an Englishman states the fact that M. Dupuy was a schoolmaster, and compare it with his statement that M. Carnot was an engineer. In one case there is, at the very least,

a suggestion that the Prime Minister has come from a very unlikely place. In the other instance, the previous career is treated as the most natural thing in the world.

What is the ground for this "disconsideration" of schoolmasters in England? It is not very easy to find an explanation. And for this reason it would be very difficult indeed to find any one who would publicly admit his dislike for schoolmasters, and still more difficult to get him to defend his position by argument. The feeling against schoolmasters is far too slight to be tangible. We are inclined to believe that if you get to the rock-bed of the feeling, it will be found to consist in the hatred of Englishmen for what is didactic. There is nothing which so much annoys the plain Englishman as the didactic man. He respects learning in the abstract, but he cannot endure the person who is inclined to lay down the law on this, that, and the other, and who is always anxious to teach people the proper way to do things. The Latin races seem to like the didactic man. They may not really learn any more from him than the Englishman, but their imaginations are pleasantly tickled by the notion that they are to be taught something new. The Englishman does not crave for sympathy, and, if possible, likes to puzzle things out for himself. He always feels at the back of his mind that it is somewhat of a humiliation to be taught. He likes to believe that he could have worked it out for himself. Notice an Englishman learning anything. He is always watching for the moment when he can, as it were, snatch the teacher's instruments out of his hand and start for himself, with a curt—"All right;—I see exactly how it's done, and can manage now much better by myself, than if you went on explaining. Your teaching me any more would only bother me. I can worry the