

to be but a private and domestic duty, he will run some danger in my opinion, to have been ignorantly bred himself." Not to weary the reader with quotations, which, however, are far less easily met with on this side of the question than on the other, we will only add a line or two from Cowley's essay on "Liberty:" "I take the profession of a schoolmaster to be one of the most useful, and which ought to be of the most honourable, in a commonwealth." Thus, at least, some great men have shown themselves disposed to pay respect to the office, where those who hold it suffer it to be respectable, and have thought highly of the post when they have thought of it as they would themselves have wished to fill it; that is to say, they have honoured their own ideal of the tutor and schoolmaster. Now, again, for the actual. How far has the public feeling towards the pedagogue been undergoing change? Hundreds of influential writers have given, by their remarks on education, an importance to the office of the educator. There has been an immense accumulation of records of gratitude from individual pupils to individual teachers, and respect for the office itself has risen—but how slowly! Bushby, in spite of those magnificent "blossoms of his rod," with whom, in full expansion, Dr. Johnson nearly fills one of the volumes of his "Lives of the Poets," is a name rather smiled at than honoured; and the schoolmaster-in-chief of our own day, Arnold, is compelled to confess, in one of his private letters, that the educator, as such, holds no position, and that it is desirable to attach "the Reverend" as soon as possible, to give a greater prestige. There is still such a mingled feeling of dislike to, and suspicion of, the office that our novelists and satirists, like those of old, can make their play upon those who hold it, taking unfavourable

specimens as fair representatives of the class, and feeling that enough of public feeling is still with them to make their portraits popular. The rich chairs of the higher public schools are, indeed, sought for by men of mark, as being among the most likely prefates to a bishopric, but even these not by men of family; indeed, men who are, or fancy themselves, of anything like high caste, without means in proportion, would, for the most part, rather beg, borrow, or live in the narrowest way, than lose that caste by earning money in any office of education. This is the simple fact, however painful it may be to state it. You may cite to them great men, from Dionysius to Louis Philippe downwards, who have been engaged in instruction; or tell them, in the words of Adam Smith, that legions of the worthies of Greece thus employed themselves. You will not get men of high family to fancy that a schoolmaster's office is anything but a subordinate one. Search the rolls even of college tutors, private and public, and you will find, almost without exception, that they are men strictly of the middle—occasionally of the lower—class. One main reason of this unquestionably is that men of real or supposed high social rank, though they would submit to vegetate upon two or three hundred a-year in a Government office, responsible to two or three official superiors, would detest the idea of being in any way minutely accountable, as the instructor must be directly, to every parent who chooses to intrust him with his son, whether patrician or plebeian; still more unpalatable is the idea of an income made up by private and often plebeian payments; for, to the Government official, the numerous private payments which supply his salary are purified by being filtered through the public purse. There is a certain sense of favour, private patronage, and ob-