

THE TWO TEACHERS.

I HAVE in mind two teachers who seemed to possess more than an ordinary degree of power, and yet it was not the same in each. The one, as far as I could discover, had the affection of every pupil. It was the delight of the children to grant every wish of the teacher, and they seemed to know her will as if by instinct. There was no law but the law of love—love for the teacher. There was no command, for all orders were mere requests. There was little talking, as the signals were all those which appealed to the sight rather than to the hearing. There was no feeling of fear or obligation; desire was the motive for all action. There was no emulation save that which was manifested in trying to see who was first to divine the teacher's will. There seemed to be just as much enjoyment in study as there was in play, for whether in study or at play, the pupils and teacher lived in each other's society, and they were alike happy. There was no friction in the machinery of government; indeed, there seemed to be no machinery either of government or of teaching. I looked in vain for a fault; I asked myself the question, Is this the perfection of school management? Is this personal influence of a lovable character the greatest gift that could be bestowed upon these children in the name of teacher? Granting that progress was made in the studies, about which there was no question, was anything else demanded? Was anything less demanded, or was this heart-power formed for a noble purpose? I wonder if human sympathy is any the less sacred when expended on children struggling up through the trials of the school-room, which are

to them as real as any they will ever meet in life? I wonder if divine sympathy was any less divine because it was extended to a race struggling with ignorance and sin? Does the true teacher ever feel that it costs too much to educate children when done at the expense of all the nerve-force at his command?

I have said that that the power which the other teacher applied was different. I think the method which he employed was more complicated and more difficult. I think the results were not so immediate. I think he had more opposition in establishing his authority, at least from a portion of his pupils; but he was supported by the community. His rule was not tyrannical, for it was just. Every requirement in the school-room rested upon moral obligation. The pupils were treated as if they were expected to do what was right from a sense of duty. The law of the school seemed to be cast in the mould of absolute right. When wrong appeared it was opposed by a mighty sentiment, and the most natural penalty was inflicted. The pupils had confidence that they would be dealt with in strictest justice, and were not afraid to be truthful and honest, nor were they afraid of pain, though they knew what it meant. I believe the mere wish of the teacher was rarely a motive for a pupil's act.

Teacher and pupils seemed to be aiming at one common object, to build up and fortify a character that would stand any strain ever to be placed upon it. Instead of seeking for sympathy, each one sought to cultivate self-reliance, which made progress sure and easy; and it was not without pleasure, for the truest