

very faint resemblance either in occupations or aims to their successors of to-day. Whence, then, comes the idea of the modern public boarding-school? It is a product mainly of the wealth, but also of the manliness, of modern society. It has been largely affected by the career of Arnold, but it has grown into something which Arnold, certainly, did not encourage, and of which it is doubtful whether he would have approved. The greatest service which Arnold rendered to education, was in showing that a man of first-rate calibre mentally and morally, a man fit for any position in Church and State, would not be thrown away in the career of a schoolmaster. During the half century or more, which has followed his appointment to Rugby, the public schoolmaster has come into existence as a distinct type. Probably, no profession, can boast of so high a standard of intellectual and moral qualities, in proportion to its numbers. Yet the modern public schoolmaster, is very different from the prototype whom he reveres. Arnold was not a man of sympathetic character; he opened himself only to a few. His best pupils, have confessed, that their predominant feeling towards him was terror. His strongest interest lay in intellectual and moral questions, and these formed the strata of his conversation even with boys. He had little or no sympathy with art. He went beyond the custom of his time, in watching a football match in the school close; and acknowledged that games were an essential part of school life. But he never joined in them himself, and he would have recoiled from the appointment of a "cricket" or a "river" master. He developed at Rugby, the "prefectial" system, which he had learned at Winchester. He strained it almost more than it would bear. He was a stern master, sometimes accused of injustice; the

life in his house was rough, even to coarseness. The most momentous changes in school society during the last generation, the sympathy and close intercourse between masters and boys, the admission of games into the accepted curriculum of study, the assimilation of school to home life in its elevating and softening influences, the development of a taste for art, all these were certainly not part of Arnold's practice and probably even not part of his dreams.

Again, he ruled over a school of manageable size. He knew, or was supposed to know, every boy placed under his care, his habits and his companions. There must be some limit to the embracing power of a head master's vision. To know three hundred boys is difficult, to know five hundred is impossible. Yet in these modern days we have not only transformed the public boarding-school until it is quite unlike the pattern of its quiet originator, but we have suffered it to grow, until its effective maintenance as a place of education seems impossible. A mass of five hundred boys, collected together, between the ages of fourteen and nineteen, are in a most unnatural condition. To keep them quiet, and to check vicious habits, it is necessary that they should be constantly employed. Hence, it comes, that in a well-conducted school, the whole life of the boy, is subject to compulsion. The master keeps record of the duties of every day and hour, and sees that they are accomplished. These duties include, indiscriminately, work and play; and play, being placed by the master on the same level as work, is naturally, placed far above it by the boys. Compulsory work is further degraded to the level of compulsory play. It is done not from love of knowledge, but from a sense of duty. The lesson is learned, the notes are taken, they are committed to mem-