a great many simply hate it. We maintain than an educator of boys has no business to be satisfied as long as this is the case. A very few may dislike all intellectual labour, just as a very few men dislike it; but these cases are as rare with boys as with men. The great mass of human beings, whether young or old, have appetites for mental food of some kind, and the reason that so many turn away from it is, that what is given them is not what they can digest. There is a sort of incongruity, which falls little short of injustice, in punishing a boy for being idle, when we know that the work which the system of his school exacts is as cramping and distorting to his mind as an ill-fitting boot to the foot. No one would claim indeed that every pupil shall have his tastes suited with minute accuracy; and the energy of a boy, if he is in good health, and otherwise happy, will carry him through minor difficulties. But no young boy since the world began has liked a Latin syntax, or a " formation of tenses," or felt anything in them for his mind to fasten upon and care for. Consider, in the case of a stupid boy, or an unclassical boy, at school, the load of repulsive labour which we lay upon him. For many hours every day we expect him to devote himself, without hope of distinction or reward, to a subject which he dislikes and fears. He has no interest in it; he has no expectation of being the better for it; he never does well; he rarely escapes doing ill. He is sometimes treated with strictness for faults to which the successful among his neighbours have no temptation; and, when he is not visited with punishment, he at least is often regarded with contempt. He may be full of lively sympathies, eager after things that interest him, willing even to sacrifice something for the sake of becoming wiser; but all that he gets in the way of intellectual education is a closer familiarity with a jargon the existence of which in the world seems to him to controvert the Argument from Design, and the chance scraps of historical and literary knowledge which fall from the lips of his routine-bound master. If only it could be regarded as an established truth that the office of a teacher is, more than anything else, to educate his pupils; to cause their minds to grow and and work, rather than simply to induce them to receive; to look to labour rather than to weigh specific results; to make sure at the end of a school-half that each one of those entrusted to him has had something to interest him, quicken him, cause him to believe in knowledge rather than simply to repeat certain pages of a book without a mistake,—then we might begin to fancy the golden time was near at hand when boys will come up to their lessons, as they surely ought, with as little hesitation and repugnance as that with which a man sits down to his work.

This is indeed something worth being enthusiastic for. To convince boys that intellectual growth is noble, and intellectual labour happy, that they are travelling on no purposeless errand, mounting higher every step of the way, and may as truly enjoy the toil that lifts them above their former selves, as they enjoy a race or a climb; to help the culture of their minds by every faculty of moral force, of physical vigour, of memory, of fancy, of humour, of pathos, of banter, that we have ourselves, and lead them to trust in knowledge, to hope for it, to cherish it; this, succeed as it may here and fail there, quickened as it may be by health and sympathy, or deadened by fatigue or disappointment, is a work which has in it most of the elements which life needs to give it zest. It is not to be done by putting books before boys, and hearing them so much at a time; or by offering prizes and punishments; or by assuring them that every English gentleman knows Horace. It is by making it certain to the understanding of every one that we think the knowledge worth having ourselves, and mean in every possible way, by versatile oral teaching, by patient guidance, by tone and manner and look, by anger and pity, by determination even to amuse, by frank allowance for dulness and even for indolence, to help them to attain a little of what gives us such pleasure. A man, or an older pupil, can find this help in books; a young boy needs it from the words and gestures of a teacher. There is no fear of loss of dignity. The work of teaching will be respected when the things that are taught begin to deserve respect.

Above all, the work must be easy. Few boys are ever losers from finding their task too simple, for they can always aspire to learning what is harder; many have had their school career ruined from being set to attack what was too hard. It may be said, perhaps, that what was easy enough for past generations, ought to be easy enough for the present. Those who urge this view, may simply be asked whether they are satisfied with the working of the classical education that exists. We are not bound to depend upon Dr. Liddell's testimony, that public schoolmen are generally ignorant of Greek and Latin, for there are obvious reasons which would prevent the Dean of Christchurch from forming a satisfactory opinion on the subject; but, taking those who go to the University with those who do not, can the education that is given be said to be the best which modern ingenuity can contrive? Allowing that the very best scholars can assimilate anything whatever, and that with the very worst it is next to useless to try at all, is it true to say that the average boys have a fair chance of making the most of their powers? If not, there are two resources before the teacher. He can, as is elsewhere pointed out, vary and enlarge the basis of education; he can also, as we have ventured in this Essay to urge, teach classics so as to include more that is of rational interest, and less that is of pedantic routine.

The Appointment of Inspectors.

There is no subject more entitled to the immediate and careful attention of Elementary Teachers, than that of the appointment of Inspectors. Whether they regard it as members of the community or as members of a profession, its consideration is equally important. The interests of the public are, as far as they go, identical with those of teachers. The public require that any system of State inspection shall be efficient, fair, and economical, they ask that those who fill the high office of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools shall be the best qualified men obtainable, and they demand that State patronage shall be so used as to secure to the country the best possible returns. Teachers, as citizens, desire all this; but as members of the scholastic profession they go farther. They maintain that the higher posts in any profession should be filled by members of that profession. They consider that those whose duty it is to examine and criticise the results of school work, should, at least, know as much of the science and art of teaching as does the teacher himself; and further, that if special training, long experience, *strict examination* and *protracted probation* are necessary qualifications in a teacher, they are surely equally necessary in those who pass judgment upon and examine the teacher's work.

It will be well for us to consider how far these public and professional requirements are met under the present system of appointing Inspectors. First, *as to efficiency*. Are our Inspectors efficient? To this we feel tempted to reply, " How *can* they be?" Having no previous acquaintance with the requirements and conditions of primary education, and possessing little or no knowledge of teaching as an art, how *can* they test efficiently either the skill of a teacher or the success of a school? Many of them are still less competent to find out and expose want of skill. Imbued with the non-elastic traditions of an education totally unfitted for the primary schools of the country, they introduce a fallacious standard of excellence to the attention of the teacher, who is thus tempted to misdirect his efforts, and to labour for what will *pass*, rather than for that which will *educate*. The experience of hundreds of teachers will endorse these statements. At the same time our remarks do not apply to all the present Inspectors, and, in their entirety, but to few. Our complaints are that *any* inefficiency should exist, and that also newly appointed Inspectors should have to learn their business after their appointment. In the next place, *Are our Inspectors impartial*? As a rule they are, and so, we believe, any body of Englishmen would be; but there have been within our knowledge many instances of unintentional unfairness, and not a few gross cases of absolute injustice. The restrictions of