

whom they are to be taught. Above all, it is not possible to keep the moral nature in suspense or inaction, while the intellectual is being dealt with. This is the point on which the whole question before us turns. The opinion of one who has not taken it into account is really worth very little. The child can pass from one branch of secular instruction to another. He can be taught arithmetic this hour, grammar that, and in learning the second he ceases to have anything to do with the first, but in learning the one and the other he continues to be moral; he cannot cease to be this any more than he can cease to breathe and yet live. During the whole six or seven hours daily that he is withdrawn from under the eye of the parents who are supposed to be primarily, if not exclusively, responsible for his moral and religious training (for the two in any effective sense must go together) amid lessons and amid play his moral nature is opera-

tive, sometimes very actively operative, the principle and habits of a lifetime are being formed under the teacher's eye. Has the teacher any responsibility in the premises? Must he not hear the profane word in the play ground? Must he not observe the falsehood that is spoken in the class-room? Must he look with indifference on the display of selfish feeling as he might look upon a wart on a pupil's hand? Who will say so? The very idea is abhorrent to every right mind. But if he has responsibility for the moral development of his pupil, then there must not be denied to him the most effective instrument, if not for correcting improprieties of conduct, yet for evoking noble and virtuous action, religious truth, the truths of our common Christianity—in other words, the education must not be absolutely secular. The welfare of the child and the welfare of the State alike forbid it.

(To be continued.)

THE STUDY OF LITERATURE.

INAUGURAL LECTURE BY PROF. ALEXANDER, TORONTO UNIVERSITY.

(Continued from November No.)

THE stimulation of noble and pleasing emotions is the aim of the poet; but emotion cannot exist by itself. It is merely the form, the garb in which something more substantial is clothed by the mind, and this substance, in the case of all great and abiding artistic work, is truth. No art, no beauty of expression can give more than a temporary hold on the minds of the race to what is fundamentally untrue. Enduring works of imagination are not fiction in the sense of being false; on the contrary, they are truer embodiments of obser-

vation and insight than the vast majority of mankind can arrive at for themselves. There is much false fiction in the world, doubtless, giving misleading ideas of men and things—enough to afford some ground to the old fashioned prejudice against reading novels. But falsity is neither a necessary characteristic of fiction, nor a consequence of the unreality of the persons and events which works of imagination usually present. Falsity can no more be invariably attributed to what is called fiction, than truth to what is called history. Indeed I