

The pleasure of High School literature depends not on the treatment but on the material, and the determination of methods in literature has nothing whatever to do with pleasure but only with truth. Fortunately in most subjects the pursuit of truth is a pleasure in itself.

But now having taken it for agreed that a subject in which we observe phenomena for the sake of analyzing its effects and generalizing such facts into truth as we may think it useful to retain is a science, and that since we make no constructive efforts in our literature studies literature can in no sense be called an art, having shown that literature is a science and necessarily and exclusively a science in our schools; it is most important to show that it is a very different science from chemistry and needs very different methods of study in some respects. It has long been an axiom in this province that a scientific study must be pursued by the use of the inductive method of teaching. Now the inductive method of teaching when followed in the spirit gives life, but when followed in the letter it kills both intellectually and spiritually. As commonly understood it requires a pupil to observe all his facts and formulate all his principles for himself, to believe nothing without independent investigation, to look with suspicion upon every new fact and principle he comes across. Now some will say that this is too narrow a description of the system, and that it demands only that a learner shall proceed from the known to the unknown with caution and logic and keen observation. However that may be, it is carried to so great an excess that we are training a race of mere stunted logic-mongers without heart or will; they may make good mechanics and prudent farmers, but unless we make a change we shall never have a great literary man, nor indeed a great man of any kind, for

even a great scientist must be more than a reasoner—must have the inspiration and kindling imagination of the poet; a scientist in the narrow inductive sense is not superior to any other good sensible mechanic. If we are to teach our pupils to discover by investigation and generalization all the principles of which they will stand in need we are to put them each into the position of another Adam; they must reject the moral canons founded on revelation or tribal experience, because it is of no use to remember canons that they have not come by honestly, to use the cant of the inductionist; they must reject the principles of dramatic composition, epic and lyric poetry, all the canons of prose structure, all the rules of painting and music unless they find them for themselves, and of course they cannot unless they live thousands of years and have the combined genius of the human race. If in natural science studies it is impossible to follow this method in the letter, does any teacher honestly think that his pupils discover the laws of chemistry because he teaches them those laws in the Socratic and inductive method? Eventually they must memorize the principles in canons even of chemistry and grammar. And if only a small point of the course in natural science is strictly inductive, how can it be argued that in poetry a pupil must find out all the principles for himself? In the recent controversy on this subject it was held by an advocate of broad rather than minute reading that the induction and formulation of canons, being an intellectual exercise, was of little or no consequence in literature. This of course means that literature is not a science. What then is it? An art? By no means! What then? The study of æsthetics. That is his answer! I accept that as true but what does study mean but science and what does science mean but formulation of