

Prof. Cappon's remark, that while he might heartily recommend "Lorna Doone" to a boy for private reading, he regards it as a very different thing to name the book in the curriculum of a great State institution, betrays a curious misapprehension of the nature of the task assigned to the Committee. These works are to form part of the High School course, not part of the curriculum of the University of Toronto.

If Prof. Cappon were at all intimately acquainted with the crowded state of our High School time-tables, he would never have supposed for a moment that they could be taken up for class reading. How could any English teacher deal in one year with two such prose works as "Lorna Doone" and "Sesame and Lilies," when he has at the same time to take up some 3,000 lines of Tennyson's poems? As the examiner is by implication forbidden to ask a single question on either "Lorna Doone" or "Sesame and Lilies," I hope that no High School teacher will make the mistake of undertaking to teach them.

My own idea—and I think I can speak for some, perhaps for all, of my associates on the committee—was, and is, that these books are prescribed chiefly, if not entirely, for "private reading." The fact that subjects for essay writing will be taken from them is a guarantee that they will be attentively read, and in my humble opinion, the best thing for the teacher to do is to impress this fact thoroughly on the pupil's mind, and then leave him alone with the authors.

So much for Prof. Cappon's remarks on the pass work proposed in the draft; he is, to my thinking, still further astray in his views as to the way in which work for honours should be dealt with in the High Schools. I refer, not to his preference of Chaucer to Milton—a preference which I heartily endorse—but to the scope he

would assign to the preparatory work which takes its starting point from Chaucer and Shakespeare. I earnestly hope that English masters in all our schools will give just enough of attention to philology and versification to enable their pupils to thoroughly comprehend the prescribed texts. There is no time in the High Schools for more of either, without stealing it from real esthetic work for which the opportunities are at the very best far too limited. Moreover, philology and versification, so far as these are deemed essential to High School equipment, can be dealt with in connection with other texts which are less worthy of esthetic study than the great productions of the great literary artists. For purposes of philological investigation I would as soon have a paragraph from a newspaper article of to-day as a scene from one of Shakespeare's dramas, or a passage from Chaucer's Prologue.

Prof. Cappon's otherwise excellent remarks on the historical treatment of literature are likely to prove amusing reading to High School masters. They do not need to be told that if they manage to get their pupils to do thoroughly the work selected from Chaucer and Shakespeare, they will have little time to trouble themselves about the historical development of either verse forms or English literature in general. Treatment of this kind may be made useful where there is time for it, but that time should not be secured at the expense of a thorough study of the prescribed texts, the versification of which need not consume much of the work of the year.

The teacher should not—*pace* Prof. Cappon—distract his pupil's attention by references to either ballad literature or the Arthurian legends, and he should let Surrey and Wyatt, Marlowe, Jonson and Sackville rest quietly in their literary tombs to be re-