

can give a pupil that active love of the true, the beautiful, the honourable and the noble, which may be called spiritual life or the perfect work of education.

The distinction between a science and an art is fundamental. It seems impossible to conceive that a method can be selected for any study unless it has been decided whether that study is an art or a science. English is universal, it contains both arts and sciences. Now it may be questioned whether this consideration has been made prominent enough. There are three or four great English subjects called in our school literature, composition and grammar; also reading. How are these to be classified under those elementary heads—art and science? In order to keep this paper within its limits the reasoning on this subject must be admitted and even the definitions of an art and science. It appears that there are two parallel courses in English, each beginning with synthesis proceeding to analytic treatment and ending, as is proper, with a higher synthesis. These courses are: I. (a) easy composition, (b) grammar, (c) higher composition or literary effort; II. (a) reading, (b) scientific study of literary productions, (c) literary effort. Those who will take pains to understand how this classification has been reached will probably agree that it represents the present state of English in Ontario, slightly idealized. As a fact there is too little synthesis and too much analytic work (especially scientific grammar) in the lower schools. It will also appear that the ideal course would merge these two into one, which would consist of (a) simple synthetic language studies (reading and writing without rules); (b) scientific language studies (grammar, literature studies and rhetoric); (c) advanced composition (writing of essays and possibly versification.) It may be remarked in passing that

the most ideal theories and practical common sense founded on experience denounce grammar (the science) in primary schools.

Now the point of all this with reference to the present subject is that literature in secondary schools is a science. This is so clearly evident to anyone who makes a study of pedagogics that contradictions of it and their consequent absurdities and inconsistencies are merely ludicrous. If anyone should in the public print deny that literature is a science as it is studied in secondary schools and that it should and must be a science, it would be time enough to refute his views; but no writer who sees the nature and importance of this distinction will fail to see the truth. Therefore while armed and well prepared to defend this view one may take it for granted that no proof of it will be required by professional people. Some of my colleagues will be wondering why it has been necessary to make so much ado about what to them seems nothing. Well the reason lies here. It is held by some who would speak to us with authority that pleasure is the object of literature studies and that the English master is doing his work completely when he blesses his pupils with emotional pleasures as a result of his reading. How has anyone ever heard of pleasure as the direct and proximate result of a scientific pursuit? What this paper would particularly emphatically and absolutely deny is that literature, as studied in High Schools, is bound to give any pleasure whatever to the pupils who study it beyond the pleasure that chemistry yields them, namely the pleasure of a healthful, intellectual activity. Now this is an extreme way of putting the truth certainly, but it is the truth, and if the passages of literature to be studied were vile and worthless the truth of it would be manifest to the dullest.