

mendable zeal he hastens to enlighten Canadian teachers on whom glimmer only reflected rays of that sun of knowledge that shines in the zenith of older lands.

I am at a loss to understand why Prof. Cappon postponed his criticism until the book he attacks had run its full course in the schools and had been laid upon the shelves forever. Was he aware of this fact, and also of the fact that there is at this very time in the hands of High School pupils an edition of Byron containing a "critical introduction," adapted from the one he attacks, but enlarged, revised, and, it is believed, greatly improved? That my critic chose to direct his shafts against my earlier and more imperfect work, I am willing to ascribe to his want of knowledge in the line of educational publications rather than to a desire to take an unfair advantage. I am the more willing to take this view when I find him dignifying my humble work by the astounding statement that in it "Toronto University has attempted to supply a great educational want."

Prof. Cappon has made a very awkward mistake in attempting to criticize a book after having read only a small part of it. It is almost certain that he has not read the preface, nor the earlier and later pages that contain general references to the style and metre of the poem, nor the paragraph that introduces the critical chapter and gives as far as such can be done a classification of the topics of the chapter. Had he read these parts of the book almost half that he has to say must have remained unsaid. He would have discovered that the "introduction" was never intended as a "manual of method," for who would dream of packing even the elements of rhetorical and critical knowledge into fourteen octavo pages? He would never have understood that the twenty-eight sections of the chapter

were to be regarded as co-ordinate and of almost equivalent value, and so to be styled "categories." He would not have found it necessary to make the following indisputable statement:—"We begin at the wrong end if we thrust between the pupil and his text an artificial system of categories." It is passing strange, for instance, to find my critic making such a statement as that just quoted when my Preface with all distinctness states that this "introduction" is intended mainly for the use of the teacher, and that *the pupil is to be led by the teacher to see the poet's art in the poem itself*, and even that is to be attempted only after the pupil has carefully read the poem through to get an intelligent comprehension of it.

I now proceed to notice, as briefly as may be, the main strictures contained in Prof. Cappon's paper. He first objects to the "definition of a poem as a sustained hyperbole, as being founded everywhere on exaggeration and unreality." At the very outset I must call attention to a marked peculiarity of Prof. Cappon's, which, to put it mildly, savors of the *ad captandum* style. No such definition of a poem is to be found in the book he attacks. In speaking of a *romantic* poem it is remarked that exaggeration and unreality are everywhere—in the verbal descriptions, in the characters, in the introduction of the marvellous and the supernatural. This is a very different thing from the statement that "a poem ('romantic' omitted) is *founded on* exaggeration and unreality." And further, if I understand him, my critic seems to say that there is nothing of the nature of hyperbole and unreality in the essence of our finest poetry, and he refers in illustration to Wordsworth's poem on the daffodils. Well, we are all familiar with Wordsworth's dictum: "Poetry is the image of man and nature. There is no necessity to trick