

Quincey's definition and divide into two classes, *literature of power*, or literature proper, *i.e.*, the resultant efforts of imaginative creative genius, and *literature of knowledge*, that which has as its aim the addition to our store of knowledge, of fact. The former will give pleasure and, incidentally, profit; the latter profit and, incidentally, pleasure. Didactic, controversial and scientific works are not literature proper, but works of genius are, and belong alone to this class.

By what standard are we to judge a work of literature? Is every lyric poet to measure up to Tennyson, every dramatic writer to Shakespeare? That would be hard on most present day authors. But some critics go farther still, and compare with Horace and Virgil, with Sophocles, and Pindar, and Theocritus. Is that just? Is it not true that these older writers wrote for an *aristocracy* of readers, while we have to appeal to a *democracy*? In our modern levelling-up, do we not also level down, and must we not change our ideals and our criticism? No Grecian *washlady* had the latest production of a May Agnes Fleming open before her as she beat her master's linen white on the stones of the running brook. Literature has undoubtedly lost in the process of levelling-up, and, I fear, without a gain to match. But if we try another course recommended, and praise the good only in each author, whose judgment is to be trusted? Surely not that of a novice? Or must we carefully ascertain what each author is capable of and judge him by himself? What various judgments would then be passed! That plan is not adopted in any department of life that I know of—we hold our ideals higher.

But whatever standard the critic has to adopt, he has also to properly distinguish between the different divisions of true literature, such as drama, comedy, lyric poetry and the different classes of fiction. Too little is known, I fear, of the nature and essence of these different forms.

But some may now ask, Who is to train our critics and where are they to get their training? I have elsewhere said that the duty of providing this lies with our Universities. A Professorship of *Æsthetics* and allied subjects should be established, and all students in any literary department should be required to take some work in such department. With properly qualified and thoroughly sane teachers, there would go out from the different universities a body of students from year to year, who would, on filling their various positions in life, gradually but with ever-increasing influence, raise the standard of taste and culture, and make it impossible for anything but good literature to succeed, a consummation devoutly to be wished.