Construction, we might arrange all questions regarding the propriety of the incidents and episodes in the poem, and, in general, the relation of its parts to the whole. It is simpler and better, for instance, in my opinion, to discuss the propriety of the minstrel's account of his preceptor or the introduction of the goblin in Scott's Lay under this head than under a vague category of "Taste."

As to the fifth head, Metre, I have already explained what methods may

be employed in this subject.

I think that the treatment and the points of view suggested under these five heads are quite sufficient for the pupil at this elementary stage. We cannot expect him to enter into the subtleties of higher criticism. What may be discussed under the heads of Characterisation, Dramatic Truth or Propriety, Ethical Significance and the like, is the work of the more advanced scholar. It is true, the

teacher may very properly introduce as much of this higher criticism as he thinks the pupils can receive, but it should be done rather in the way of suggestive remarks than by formal discussion. The main thing for the pupil at this stage is to get into direct and sympathetic contact with the author's meaning and art, and the way to that end does not lie through the abstract and often doubtful points of view of Formal Rhetoric.

You see, then, gentlemen, the point of view from which I judge the Critical Introduction to be defective as a manual of method. It is not sufficiently simple and clear in its classification of things; it is not sufficiently direct and practical, and it contains a good deal of doubtful doctrine; but it was high merit, in the present unorganized condition of methods of teaching in English, to attempt such a work at all.

(To be continued.)

THE ACROBAT IN HIGH SCHOOLS—A PROTEST.

A. H. MORRISON, BRANTFORD.

WHEN a Hindu cook is asked by his master what he has prehis master what he has prepared for dinner, the answer usually given, and indeed expected by the questioner, is "eberyting, sahib." the days to come, when a candidate for the position of pedagogue in a High School is asked by the Board of Trustees what he has prepared for the educative pabulum of his clients, he will assuredly respond "Everything, sirs," thus proving beyond a doubt the common origin of the Hindi and Anglo-Saxon races? When the questioner, synthetic, so to speak, of the Hindu cook comes to apply his catechism analytically, the resulting answer, which looked so well in the aggregate, dwindles, or perhaps

"spindles into longitude immense," not unfrequently, as regards tangible alimentary profit, vanishing altogether. For at each reiterated, "Have you this?" "Have you that?" "Have you the other?" The inevitable answer is, "Nahim, sahib (no, sir), but I hab eberyting else." In like manner, regarded in the same light of parallelism as before, the High School educational chef decuisine, whose office is to cram as well as to baste, may not inaptly be expected to follow in the wake of his oriental paradigm and make answer on similar lines:

"Can you do this or that or the other thing?"

"No; but I can do everything but this or that or the other thing."