

of the words, phrases, and clauses of the first sentence of the *Paradise Lost*, or of the ninth section of the *Ode to Intimations of Immortality*, while reading along at the usual rate. The fact is that such a grasp of learned English sentences as is implied in such a power of reading Milton is confined at present to a few men who have made a thorough course in Latin prose or a very uncommon course in English syntax.

It is difficult to conceive of an English master who would say that such a grasp of syntax as will enable a boy to read Milton or Burke is beyond High School work. Hence, we shall, for the sake of brevity, assume that all will agree that enough analysis should be taught in our schools to enable at least the brightest pupils to reach that stage of reading. No teacher of literature will for an instant argue that a boy understands "*Paradise Lost*" in a literary sense, who cannot answer clearly all questions concerning the relations of the parts of each sentence so long as the questions are fairly put and untechnical. Now we should like to ask of any one who has followed the subject to this point whether it would be well to teach analysis in connection with literature. A universal *no* is the only possible reply. Then the problem is narrowed down to this, — (a) *No one can understand "Paradise Lost" as literature who cannot analyze its sentences* (with or without technical terms such as *subject*, *adverbial adjunct*, *subordinate clause*, which in reality are terms so helpful and even necessary that any intelligent person would invent them, or others like them, if he once set to work to analyze seriously); (b) *It is desirable that High School pupils should understand as literature, much English which they cannot analyze at present*; (c) Where and how shall their powers of analysis be developed so as to enable them to cope with learned English?

No answer can be imagined beyond these two: (a) In the Literature Class; (b) In the Grammar Class. In the Literature Class a great deal of logical analysis may be and is done under the name of Poetry. Those who rail most against turning the Poetry Class into a Grammar and Rhetoric Class really do the most of this disguised Grammar work; but all are agreed that as far as possible the Poetry Class shall be for poetry, that is art, beauty, great thoughts and lofty principles, hence all must agree that this fundamental work upon which all appreciation of literature of the more difficult order rests must be done by exercises in analysis in the Grammar Class. It is a temptation just here to take a passage from Milton and to ask, not the pupil, but our reader, a few simple untechnical questions as to the relations of the words, phrases, and clauses, and when he smiles and protests his inability to answer such questions off-hand, to ask him how much claim he has to praise the sublime art of what is merely obscure to his intellect. There is no single line of work in which so many of our best pupils are so absolutely bewildered as in simple untechnical analysis of even so clear a writer as Tennyson. Passage after passage in the *Idylls of the King* is utterly beyond the analytic powers of five sixths of those who obtain third and even second-class teaching certificates. Those who believe that these pupils understand the *Idylls* as Literature, because through a sort of maudlin sympathy they appear to follow the teacher's elucidation, are dreadfully deceived. Tennyson, Gladstone, and Swinburne, learned their *Odyssey* and their *Odes of Horace* burdened with a minute grammatical analysis and there is reason to believe that they profited as much from the poetry of them as if they had wept and smiled with an