

same time the harmony between them. From this it will be seen that in our opinion the teacher of English Literature should be the best, or equal to the best, in the school instead of, as is not unfrequently the case at present, the poorest or the least prepared to fill the position and receiving an inferior salary. Doubtless the teaching of Literature in our Universities is not all that it might be, and this will have an influence on its teaching in the schools; but it is certain that the schools are not so well supplied, even from the available teaching material, in this department as they are in the others, and it is also certain that the examinations, by means of which the instruction given is to be tested, do not encourage more intelligent methods of teaching English Literature. No doubt the present widespread agitation of the subject will be productive of good results.

WE beg to call attention to the article in another column on "Wooden Criticism," from the pen of an esteemed contributor. The extraordinary style of criticism indulged in by Bentley shows the immense value of a proper point of view. We should be inclined to hold that the true lesson to be learned from that great scholar's absurdities, is, that the method proper to the study of English Literature is totally different from the method of Philology. The history of a word is one thing, the employment of words for the expression of emotion and thought is another and a very different thing. But there is no reason why contempt should be poured upon either the one or the other. What we should keep clearly before us, is, that Philology and Literary Criticism are quite distinct, and that each has its own laws. The new quarrel between the advocates of either, like the "old quarrel" between Poetry and Philosophy, is unnatural. No genuine manifestation of the human spirit can be at variance with any other

manifestation of it. Science is not Art, but each has its proper place in the sum of human activities. But, just as the physicist refuses to allow things to be explained theologically or by "final causes," so the æsthetic critic may fairly object to a literary masterpiece being robbed of its soul by being made the "happy hunting ground" of the philologist. This is quite fair. The mental attitude of the literary critic is different from that of the philologist. To say that both deal with words has as much, or as little, force as to say that science, art, religion and philosophy all deal with the same universe. They deal with the same universe, no doubt, but not with the same aspect of it. We should, therefore, be inclined to say that while Mr. Collins is right to protest against the method of the philological critic being applied as if it were a substitute for literary criticism, there is no reason for undervaluing the labours of the philologist, as if they had not their own proper value and application. We certainly think, however, that the study of philology is not suited for the ordinary student, but should be reserved for those who are aiming at special eminence in the Science of Language.

WE have to congratulate Trinity College on its new departure, and are glad to learn that Moderns are to occupy an important place in its course of studies. Trinity, like Oxford, has always prided herself in her Greek and Latin studies, and she follows Oxford in now opening a place for French and German and perhaps Italian, but not least important for Anglo-Saxon. But *Rouge et Noir* is wrong in supposing that now for the first time will this study find a place in a Canadian University. It has been taught in Queen's for the last fifteen years, and by referring to our Calendar it will be seen that large portions of the Anglo-Saxon and Semi-Saxon works are read each year.