

style are not in the proposed scheme, although they, more perhaps than any other devices, reveal the temper of the poet. The meaning and application of the literary terms "strength" and "pathos" may, it seems, be left for University study. The various modes employed by the poet to eliminate or minimize the painful and disagreeable elements of description and character are, it seems, too abstruse for elementary work. The poet's modes of treating nature, so interesting to Principal Shairst, that he has given a whole book to the examination of the subject, must also be left out of consideration. The study of character, we are plainly told, "is the work of the more advanced student." Those striking features of style—the "faculty of concrete vision," and the cumulation of objects, situations, characters, incidents, and images, to produce a harmonious and effective whole, are too difficult for the appreciation of Canadian boys and girls in the senior classes of our High Schools. And then "poetic harmony," to produce which is the highest essential of fine-art effects, is to be neglected. "Taste" and "beauty," too, are terms that the teacher must carefully avoid, or be satisfied if in using them he is not understood. This long list of figures and qualities and devices and characteristics of poetry are to be passed over "at this elementary stage," as, says Prof. Cappon, "we cannot expect (the pupil) to enter into the subtleties of higher criticism."

But, lo! Prof. Cappon has sagaciously left for himself a door of escape.

I find at the very end of his criticism this saving clause:—"It is true the teacher may very properly introduce as much of this higher criticism as he thinks the pupils can receive." Just so; and that is all that any teacher in his right senses would think of introducing. So, after all, the whole of the twenty-eight "categories" are to be accepted and used by the teacher to the limit of the pupil's capacity.

Now, let me join with Prof. Cappon in emphasizing his last sentence:—"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."

It will be seen, then, that a very large part of Prof. Cappon's paper is based on misconceptions. He had not taken the trouble to familiarize himself with the whole book before criticizing a part; he has not granted the teachers in our secondary schools the possession of all the intelligence and scholarship which is theirs; and he has underrated the attainments of the senior pupils in our High Schools. Notwithstanding all these faults in this paper, I am heartily glad that Prof. Cappon has spoken. With him I admit that "before English can take its place beside the classical languages as an effective means of discipline and culture there is still some work for us to do;" and I am sure that all teachers of English in Ontario welcome Prof. Cappon as an ardent co-worker in this broad and attractive field.

---

"As you grow ready for it, somewhere or other you will find what is needful for you in a book."—*George Macdonald.*

"ONLY one literature there is, one great literature, for which the people have had a preparation—the literature of the Bible. . . Therefore I have so often insisted, in reports to the Education Department, on the need,

if from this point of view only, for the Bible in schools for the people. If poetry, philosophy and eloquence, if what we call in one word letters, are a power, and a beneficent wonder-working power, in education, through the Bible only have the people much chance of getting at poetry, philosophy and eloquence."—*Matthew Arnold.*