

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH STUDIES
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY ANGLO-CANADIAN COLLEGES

BY

HENRY ALLAN HUBERT

B.A., The University of Alberta, 1965
M.A., Simon Fraser University, 1970

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1989

© Henry Allan Hubert, 1989

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of English

The University of British Columbia
1956 Main Mall
Vancouver, Canada
V6T 1Y3

Date June 21, 1989

ABSTRACT

In the last three decades, English studies in Anglophone colleges and universities in Canada have seen a marked diversification, including a return toward an historically normative program featuring both poetics and rhetoric. Such a balanced program, present at colleges like Dalhousie and McGill at the time of Canadian Confederation, developed from the earlier classical program of studies that itself included both poetics and rhetoric in Latin and Greek in each college's Classics offerings.

The earliest Anglo-Canadian colleges, opened in the first half of the nineteenth century, were products of the religious interests of separate social groups each rooted in particular traditions. Anglican colleges stressed a curriculum modeled on Oxford and Cambridge, who featured liberal studies emphasizing classical learning in both content and language. Presbyterian colleges, modeled on Scottish universities, included classical studies but included a practical emphasis on rhetorical study in the vernacular. Methodist education, influenced by both English and American ties, was the most practical, with a strong rhetorical emphasis in the vernacular.

Shortly after mid-century, English literature began to gain a place in non-Anglican colleges, and the rhetoric and poetics focus of Classical studies gradually moved to English. In the 1880s, however, the development of English studies was suddenly

diverted from an expansion of rhetoric and poetics together to a strong literary focus. Instruction in oral rhetoric virtually died, and the teaching of written rhetoric was subsumed into a focus on expository writing as a means of examining literary criticism. The new curriculum, following Matthew Arnold's emphasis on "the best that has been known and thought," featured historical masterpieces in British literature. The focus of this curriculum was supported by a philosophical idealism that combined historic Christian thought with neo-Hegelianism in liberal Protestant institutions throughout the nation at the century's end. The narrowing of the curriculum was further fostered by academic specialization that swept Anglo-Canadian colleges just as idealism took a strong hold on liberal academic thought. This late nineteenth-century idealistic curriculum controlled Anglo-Canadian English studies until the late 1960s.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Scottish and English Traditions: Democracy vs. Elitism	17
Chapter 2 Religious Affiliations and the Rhetorical Curriculum in British North America, 1800-1853	44
Chapter 3 English Studies in Victorian Britain	97
Chapter 4 Anglo-Canadian Developments, 1853-1884	171
Chapter 5 Specialization, Idealism and British Literature in Canada, 1884-1900	229
Conclusion	302
Bibliography	358
Statutes, Calendars Consulted	383

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank Cariboo College for its support through five years of graduate study and research, the English Department at the University of British Columbia for making these five years intellectually and professionally rewarding, the Extension Services of the University of British Columbia library for searching for obscure historical texts, copying microfiche, or simply mailing monographs quickly, and the Social Sciences and Research Council of Canada for a year's support toward completion of the present study.

At the personal level, I am grateful to Andrea Lunsford, to Alexander Globe, and to Eva-Marie Kroeller for their enthusiastic personal support, and especially to Nan Johnson for sharing her wealth of historical data, for offering strategic advice, and for the highest dedication in supervision.

INTRODUCTION

The last three decades have seen remarkable changes in the undergraduate English studies curriculum in Anglo-Canadian universities. These changes have expanded course offerings from what thirty years ago was a remarkably homogeneous program nationally to a present program with wide diversity, both within individual English departments and among programs in different universities. The traditional program focused largely on poet-ics. It featured the works of historical British authors, as Northrup Frye puts it, "from Beowulf to Virginia Woolf" (Harris 1988, ix). To this pre-1960 core curriculum were added single courses on Anglo-Saxon, the history of the English language, and the history of criticism. Composition was subsumed under the study of literature in the first year; often composition was not specifically taught, existing only as feedback on essays of literary criticism, such essays being the chief--often the only--form of writing in English courses. In contrast, present programs include the study of a wide range of non-British literature in English, a wealth of authors in translation, numerous courses in criticism (including the most contemporary theorists), courses in linguistics, specific attention to the traditional study of rhetoric and composition (with writing in a variety of formats and styles), and, in some non-traditional programs, studies in

theatre, dance, film, and communication theory.¹ In this expansion, the Anglo-Canadian English studies curriculum has begun a return to the full traditions of poetics and rhetoric lost since two decades after Confederation.

Since classical times, this combination of rhetoric and poetics has been the theoretical norm, although often institutional practice has not followed this norm. Cicero describes as "absurd and unprofitable and reprehensible" the "severance between the tongue and the brain, leading to our having one set of professors to teach us to think and another to teach us to speak" (De Oratore III. xvi. 61). Cicero's concern for separating thought and speech would, in contemporary English studies, translate into concern for separating thought (literature) and writing. In the late 1870s, Dalhousie College in Halifax followed the Ciceronian norm. Dalhousie required all its first-year students to read Elizabethan and Victorian writers and to study Anglo-Saxon as part of a full history of the English language; this course of study also prescribed Whately's Elements of Rhetoric and Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric, and assigned daily exercises and weekly essays in composition. Oratory (or elocution) was studied for half of the academic year. Dalhousie's honours students also fulfilled these general requirements but added literature from Chaucer to Pope. A decade earlier, McGill

¹The concluding chapter of this dissertation includes a review of twentieth-century English studies developments in Anglo-Canadian universities.

College in Montreal had offered the same broad scope, but with a greater depth in courses since it offered English in all years. However, McGill and Dalhousie offerings between 1860 and 1880 were not typical of the English studies and rhetoric curricula in Anglo-Canadian colleges throughout the century.

Religious interests, generally Anglican or Presbyterian, founded or at least controlled the earliest Anglo-Canadian colleges. The Anglican Church was associated with the culture of England; the Presbyterian tradition was associated with a Scottish heritage. In the early part of the nineteenth century, however, neither the Anglican nor Presbyterian college had an English curriculum with a strong literature component. This became standard only at the end of the nineteenth century. Indeed, the early colleges had little English of any kind in the curriculum. The two oldest colleges, one at Windsor, Nova Scotia, and one at Fredericton, New Brunswick, had curricula modeled on England's Oxford College. The Oxford curriculum was classical in both language and content; it, therefore, focused on Greek and Latin grammar and literature, with the classical works including both rhetoric and poetics. So strong was the classical influence, however, that the statutes of Windsor's King's College, which prescribed the curriculum and class exercises, limited the extent of English instruction to one English theme (in prose or verse) every second week, alternating weekly with a Latin theme. In addition, every Saturday two students presented a memorized

recitation in Latin, Greek, or English. The statutes suggest that no English language instruction beyond the correcting of the themes was anticipated for Canada's first anglophone colleges. The Fredericton curriculum followed the same general pattern as Windsor's.

At colleges such as Dalhousie, and Queen's College in Kingston, Upper Canada, Scottish traditions modified the classical curriculum by adding a specific emphasis on English composition. At Dalhousie and Queen's, the bulk of students' education in rhetoric and reading also occurred in the classics classes, where translation from English to Greek and Latin, and from the classical languages to English, took place continually. The only exception to this strong classical focus in the curriculum before the middle of the nineteenth century was at Cobourg's Victoria College, a Methodist institution that opened in 1842. Victoria stressed college work as both a liberal and a utilitarian preparation for the professions, with an emphasis on the Christian ministry. Victoria, therefore, included rhetorical theory and both oratory and composition in the vernacular. Before 1850, Victoria's literature program continued to be classical.

Neither Victoria nor any of the other early colleges allowed options: all students studied the same curriculum. Professors of rhetoric (who generally also taught classics) at all the colleges were invariably clergymen, who themselves had but three or four years of the general classical education that they now trans-

mitted to their students.

In strong contrast to its relative absence in this early curriculum, English studies was a specialty by the end of the century, often with several senior-level options as well as honours programs for those desiring a B.A. with an area concentration. By 1900, the professors were also almost all English specialists; ordained ministers were an exception. English programs in all anglophone colleges no longer focused on classical or rhetorical studies, but almost wholly on English literature. Rhetoric as a separate theoretical study had been absorbed into literature classes as criticism and composition. Elocution had disappeared. This English studies curriculum, which dominated English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges and universities till after the middle of the twentieth century, and which still has a strong influence today, privileged literature over language, and literary analysis and appreciation over rhetorical production, especially in speaking, but in writing as well.

The present dissertation is an historical study whose primary purpose is to detail this development of English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges. Since this is an historical study, the warning of Isaiah Berlin is in order: "Historical explanation is to a large degree arrangement of the discovered facts in patterns which satisfy us because they accord with life as we know it and imagine it" (qtd. in Sherman, 214). The thesis this dissertation is meant to satisfy is that the English studies curriculum that

evolved in Anglo-Canadian colleges and universities at the end of the nineteenth century was strongly literary owing to strong ideological pressures. These pressures derived from a philosophical idealism that, in the wake of Darwinism and of German higher criticism of the Bible, swept over Canadian liberal thought in the late Victorian period. This idealism, as manifested in British literature, was strongly influenced by Matthew Arnold's search for "the best that is known and thought in the world" (1865, 440). A secondary assumption in this dissertation is that this strongly literary curriculum was an aberration from the classical norm, which combined rhetoric and poetics, especially in the Ciceronian tradition.

While presenting a warning about the necessarily interpretive stance of any historical study, Isaiah Berlin's statement is also a rephrasing of the traditional argument for historical study of almost any kind; namely, that it reveals to us our past within a context meaningful to our present. Richard E. Young, an American composition scholar who advocates historical study, states, "We cannot understand what is happening unless we understand what happened. . . . Furthermore, without a knowledge of history, we have no way of knowing what is genuinely new, what is redundant, what is promising, what has been tried before and found wanting" (qtd. in Murphy 1982, v). Young sees historical studies as adding a comparative perspective especially valuable during times of crisis (Young 45). Although some might argue

that Anglo-Canadian English studies are not in a full-blown crisis, the present state of rapid curricular development is certainly not normal in historic terms.²

It is now a hundred years since English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges and universities underwent a radical shift from a primary emphasis on rhetoric to a strong emphasis on poetics. Leading up to that shift was a far-reaching change in social attitudes and epistemological conceptions that broke into the open with the emergence of German higher criticism and Darwinian thought just after the middle of the nineteenth century. After a century, the Anglo-Canadian English studies curriculum is once again in a transitional period; we need a wide perspective to understand the impetus for the present changes, the nature of the changes, and the potential scope of the changes to help us in directing their course. The presence of this change is, of course, inevitable. To some extent, at least the scope of present change within Anglo-Canadian university English studies can be determined by the scope of the curriculum in the past, for the limits of English studies have been initially defined there,

²The twentieth-century overview in the last chapter of this dissertation shows that though the English studies curriculum across the nation remained fairly stable from 1890 to the late 1950s, since 1960 English studies offerings at many Anglo-Canadian universities have more than tripled, with the scope of English departments broadening dramatically. In 1980, for instance, McGill offered three options in English studies: Literature, Drama, and Film and Communication. In addition to courses in literature, York, in 1980, offered such courses as dance, film, and theatre. In historical terms, this rapid change in focus and scope is remarkable.

whether or not the limits are now redefined. The past at least provides the present with an objective standard.³

The present inquiry began as an attempt to find reasons for the strong and sometimes virtually exclusive focus of Anglo-Canadian English studies on literature, specifically British literature, through the first sixty years of this century. Given the early nineteenth century rhetorical roots of English studies, given the continuing need for college graduates to communicate effectively in their own language, given repeated complaints that students' writing skills were weak,⁴ and given alternative curricular models in America (always a powerful influence on Canada), the strong tendency toward excluding rhetoric from the early twentieth-century English curriculum needs explanation. The emphasis on literature without a corresponding emphasis on rhetoric had such a strong influence on Anglo-Canadian English studies in Canada in the first six decades of the present century (and it still influences the college-level curriculum), that the English studies profession needs this historical perspective to understand many of its own attitudes toward poetics and rhetoric

³The basics of the Ehninger argument are taken from Richard Young's review of Ehninger as given in Young's "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention" (1978). Ehninger's original article, "On Systems of Rhetoric," appeared in Philosophy and Rhetoric 1 (1968): 131-144.

⁴Concerns about poor student writing have dogged the strong literature curriculum through the decades. R. S. Harris records the concern at the University of Toronto as early as 1892 (R. S. Harris 1988, 32); see Harris 1953, 8, as well as Broadus 1927.

even today. This study, therefore, explores the development of the nineteenth-century Anglo-Canadian college English studies curriculum to determine the roots of the dominating literary content and focus, and the resilience of this poetics-oriented Anglo-Canadian English studies curriculum that resisted significant change for almost a century.

One of the most significant ideological features of the late nineteenth-century English curriculum was its emphasis on an ideal culture embedded in the works of historic British authors, from the Anglo-Saxon writers in the eighth and ninth centuries to Tennyson and other late Victorians. In this idealistic bent, the curriculum was influenced by the philosophical environment. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, Anglo-Canada developed a strong sense of the ideal in both theoretical philosophy and in liberal culture, which included higher education as well as a large segment of mainline protestantism. In large measure, this idealistic emphasis privileged poetics over rhetoric in English studies, and literary criticism over all other modes of writing. This idealism derived from roots deep in British religious and educational traditions, both Scottish and English, although the two differed considerably from each other. However, the strength of this late nineteenth-century idealism in the curriculum overpowered these cultural differences and national backgrounds in Canada. This idealism also overcame a strong utilitarianism that emerged with the decline of the classical

curriculum just after mid-century. The strong importance accorded British literature in anglophone Canada also derived from an historically strong colonial attachment toward Britain. This commitment to British traditions went back not only to the British influence in eighteenth-century settlement, but also, and perhaps even more importantly, to the arrival in the Canadian colonies of the United Empire Loyalists after the American Revolutionary War. The pro-British attitude was further deepened by the War of 1812, which, together with already existing loyalist sentiment, resulted in a strong anti-Americanism that drove Canadian educational (as well as political and industrial) policies up to Confederation, and which lingered long after 1867.

Therefore, the English studies curriculum emerging from Anglo-Canadian higher education at the beginning of the twentieth century was the result of numerous cultural forces. To date no extended analysis of cultural influences on the English studies curriculum has been done. A number of small studies of English departments at individual colleges and universities have, of course, been written. An example would be R. D. McMaster's University of Alberta study, entitled "The Department of English, 1908-1982," written primarily as a review of the careers of early department heads, and, in this case, written for the University of Alberta's 75th anniversary. Such studies have not been meant as comprehensive works on English studies in Canada. A highly valuable study of an individual university, however, was pub-

lished in the spring of 1988 by Professor R. S. Harris of Innis College at the University of Toronto. Harris' work is a full-length historical monograph entitled English Studies at Toronto: A History.⁵ Harris' study is especially important because it details developments from 1853 to 1985 in what became Canada's leading university within decades of its founding in 1827.⁶ Valuable as well for a study of English studies in the present century is Professor Harris' 1953 doctoral dissertation, "The Place of English Studies in a University Program of General Education," which reviews all programs in anglophone universities and colleges in Canada in 1951-52.⁷

⁵Professor Harris was kind enough to give me a draft copy of his book well in advance of its publication, so the present dissertation has had the benefit of Professor Harris' research even though I began writing well before the book was published.

⁶Not only did the University of Toronto become the largest university in Canada before Confederation, a status it has held ever since, but, as a result, it has graduated more students in English than any other Canadian institution. The University of Toronto has also had a strong influence on English studies in Canada as a result of its graduate program. It produced its first Ph.D. in English in 1920 (R. K. Gordon, who became the second English Department head at the University of Alberta), and from then to 1984 the University of Toronto has granted 40% of Canada's doctorates in English: 492 of a total of 1231 (R. S. Harris 1988, 291).

⁷Anticipating the present emphasis on writing across the curriculum, Professor Harris' dissertation argues that writing should be taught in all general education courses in a university program. It also argues that the combination of teaching composition and literature in English departments hurts both composition and literature. Harris concludes that English Departments, as the most important representatives of traditional humanistic study, should teach literature exclusively, though they might coordinate the writing instruction throughout the other university programs.

Professor Harris' works do not, however, attempt an extended analysis of the historic cultural environment in which English studies developed. The present dissertation is, therefore, the first to attempt such a task for English studies in Canada. Similar studies have been done in both Britain and the United States. The most recent British studies are by Terry Eagleton, whose Literary Theory: An Introduction includes an excellent first chapter entitled "The Rise of English," and by Jo McMurtry, whose English Language and Literature: The Creation of an Academic Discipline has been of great importance in the present dissertation. D. J. Palmer's The Rise of English Studies has also been valuable. All three of these monographs relate the rise of English studies to the cultural interests of England especially, although McMurtry includes discussions of Scottish traditions as well. American studies review rhetoric (Guthrie, Kitzhaber 1953), English departments (Parker) and, most recently, composition. The most valuable of these for the present dissertation have been two recent works by James Berlin, the first of which (1984) reviews nineteenth-century developments, and the second (1987), twentieth-century rhetorical curricula in American colleges. Although Berlin focuses on writing instruction rather than English studies generally, his analysis is important, for it is based on the premise that "the transformations that occur in a society's rhetorics are also related to larger social and political developments. In taking into account this relationship, we

are in an area of thought commonly designated as ideology" (1987, 4). Although the present dissertation does not strive to categorize curricula by narrowly identified ideologies, as Berlin's studies do, this dissertation assumes Berlin's basic stance that changes in a society's rhetorical and poetic curricula are "related to larger social and political developments."

To develop a coherent argument, this dissertation proceeds chronologically, with the study divided into three main periods. The first period, 1800 to 1853, focuses on the founding of colleges in the three main regions of the British North American colonies: the Maritimes, Lower Canada, and Upper Canada. All of these early colleges opened with a unified, predominantly classical curriculum compulsory for all students. The second period, 1853 to 1884, a transitional period, leads from the early classical curriculum to the strongly idealistic, literary curriculum at the end of the century. The year 1853 marks the University of Toronto's appointment of Daniel Wilson to a position as Professor of English History and Literature. Although Wilson's position included two subjects, Wilson was British North America's first professor of English as a separate college subject. Wilson retained this post until 1889, when W. J. Alexander came to Toronto as its first appointment solely in English. The final period, however, begins with Alexander in 1884, when Alexander was appointed as the first George Munro Professor of English Language and Literature at Dalhousie, the earliest Canadian

specialist appointment exclusively in English studies. Since the Canadian development of the English curriculum is so closely related to developments in Britain, each of the three periods discussed is preceded by a discussion of prior developments in Britain. The British dates do not consistently conform to the calendar established for Canada, especially since British colleges often developed slowly what was then implemented fairly directly on this side of the Atlantic.

Apart from the conclusion, which reviews the first six decades of the present century, and which includes a brief discussion of reasons for recent changes in Anglo-Canadian English studies, the following dissertation focuses on the nineteenth century. This study's primary curricular emphasis is the shifting focus between rhetorical and literary concerns in English studies. The development of specific philological and linguistic topics, although not excluded, is incidental rather than central for this investigation, since the study of language, as grammar, was related to rhetoric in classical study. The main discussion of this dissertation is restricted to eight colleges, all established before 1855, since the English studies curriculum spread to the Canadian West after gaining its unique focus in Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes. The colleges chosen were among the first or the most typical in each area. In the Maritimes, this included the two King's Colleges (one at Windsor, Nova Scotia and one at Fredericton, New Brunswick--King's Col-

lege, Fredericton was named the College of New Brunswick until 1828, then King's College until 1859, when it became the University of New Brunswick); Dalhousie College, in Halifax; McGill College, in Montreal; Victoria College, in Cobourg, Ontario until 1890 (when it joined the University of Toronto federation in Toronto); Queen's College, in Kingston; King's College, in Toronto (after 1850, University College); and Trinity College, in Toronto (after 1904 also part of the University of Toronto federation). The following study uses the terms "college" and "university" somewhat interchangeably. Strictly speaking, a college was generally considered to be an institution offering an undergraduate liberal arts degree. All the earliest institutions, therefore, began as colleges. All, however, also developed into institutions containing professional or graduate schools as course offerings specialized and divided, so, by the end of the century, all the institutions in this study officially were universities, although their common names still carried the college designation.⁸

Rhetoric and classics, and then English studies, formed the humanistic core of the liberal arts program, the major focus of these institutions' curricula. The present study now turns to this core, to determine how and why a developing Anglo-Canadian culture in the nineteenth century shifted the focus of its foun-

⁸It was common for institutions to have both names, such as "University of Trinity College" in Toronto, for instance, or "University of King's College" in Windsor.

dation courses in the liberal studies program from a combination of rhetoric and literature in the early period to an almost exclusively literary focus at century's end. Under a strong Scottish utilitarianism, rhetoric balanced poetics as Anglo-Canadian college studies turned to the vernacular in the decades following the middle of the nineteenth century, but, in the last two decades of the century, a growing idealism overshadowed the historic emphasis on rhetoric in the Anglo-Canadian liberal arts curriculum, preparing the way for the strong emphasis on British literature that typified Anglo-Canadian English studies until after the middle of the twentieth century.

**CHAPTER 1: SCOTTISH AND ENGLISH TRADITIONS:
DEMOCRACY VS. ELITISM**

The earliest English language colleges in British North America were founded by English and Scottish settlers, with the English strongly influenced by United Empire Loyalists, newly-arrived following the American Revolutionary War. Although both the English and the Scots spoke the same language, they settled in different regions and tended to keep their own cultures. The English, together with the United Empire Loyalists, established colleges funded by the English crown and the Anglican church, with curricula modeled on Oxford and Cambridge. The Scottish settlers, on the other hand, excluded from the Anglican colleges by statutes and social pressure that required students to belong to the Church of England, funded their own colleges, or, as in the case of Dalhousie, and, to some extent McGill, dominated institutions established by government funds. The Scots' curricula derived from the universities of Scotland. To understand the educational dynamics of those early nineteenth-century colleges, as well as the rivalries that soon developed between the two parties, it is necessary to turn briefly to Britain to review the educational culture of England and Scotland. Especially important are their historic attitudes towards poetics and rhetoric, the two concerns most directly related to the development of English studies in British North America in the nineteenth century.

In 1809, R. L. Edgeworth, an Anglo-Irish social and educational reformer, published Essays on Professional Education, a volume that attacked the traditional British system of university studies that strongly emphasized classical thought and classical languages. Edgeworth's volume focused on a debate that would influence higher education not only in Britain but also in Canada for the next hundred years. The debate highlighted differences between Scottish and English higher education, but, instead of initiating a convergence between the two systems, Edgeworth's essays reinforced their differences. The Scottish university system continued its evolution toward a practical education, emphasizing universal access and use of the vernacular; the English system, in contrast, reacted to the attack by reasserting the importance of a non-utilitarian curriculum stressing the classics in both language and content. Following Edgeworth's concern about the lack of useful application in a curriculum predominantly made up of classical language and learning, The Edinburgh Review in October of the same year printed an article that also attacked the universities of England:

What ought the term University to mean, but a place where every science is taught which is liberal, and at the same time useful to mankind. Nothing would so much tend to bring classical literature within proper bounds, as a steady and invariable appeal to utility in our appreciation of all human knowledge. (qtd. in

Sanderson 37-38)

The Scottish attacks incensed Oxford and Cambridge, who stoutly defended their curriculum. The following year, Edward Copleston of Oriel College, Oxford, wrote A Reply to the Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review Against Oxford, Containing an Account of Studies Pursued at the University. Copleston argued that a university education was not meant primarily to train its graduates for employment:

Without directly qualifying a man for any of the employments of life, it enriches and ennobles all . .

. . If a question arise concerning the comparative utility of two things, it can only be determined by considering the nature of the ends to which they respectively lead. . . .

There must surely be a cultivating of the mind, which is in itself a good: a good of the highest order. Copleston argued that a classical education regarded in that light would be found faultless (Sanderson 37-38). The purpose of an English university education was not to train professionals but to prepare young men for all professional training by laying a strong foundation in mental competence, religion, and morality. The same argument was made repeatedly by later Oxford professors, most notably by John Henry Newman, who elucidated the position clearly even after his resignation from Oxford. In The Idea of a University (1852), Newman defined the goals of Oxford and Cam-

bridge when he defined a liberal education as the "process of training, by which the intellect, instead of being formed or sacrificed to some particular or accidental purpose, some specific trade or profession, or study or science, is disciplined for its own sake, for the perception of its own proper object, and for its own highest culture" (211).

George Elder Davie's The Democratic Intellect, an historic study of the development of Scottish universities, points out that the concerns of Edgeworth and the attacks of the Edinburgh Review, in fact, coincided with a debate that had begun in Scotland itself, a debate that would continue through most of the century. The disagreements between Scotland and England on the merits of utilitarian education versus the merits of a classical education arose out of differing traditional roles of the university in Scotland and England. During the eighteenth century, Oxford and Cambridge had begun to specialize in classical learning, but the Scottish universities had remained general in their curriculum. Whereas the English system restricted entrance to those eighteen years or older, thereby allowing Oxford and Cambridge to demand a preparation that only a sophisticated secondary education could produce, the Scottish system still offered higher learning to all who desired it, even if their secondary education lacked the finish of expensive English schools. As a result, toward the end of the eighteenth century some Scots had begun to worry that their national universities were falling

behind Oxford and Cambridge. This fear led to the initial debate on curriculum in Scotland. According to Davie, the object of the Scottish struggle was to decide whether the approach of the university should be philosophical or classical, focusing on fundamentals of thought in mental, moral, and natural philosophy, and de-emphasize the classics, or whether public schools should focus on the basics of the classical languages, essentially completing them before the student even left school. The university would then develop classical thought from this base set in the schools, that is, follow the English model (Davie 5).

More than two centuries of tradition separated the early nineteenth-century Scottish and the English educational systems, including both school and university, so the debate addressed fundamental issues. During the protestant reformation in Scotland, John Knox had insisted that the populace be educated in order to read the Bible. The Scottish school system was thus both universal and democratic, at least in theory. Reflecting this Scottish belief in the accessibility of the complete education system from the earliest years through to the final years at a university, the well-known reformer and University Member of Parliament Lyon Playfair, as late as 1871, argued that

Primary and secondary education are. . . so thoroughly ingrained in Scotland that you cannot deal with them separately, nor would Scotchmen give one farthing for a system of national initial education in which they were

separated. The great Napoleon used to say that every soldier carried his Marshall's baton in his knapsack; so every Scotch peasant, when he goes to school, carries in his satchel a minister's gown, or the emblem of a learned profession, and it is his own fault if he lose it. (qtd. in Anderson 108)

The same spirit was reflected in the report of the Argyll Commission into Scottish education in 1867-68:

It cannot be too often repeated, that the theory of our School system, as originally conceived, was to supply every member of the country with the means of obtaining for his children not only the elements of education, but such instruction as would fit him to pass to the Burgh school, and thence to University, or directly to the University from the Parish school. . . . (qtd. in Anderson 106)

The Scottish history of education, from school entrance to university graduation, thus combined three related concerns: religion, democracy and economics. Davie's study emphasizes the first two, and a later study by R. D. Anderson, Education and Opportunity in Victorian Scotland, adds the third concern, through his emphasis on utility in education. Part of the Scottish difficulty with the Oxford emphasis on classics was the lack of practical application of a highly classical education. While the English system could be content to serve the privileged

classes that had no need to apply their education to gain employment outside the church, the Scottish universities were strongly driven by the economic interests of the middle class. The popular emphasis on universal access to a university education, regardless of the economic status of the student, accentuated this economic impetus in the shaping of the Scottish curriculum. Indeed, Anderson suggests that, since the universities were driven by the economic interests of the middle class, the concept of Scottish education as totally democratic was little but a myth. Even as a myth, however, it exerted a powerful impact on the Scottish curriculum (Anderson 336).

This emphasis on universal education, then, in theory including university for those desiring it and able to complete the necessary prerequisites in publicly funded schools, necessitated a non-specialized, philosophical university curriculum that stressed general principles over detailed analysis with which some of the students could not have coped. The philosophical approach to education was also fostered by the emphasis on learned discourse, especially as practiced in Scotland's Presbyterian pulpits. The result was a "characteristically humanist flavour" in the Scottish university system (Davie 13). Even the study of classics focused on aesthetics and criticism, an emphasis "condemned by Oxonians as yet one more instance of the Scottish vice of premature intellectualism, and of unreasonable addiction to metaphysics" (Davie 206).

In 1826, a university reform commission was established to examine the need for changes in Scotland's universities. The previous year, George Jardine, Professor of Logic at Glasgow, had published the second edition of his Outlines of a Philosophical Education, in which he "contrasted the Scottish system with the English one, and pointed out the basic difference that, whereas the former aimed at a general education, the latter was devoted chiefly to the cause of specialized education," Oxford focusing on classics and Cambridge on mathematics. Jardine argued that sciences, both physical and mental, were more important than a focus exclusively classical and philosophical (Davie 10). The concern for competing with the English universities emanated from English admirers. William Illsley's dissertation on the history of teaching English in Scotland substantiates Davie's position, finding the roots of English influence in the eighteenth century:

Almost throughout this century many Scottish intellectuals were concerned in schemes to improve their English pronunciation, either because of awakening interest in the vernacular, or because of recognition (however reluctant) that, subsequent to the Act of Union, cultivation of a form of speech comprehensible in South as well as in North Britain was becoming a necessity. (Illsley 189)

This interest in English elocution led to the great success for Thomas Sheridan, the leader of what became known as the "elocutionary movement," and for John Walker, who published a pronouncing dictionary in 1774 (Illsley 215).¹

The study of rhetoric in Scotland was thus not always restricted to a chair of rhetoric. Indeed, rhetoric was most often a component of the course in logic. At Glasgow, for instance, George Jardine, Professor of Logic from 1787 to 1827, supplemented his lectures by daily oral questioning and by frequent written essays on a wide variety of general themes (Anderson 33). Prior to Jardine's time, Glasgow's Professor of Moral Philosophy, none other than Adam Smith, in 1762-63 gave Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, subsequently published from student notes. Smith's lectures dealt with argument, they emphasized a plain, natural style and simple arrangement, and they related rhetoric to all literature.

Prior to gaining a professorship at Glasgow, however, Smith had given a series of public lectures on rhetoric in Edinburgh, where the strongest rhetorical traditions in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were established. Here John Stevenson taught logic for over forty years, up to 1775. Sir Alexander Grant, historian of the University of Edinburgh, states that "the

¹The elocutionary movement did not confine itself to Scotland. Walker's and Sheridan's works, which shifted the meaning of elocution from style to delivery (Corbett 620), were widely read in England and in the colonies, and remained influential well into the nineteenth century.

most important and fruitful part of Stevenson's work was that which he did as a teacher of Rhetoric, which subject, although not named in his title, was considered to belong to his Chair" (Grant II, 279). He read with his class Aristotle's Poetics and Longinus On the Sublime as a basis for treating the principles of criticism. He discussed extracts from the prose discourses and prefaces of Dryden, Addison's papers in the Spectator, Pope's notes, and French authors.

Stevenson's course included a strong emphasis on composition. Stevenson, of course, taught during the very period of concern for learning proper English pronunciation and other aspects of English culture, including literature. In his study of higher education in Britain, Stephen Potter writes, only half-facetiously, that to the Scottish, English was a foreign tongue: "to lecture in good English was in itself no unimportant feat" (104). Grant alludes to the academic spirit of the time when he remarks that Stevenson's lectures "had really an extraordinary effect; they were delivered just at a period when a certain aspiration after literature was beginning to be felt in Edinburgh, when an intellectual revival, after the Covenanted dark age, was in the air" (II, 280).

In 1782, Hugh Blair, Stevenson's student, was given a new chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, part of the teaching that had belonged to Stevenson. As is well known from his published Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, Blair, unlike Stevenson,

but like Adam Smith, lectured in English. Blair focused on cultivating a proper taste, which his second lecture defines as "The power of receiving pleasure from the beauties of nature and art." Blair's published lectures became enormously successful, and were subsequently used throughout the British empire, in addition to being printed in numerous translations. Unlike Stevenson and Jardine, however, Blair included no composition assignments with his lectures (Meikle 94). The strength of Blair's rhetorical instruction was thus more philosophical than utilitarian.² Indeed, Blair's emphasis on belles lettres shifted the focus of rhetoric in his university chair from writing and oratory toward aesthetics and the reading of English literature. At Edinburgh, writing was thus related more closely to logic than to rhetoric. The emphasis on aesthetics in the lectures of Adam Smith and Hugh Blair thus began a shift that would see the full study of poetics shift from classics to English literature, with English literature at Edinburgh initially taught by the professor of rhetoric.

In Scottish universities of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, specific chairs were highly adaptable to the demands

²Interestingly, none of the works consulted in this study reviewed programs in oratory at any of the Scottish universities prior to the Victorian period. Illsley points out that Sheridan and Walker, along with numerous other itinerant lecturers, created a strong interest in elocution, which was sometimes incorporated into school programs, but no mention is made of university programs (Illsley, Ch. 6). Perhaps daily recitations were considered sufficient to train students in oratory.

of the academic environment. At Edinburgh, John Wilson, Professor of Moral Philosophy from 1820 to 1853, also turned his lectures into classes in rhetoric and belles lettres. Grant writes that Wilson "treated of the passions, virtues, duties, and so on, but he dealt with them in the concrete, with illustrations from literature. . . . [T]he tendency of his nature was towards the concrete and poetical, rather than the abstract and philosophical" (345). Wilson, as "Christopher North," was himself a well-known Scottish writer and critic. Like Stevenson before him, Wilson also encouraged his students in writing. Grant states, "Nothing was more remarkable in his Professoriate than his conscientious diligence in reading and commenting on all the essays produced by his numerous classes" (II, 345).

Concurrent with Wilson teaching rhetoric and belles lettres, including composition, in his philosophy classes, William Spalding held Blair's chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres at Edinburgh from 1840 to 1845. Owing to poor lectures from Blair's immediate successors, the popularity of the chair fell after Blair's retirement (Meikle 97). In addition, a report of the 1826 Royal Commission on education criticized "the low state of grammatical instruction in this part of the island, and the local and provincial idioms prevalent in the works even of the learned." As a result, the professor's time was "employed in minute remarks on the choice of words, the structure of sentences, and the errors or inadvertances which obstructed the perspicuity of

composition" (qtd. in Meikle 97). In the years after Blair, rhetoric at Edinburgh thus developed a grammatical focus. Essays were voluntary, the course had no exams, and teaching was mostly by lecture. Spalding tried to change the pattern when he ascended to the chair in 1839. Although attendance alone was required for the degree, Spalding assigned weekly essays and examinations for students to complete if they wished to compete for prizes that Spalding provided. With only a small class of twenty to thirty students, however, Spalding soon left for the chair of logic at St. Andrews.

Spalding's successor, William Edmonstoune Aytoun, not only reversed the slide of rhetoric and belles lettres as a separate subject at Edinburgh, he followed Blair in shifting the whole direction of Scottish rhetorical study toward a critical reading of literature in the vernacular. But that is to anticipate. Important here is Aytoun's attitude toward the question of utility, in which Aytoun took a decidedly Scottish position. If students came to the university unprepared for advanced work, he would teach them.

As for the argument that it is beneath the dignity of a University to deal with rudimentary elements, we dismiss that at once with the contempt which it deserves. No higher privilege is granted to man than the power of instruction, however humble or limited that instruction may be. (Aytoun 82)

As for the question of the university teaching practical matters, Aytoun again asserted the position of most of his countrymen, making the point that Scotland's wealth and culture were different from that of England, so the English system should not be taken as a model. "Scholastic learning commands but a low price in the general market when offered in its own shape," he argued. "Combined with other material, it becomes of much higher value" (80).

The Scottish system of rhetoric and composition instruction prior to Aytoun in 1845, therefore, was built on logic as a base, and, from Adam Smith onward, included a study of belles lettres in the vernacular. But only Edinburgh had a separate chair in rhetoric, its chair deriving from Blair's regius appointment in 1762. The interest in composition and belles lettres overlapped subjects though, with composition taught in logic, rhetoric, and philosophy courses, with philosophy also including belletristic interests. The curriculum featured a general education rather than a specific division of labor. Within this context, the focus appears to have been on the development of a literate student able to compose at least his written thought with perspicuity.

This emphasis on the student as one who should graduate as a literate person derived from three factors already mentioned: the economic, the religious, and the democratic. The latter two concerns went back to the Knox reformation, and the consequent

growth of a school system that would teach everyone to read the Bible. In the nineteenth century, however, the economic impetus for education gained ascendancy, as the middle classes asserted their interest in a utilitarian education, an interest which naturally emphasized the vernacular over the classical. Added to a local utilitarianism was also the Scottish recognition that Scotland's political union with England demanded an expertise in the vernacular of the South, which dominated the whole British economy and government. Related to the interest in the vernacular was also an aesthetic consciousness, especially in the cultured citizens of the capital city of Scotland. In 1762, this had led Edinburgh to take the lead in rhetorical innovation by supporting Hugh Blair, the prestigious minister of the historic St. Giles church, for the Edinburgh chair in rhetoric, a chair with lectures focused on sound criticism and taste. This Edinburgh focus on rhetoric and aesthetics would continue under Aytoun.

These basic economic, religious and democratic concerns related to rhetoric were to be foremost in the culture that was carried to early nineteenth-century British North America by Scotsmen involved in the birth of higher education in the Maritimes and in Upper and Lower Canada in the first half of the nineteenth century. The Scottish emphasis on universal accessibility in British North America would relate to access for all, regardless of religion, nationality, or economic status. Within

this context, both the democratic and the utilitarian emphasis in Scottish education would stress the importance of rhetorical study in the vernacular.

The development of the rhetorical tradition in England up to 1850 contrasts sharply with that of its northern counterpart, the contrasts becoming more and more pronounced after the French revolution. Just as the Scottish universities developed within the context of a whole Presbyterian culture, stressing education and democracy within the framework of general religious and social values, so the English system, featuring Oxford and Cambridge as finishing schools for the upper classes, grew out of English religious structures and social values.

England's sixteenth-century interest in the vernacular has been well documented in numerous histories of both English literature and rhetoric.³ Both Oxford and Cambridge flourished in Elizabethan England. However, in the turbulent seventeenth century, the civil war and subsequent restoration of the monarchy resulted in a reaction against the vernacular by the upper classes, a reaction that also led to a hardening of social class differences. The 1662 Act of Uniformity not only deprived the non-conformist clergy of their livings, but also denied their sons the opportunity of gaining degrees from England's two uni-

³Edward Corbett's Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student [(New York: Oxford UP) 1965] presents an overview; Wilbur S. Howell's Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700 [(Princeton: Princeton UP) 1956] provides a detailed history.

versities. Often the newly unemployed clerics turned to education, setting up their own institutions, known as "dissenting academies," many of which soon replaced Latin with English instruction (Palmer 5-7). At Oxford, first-year enrolment fell from over 450 before the Act of Uniformity to about 300 by the end of the century. As competition for positions in the church increased, the wealthy gained the advantage of political influence to gain employment. Since poor Anglican families could not afford adequate classical schooling, Latin became more and more a mark of an Anglican gentleman (Stone 36ff.).

Richard Altick's The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900 states that in an attempt to prevent another civil war, public policy allowed the old idea of "degree" to harden "into a rigid pattern of social attitudes . . . and everywhere there was an intensified awareness of status" (31). One way of ensuring peace was to keep the masses ignorant. As an added advantage, this policy ensured a supply of cheap labor as the nation entered a period of rapid expansion in industry. The fear of revolt pervaded society through the eighteenth century and into the nineteenth. The results of this fear led to a moral dilemma for those with religious concerns about the nation. Devout Anglicans and dissenters alike wished to propagate the Christian gospel through print, especially in an age when tracts were a chief means of reaching the masses. The Anglican founders of the Society for Promoting Christian Know-

ledge in 1699 argued that a knowledge at least of reading was necessary, for without that, how could piety, morality, industry, and unquestioning loyalty to the Protestant faith be impressed upon the masses? (Altick 32-34). The Methodist followers of John Wesley, generally among the lower classes, also stressed reading for the same reasons. "Reading Christians," wrote Wesley, "will be knowing Christians" (qtd. in Altick 35).

At the end of the eighteenth century, the atrocities of the French Revolution redoubled opposition to popular education, intensifying the historic English fear of revolution. When Thomas Paine's The Rights of Man gained popular notice in 1791-92, leaders of the Sunday school movement, which had stressed reading, were cast as public enemies for having provided the lessons that now allowed the lower classes to read seditious literature (Altick 67). Even the liberally educated, like Samuel Taylor Coleridge, shared the fear of literacy extending beyond reading to writing and to oratory. "Of the laboring classes. . . more than this [reading] is not . . . perhaps generally desirable," Coleridge said. "They are not sought for in public council, nor need they be found where politic sentences are spoken. It is enough if every one is wise in the working of his own craft: so best will they maintain the state of the world" (emphasis in original; qtd. in Altick 144).

The relationship of Oxford and Cambridge to this social structure was, of course, obvious, but it is presented poignantly

by Charles Kingsley's Alton Locke (1850), whose main character muses as he scans the spires of Oxford:

You refuse to admit any who . . . will not sign the dogmas of the Church of England, whether they believe a word of them or not. Useless formalism! which lets through the reckless, the profligate, the ignorant, the hypocritical; and only excludes the honest and the conscientious, and the mass of intellectual working men. Why are we to be shut out from the universities, which were founded for us. . . . It is not merely because we are bad churchmen that you exclude us. . . . No! The real reason for our exclusion, churchmen or not, is, because we are poor." (qtd. in Sanderson 54-55)

At the beginning of the nineteenth century especially, Oxford and Cambridge had the reputation of requiring vast sums of money, for the sons of England's social elite attended more to gain the universities' stamp of approval as gentlemen than to gain insight into human history and philosophy, natural or moral. Emphasizing the utilitarian nature of Scottish education, but contrasting the requirements of the southern universities with those of Scotland, Lyon Playfair told the House of Commons, "The English Universities . . . teach men how to spend one thousand pounds a year with dignity and intelligence while the Scotch Universities teach them how to make one thousand pounds a year

with dignity and intelligence" (qtd. in Anderson 35).

Although Oxford and Cambridge became the finishing schools of the wealthy, the relationship between the Anglican church and the two universities was also central to the English way of life. William Whewell, a Cambridge philosopher, stated that the church could not exist without the prevailing system of education (Sanderson 201). This relationship between the Church of England and the universities was of financial importance for all graduates as well as for the Anglican church, for a degree from Oxford and Cambridge normally led directly into an ecclesiastical living. In order to prevent widespread unemployment among graduates of the two universities, the number of students could not exceed by much the available annual positions in the church.

Given the nature of the relationship between university and church and the complex question of social class, the 1809 Edinburgh Review attack castigating Oxford and Cambridge for their insistence on the classics, for the Scots an anti-utilitarian focus, resulted in Coplestone's highly idealistic defense, as reviewed at the beginning of this chapter. Further, given the growth of utility-oriented dissenting academies for the rising non-Anglican middle class, institutions which deflected much potential criticism from the classical curriculum of the two universities, forces for change in Oxford and Cambridge had little effect. Insofar as the dissenting academies needed university-level support, that was supplied by Scottish connections.

D. J. Palmer suggests that the Scottish colleges may even have been the models for the English dissenting academies (7-9). Nevertheless, the exclusion of non-Anglicans irritated many of the wealthy middle class in London.

Although these Londoners despised the religious exclusiveness of Oxford and Cambridge, and although they ridiculed the classical curriculum, the lack of an opportunity to gain university degrees upset enough influential citizens that after the Napoleonic wars the British government founded University College, a non-Anglican institution, in London (1826). Because it was not affiliated formally with a religious body, it quickly became known as "the Godless institution on Gower Street." Palmer states that its curriculum was modeled after the Scottish universities, especially since most of the early professors were themselves Scotsmen (16). University College, therefore, offered instruction in the vernacular, including instruction in English literature. Initially, however, the new college could not offer degrees.⁴

The first professor of English at the "Godless Institution"

⁴In offering a curriculum without allowing a degree, University College, in fact, resembled Cambridge, since dissenters could also get a college education there, though not a degree since the oath of allegiance to the Thirty-Nine Articles was taken at the end of the course of studies. In Scotland leaving the university without obtaining a degree was also a commonplace.

Three years after University College opened in 1828, the Church of England founded King's College, also in London. In 1836 both were affiliated under the administrative umbrella of the University of London, which then began granting its own degrees.

was an evangelical clergyman, the Rev. Thomas Dale. Dale immediately clarified his position relative to public concern about godlessness. In this he set the direction for the next half century in the study of English literature. His inaugural lecture, delivered at University College in October 1828, stressed that "moral culture should be connected with moral instruction, and both enlisted in the service of Religion" (Palmer 19). His course included the history, philosophy and "use and applications" of the language in the various kinds of speaking and composition, "commencing with the plain and perspicuous, and proceeding upward to the elevated and majestic style." His main concern, however, expressed in suitable flowers of eloquence, was clearly morality:

But in all my Lectures, more particularly when treating upon that glorious and inexhaustible subject, the LITERATURE of our country--I shall esteem it my duty--and I trust I shall find it my delight--to inculcate lessons of virtue, through the medium of the mastery of our language. . . . [N]ever, in tracking the course of those brilliant luminaries that sparkle in the firmament of our literature--never will I suffer the eye of inexperienced youth to be dazzled by the brilliancy of genius, when its broad lustre obscures the deformity of vice; never will I affect to stifle the expression of a just indignation, when wit, taste, and talent, have

been designedly prostituted by their unworthy possessors to the excitement of unholy passions, the palliation of guilty indulgences, the ridicule of virtue, or the disparagement of religion. (Palmer 20)

The bulk of Dale's instruction at University College, however, was not in literature but in language, in which subject he lectured three times a week. Palmer is not impressed with the quality of Dale's instruction, for from examination questions it appears that "the principle [sic] test was of ability to remember the Professor's prescribed answers" to questions such as the following:

Who is the first distinguished writer of English prose? Point out the characteristic features of his style, and say in what respect it differs from that of Lord Clarendon. . . .

When is the translation of an idiomatic expression perfect? . . .

Why is D a perfect letter? (qtd. in Palmer 22)

These are questions from a five-part exam covering the History of the English Language, English Grammar, Principles and Practice of English Composition, Translations from Classical Authors into English, and Rhetoric (Palmer 21).

In its early years, English study at University College followed the empiricist tradition of emphasizing factual material, which a rigid examination system forced the students to

learn. The titles of Dale's lectures suggest an approach through rhetorical forms: Dramatic Poetry (8 lectures), Epic Poetry (6 lectures), Divinity (5 lectures), and the History of Romantic Fiction (one lecture). Dale also treated the History of English Literature; the factual nature of such lectures is revealed in a letter from John Ruskin to his father: "Four lectures on this subject have spoken of four celebrated authors of old time--Sir John Mandevill, Sir John Gower, Chaucer and Wickliffe. We are made acquainted with their birth, parentage, education, etc.; the character of their writings is spoken of, and extracts are read as examples of their style" (qtd. in Palmer 23).

Although Dale resigned after two years, the nature of the course changed little for the next twenty years. An historical and biographical emphasis only gradually replaced the organization by rhetorical classification. Except to note that student compositions were assigned, neither Palmer nor other histories of University College reviewed for this study comment further on formal rhetorical study.

Important for the present analysis in Anglo-Canadian studies in rhetoric and English, therefore, is an appreciation for the close relationship between education and the Church of England, as well as a distinct class consciousness related to a university education in England. Whereas University College included instruction in the vernacular, the Church of England's concept of an education at Oxford and Cambridge was distinctly classical in

nature: the concern was more the production of a sophisticated gentleman than the development of an immediately useful professional education. In its attitude toward utility, the Oxford system differed from the Scottish in both philosophy and practice. In their relationships to the church, both systems differed as well. Oxford and Cambridge degrees led directly into church livings; Scottish degrees guaranteed no position. Since Scotland's democratic philosophy ostensibly ensured a university education to all deserving students, the Scottish system produced far more graduates than Scotland could employ. This, in part, would account for the strong Scottish influence in the history of Canadian higher education, for Scotland regularly exported its educational philosophies with its graduates.⁵

The battle between the Scottish and English approaches to higher education was carried to British North American colleges from their very inception. Scotland's emphasis on utility, on accessibility, and on the vernacular stressed the importance of rhetorical training, especially in writing, which Scotland taught in both logic and rhetoric classes. Oxford and Cambridge in-

⁵Thomas McCulloch and John Strachan, two seminal figures in Anglo-Canadian higher education and discussed in the following chapter, illustrate well the Scottish educational influence in the early development of British North America. This influence continued throughout the century. Other influential alumni of Scottish universities discussed in this dissertation include Sir J. W. Dawson, President of McGill, Sir Daniel Wilson, Professor of English Literature and History at Toronto, the Rev. W. T. Leach, Professor of Rhetoric and later of English Literature at McGill, and James Cappon, Professor of English at Queen's.

fluences in British North America, in contrast, denounced the utilitarian approach, restricted access to Anglicans, and emphasized the classics, both in language and content. In the colonies, however, the differences between English and Scottish systems would not be separated by national boundaries. As colonial administrators and settlers of both Scottish and English heritage, therefore, turned to education as a means of ensuring future social and economic stability, differences in the educational philosophy and practice were obvious. These differences, naturally, followed national and religious lines, given that the early Canadian colleges were all tied to official religious organizations, each of these associated with particular immigrant groups.

In British North America, therefore, early colleges with Scottish roots tended to be Presbyterian in religion but with no religious bars for entering students. These colleges also emphasized rhetoric in the vernacular, arguing that a strongly classical education did not suit the social and economic situation of the colonies. The early Anglican colleges, on the other hand, restricted entrance to those who affirmed the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. The curriculum was strongly classical, with little formal attention to the vernacular--except a strong concern for English elocution in its most basic sense; namely, the correct pronunciation of the King's English. Whereas colleges with Scottish roots thus emphasized an education with

practical economic benefits, the Anglican colleges, even in the colonies, strove to produce an upper class Anglican gentleman.

CHAPTER 2: RELIGIOUS AFFILIATIONS AND THE RHETORICAL CURRICULUM IN BRITISH NORTH AMERICA, 1800 - 1853

In early nineteenth-century higher education in Britain, utilitarian values and emphasis on instruction in the vernacular separated the Scottish university system from that of Oxford and Cambridge. The English universities valued classical languages and a liberal education unrelated to training for a profession after graduation; the Scots considered the professions important in their educational system. The English system was elitist; the Scottish system, democratic. These values were brought to the shores of Nova Scotia and the townships of Upper Canada by emigrants from the two British countries and from post-revolutionary America. In British North America, the English elitism was only slightly modified by the democratic experience of the United Empire Loyalists, who came north in large measure because of their strong English attachments. Many of the Loyalists also had strong religious convictions, convictions which were to have a strong impact on education in the Loyalists' new home.

The national differences between the Scots and the English in the British North American colonies were marked overtly by differences in religious practice, with the Scots committed to their Presbyterian order, which permitted a fair measure of local autonomy, and the English committed to the Anglican hierarchy,

tied directly to English authority, both political and religious. Because of their social and religious differences, the two groups established separate colleges.

The rhetorical programs of the early colleges were related to the social objectives of the two respective constituencies. The colleges dominated by Scottish professors emphasized a utilitarian curriculum that fitted the social situation of a new colony struggling for economic growth. The rhetorical curriculum of these colleges emphasized both composition and speech in the vernacular. The Anglican colleges, on the other hand, emphasized the classics, familiarity with which marked a gentleman in the colonies as well as in England. The Anglican curriculum in rhetoric was confined largely to reading classical authors to learn their languages by translating them into English, and from English back to Latin and Greek. Oral exercises in Greek, Latin and English, of course, also focused on classical learning. The first half of the nineteenth century saw other groups establish colleges as well,¹ but in order to trace the most important developments of early nineteenth-century Anglophone education in British North America, this study traces the two earliest and most prominent traditions, the Anglican and Presbyterian. These

¹The most common religious denominations, most of which were involved in higher education, were Anglican, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, and Roman Catholic (generally French). Other early colleges not discussed in this dissertation include Acadia (Baptist), Mt. Allison (Methodist), Bishop's (Anglican), and Bytown (Ottawa--R. Catholic and bilingual).

two are then followed by the Wesleyan-Methodist tradition, which combined British dissenting pietism with a colonial American emphasis on utility. In this emphasis on utility, Presbyterians and Methodists often found common ground in opposing Anglican elitism, especially in Upper Canada. This opposition resulted in social friction, almost constantly associated with higher education in the first half of the century. Differences in values, of course, were reflected in different curricula, especially in rhetoric. However, to understand rhetorical developments, we must first understand the larger colonial issues relating especially to Anglicans and Presbyterians, issues which affected the development of the whole college curriculum.

English interests were controlled by colonial leaders appointed by London. As members of England's ruling class, these colonial leaders had a low opinion of the colonists, most of whom were relatively poor, and who, therefore, would have remained uneducated in England. Colonial government leaders thus saw little need for colleges in British North America. Indeed, some saw British North America generally as nothing but a burden for the mother country. In 1816, Admiral Sir David Milne, newly appointed to Halifax, wrote back to England, "From what I have seen it would be lucky for this country [England] to be weel reid of it [Canada]. It is certainly a fine country but too distant for us to defend against so powerful a neighbour" (qtd. in Agnew 34). Nineteenth-century Canadian historian J. G. Bourinot sug-

gests that this view, though magnified by the political situation following the American and French revolutions, antedated both of them. As far back as Wolfe's conquest of the French on the Plains of Abraham in 1759, the British as well as the French had doubts about the value of this northern region. Bourinot suggests that, the wealth of the fishery and fur trade notwithstanding, London feared the future costs of defending these colonies (Bourinot 1881, 16).

The attitude of the Church of England to the colonies before the American Revolution corresponded to that of the crown. Reviewing the Anglican Church's record in colonial America in 1832, Archdeacon John Strachan of Toronto wrote to Thomas Chalmers, Professor of Divinity at Edinburgh:

In the British-American settlements, before the revolution, no attention whatever was paid by imperial government to the religious instruction of the colonists: in this matter they were left entirely to themselves; and laboured under the most serious difficulties; they were indeed so great, that, had not the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts taken pity upon her members, and sent them missionaries, an episcopal clergyman would have been hardly found in British North-America at the era of the revolution. The Plantations, as the colonies were then called, were considered a part of the spiritual charge of the Bishop of

London, but no prelate of the Church had ever beheld them. The clergy and parishes were without superintendence; the churches and burial grounds remained unconsecrated; the children were without confirmation. . . .

(Strachan 1832, 4-5)

Although the arrival of Loyalists from America following the Revolutionary War necessarily changed London's indifference to British North America, owing to many of the Loyalists' strong personal ties to the mother country, the colonies still ranked low in England's concerns. These attitudes spilled over into education. England's eighteenth-century view that education bred rebellion was reinforced with the revolution of Thirteen Colonies. Lord Durham's Report, following the 1837 rebellions in Upper and Lower Canada, confirms that this attitude had existed. "I am grieved," he wrote, "to be obliged to remark, that the British Government has, since its possession of this Province, done, or even attempted, nothing for the promotion of general education" (72).

The perspective of Anglican religious leaders in the colonies after the American Revolution differed from that of the political governors. The clergy, many of them United Empire Loyalists who had served as missionaries in the Thirteen Colonies, recognized that the role of the church was paramount in the colonial culture. Canadian cultural historian S. F. Wise points out that, at the end of the eighteenth century, "it was the

clergy, not the politicians, who bore the chief responsibility for interpreting the meaning of Europe's convulsions to society at large." He notes that clergymen were extremely influential in the days before the journalist and politician gained access to the people through the newspaper (Wise 82).

It is not surprising, then, that the important Anglican agitators for colleges in early Canada were almost exclusively Loyalist clergymen. In fact, the first concerns for higher education in the Maritimes were transmitted to London before two of these clergymen had even arrived in Nova Scotia. On March 8, 1783, eighteen Church of England clergymen in New York formulated "A Plan of Religious and Literary Institution for the Province of Nova Scotia." The plan included churches, church lands, clergy, and a seminary, academy or college. The plan also called for a grammar school for learning in the classical languages. On October 18, 1783 the plan was reaffirmed and sent to London with Guy Carleton, then Commander-in-Chief at New York. A member of the original group of eighteen was Charles Inglis, an Irish-born American clergyman about to emigrate to Nova Scotia, where, in 1787, he would become British North America's first Anglican bishop.

For Inglis, the Church needed a college for training ministers. In January 1788, he wrote from Nova Scotia to the Archbishop: "There are two objects which I have in view--one is a proper Establishment of the Church in this Province, by an Act

of the Legislature; the other is, the Establishment of a college, without which Church matters must be in an imperfect state" (qtd. in R. V. Harris 112). Thus, Canada's first Anglican bishop envisioned for his new charge the English pattern of higher education linked to the church and to government authority. This link was especially important because of Nova Scotia's proximity to post-revolutionary America, which had forcibly rejected British ideals, ideals which had led the Loyalists to seek new beginnings in the British colonies to the north.² A distrust of American culture in politics, religion and education would influence the development of colleges in the colonies of British North America until Confederation in 1867--and even after that.

Inglis had served as a missionary priest in America, and had personally experienced the anger of the revolutionaries for his loyalty to the British monarchy.³ An even more serious social

²In 1790, Inglis wrote in a letter:

With respect to our seminary, one of my principal motives for pushing it forward was to prevent the importation of American Divines and American policies into the province. Unless we have a seminary here, the youth of Nova Scotia will be sent for their education to the Revolted Colonies--the inevitable consequence would be a corruption of their religious and political principles" (qtd. in Vroom 25).

³Although actual incidents are difficult to find, stories circulating among Church of England worshippers told of attacks on priests by troops waiting outside the church until the priest prayed for the King in the "Intercession," part of the service of holy communion. Since prayer for the British king was an act of treason, the priests were branded as traitors and treated as such.

disintegration than a revolution like that in America, was, however, taking place in France, even while Inglis planned for a college in Nova Scotia. S. F. Wise holds that for Inglis, the French Revolution was an event without precedent in human history--and it was the result of impiety in the upper orders of the European nation. For Inglis, Britain's victory in the French war indicated God's approval of the British social order, which, as an ideal in God's will, Inglis wished to implement in Nova Scotia (Wise 84,85). The college, therefore, was not primarily an institution for training lawyers and merchants to increase the physical wealth of the colony. It was an integral part of God's kingdom on earth.

But Inglis had difficulty founding the college he so desired, owing to the elitist attitudes of Nova Scotia's English political leaders. In 1790, he wrote the Archbishop about his difficulties with Governor Parr: "He holds literature in great contempt, and often hints that it does hurt to mankind. . . . It is with difficulty that I can get him and the other Governors to meet on any business relative to it [the College] and when met, the business goes on heavily. At present I seem to roll a Sisyphean stone" (qtd. in Vroom 25). One of the other troublesome governors of the college was Alexander Croke, Vice-judge of the Admiralty, who, against Inglis' protestations to the Archbishop of Canterbury, insisted that all students of the new college subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England.

Croke also insisted on hiring only professors who had studied at British universities linked to the Church of England. These men were to set an English "tone of character." Croke held that "a very principal object of the new institution would be accomplished by assimilating the manners of the rising generation to those of the parent state." In charging the first professors of the new college with their duties, he was especially concerned about elocution: "We think that it is of no small importance to this seminary to teach the genuine use, practice and pronunciation of the English language, undebased by local or national accents and solecisms" (qtd. in Vroom 37).

The statutes of the University of King's College, based on the royal charter of 1802 but officially proclaimed as statutes in 1803, present not only the proposed curriculum, but also the exclusive nature of the institution ultimately established by the Anglican Board of Governors dominated by Croke. The college was to have four professors, with the following teaching divisions: Divinity and Hebrew; Moral Sciences and Metaphysics; Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, and Astronomy; and Grammar, Rhetoric and Logic. The duties for this last professor were prescribed:

1st. He shall lecture in Grammar, and the Greek and Latin Classics, alternately, every day, in term, except Sundays and Holydays, the first, and the two last days, from nine to ten. And his Pupils shall be all Students during their third and fourth years; he

shall read different books the second year from those he shall read the first.

2d. In Rhetoric, every day, in term . . . the first and the two last days, from half past ten to half past eleven. His Pupils shall be all Students during the first year.

3d. And in Logic, every day, in term. . . the first and the two last days, from twelve to one. His pupils shall be all Students during their first year.

(Statutes 1803, 4)

Masters were to be procured to teach Modern Languages, particularly French. Students were allowed private instruction in Drawing, Dancing, Music, French, Riding, "and other polite accomplishments" (Statutes 1803, 13).

Exercises were also stipulated. These reflected the strong classical nature of the curriculum, with classical work deemed fully as important as that of the vernacular. "All Undergraduates except Civilians" were to compose "a Theme every week in term, either in prose or verse, in English and Latin alternately" (Statutes 1803; "Exercizes," 1) Every Saturday undergraduates and Bachelors of Arts were to rotate in giving two declamations, one in English and the other in Latin. Every Saturday, selected passages from English, Latin or Greek authors were to be recited from memory by two or more undergraduates. The statutes specifically demanded that in all

declamations, recitations, and in all other exercises, in which the Students shall read aloud or speak in public, great attention shall be paid to their pronunciation, that they shall avoid all Provincial accents, and other improprieties, and shall deliver themselves with correctness and in proper emphasis.

(Statutes 1803, "Exercizes," 4)

In informal exercises, the emphasis on classical material with English again reflected the goal of the curriculum as producing a graduate just as familiar with Greek and Latin as with his native culture. Each student was to make collections, in English, Latin, or Greek, "either by abridgement, by a logical analysis and resolution of arguments into syllogisms, or by making extracts of the finest or most material, passages, together with his own criticism, and observations upon them. And finally, every Sunday there were to be disputations, "either logical or rhetorical."

The emphasis on education as a training in moral culture was also stressed. Students' private behavior was to be monitored by tutors:

It shall be the office of the Tutor to direct and examine the private studies of his Pupil, particularly in case he shall find him deficient in Grammar and the Classics upon admission; to inspect his moral and religious conduct; to control his expences; and to

regulate all those parts of education and behaviour, which are not within the province of any of the Professors, and are too minute for the attention of the President. (Statutes 1803, "Of The Tutors")

Non-Anglican religious practice and non-aristocratic principles were strongly proscribed as Anglican exclusiveness mixed with an anti-American consciousness was reinforced by the statutes:

No member of the University shall hold, maintain, or teach, any atheistical, deistical, or democratical doctrines, principles contrary to the Christian faith, or to good morals, or subversive of the British Constitution as by Law Established. . . .

No member of the University shall frequent the Romish mass, or the meeting Houses of the Presbyterians, Baptists, or Methodists, or the Conventicles or places of Worship, of any other dissenters from the Church of England, or shall be present at any seditions, or rebellious meetings. (Statutes 1803, "Of Moral Conduct and Behavior" 3)

From the beginning, Inglis had protested Croke's plans as too restrictive and far too grandiose and expensive for a small colony. When the college finally opened, his fears proved true. First, owing to the religious prescriptions and the lack of an adequate preparatory school, there were few students. Second, the college had a difficult time finding a teaching staff that

met Croke's stipulations. And third, since the college was situated at Windsor, a day's journey from Halifax, it attracted few part-time students, such as were common in Scottish universities. The college, therefore, struggled with only two professors through its first years, with financial difficulties sufficient to force temporary layoffs even then. In addition, the Professor of Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic was a graduate of Dublin, since no incumbent from Oxford or Cambridge could be procured. Notwithstanding the reality of the situation, Croke insisted that this professor deliver his Logic lectures in Latin, "because this was the custom at Oxford." Vroom writes that "Dr. Cochran readily consented, but the folly of it was soon apparent." In Rhetoric though, "Cochran and his students read Quintilian in the Latin" (Vroom 50).

Within a decade of Windsor's opening, the classical focus, together with the exclusive Anglican orientation had repercussions beyond the confines of the new college. In the fall of the year that the statutes of King's College were proclaimed, Thomas McCulloch, an emigrant Presbyterian minister from Glasgow, initially bound for Prince Edward Island, was swayed by the appeals of Pictou Scots to stay the winter. In McCulloch's agreement the foundation of Pictou Academy was laid--and in the necessity for Pictou Academy itself was embodied a deep resistance to the Church of England establishment represented by King's College at Windsor. McCulloch was not opposed to a religious college, but

his Scottish heritage revolted against a university demanding that students adhere to a specific creed in order to gain an education. Although Scottish universities were decidedly Christian, often with a strong Presbyterian flavor, they prescribed no religious tests, welcoming Roman Catholic, Anglican or Presbyterian without prejudice.⁴

McCulloch's Presbyterianism differed significantly from Croke's Anglicanism, with important results for McCulloch's philosophy of education. Education for all was a basic necessity for a healthy individual as well as a healthy society. "The original conformation and state of the human mind, connected with the peculiarity of those circumstances in which man is placed," stated McCulloch, "show that he has been designed for intellectual and moral improvement" (1819, 3). However, because deep-rooted imperfections prevent one from achieving one's potential, individuals cannot improve themselves; especially in youth, superiors must remove from the individual "everything tending to depravity of disposition," putting in its place "whatever appear[s] to be good and useful and calculated to encourage imitation" (4). The end of a liberal education, then, was "the improvement of man in intelligence and moral principle, as the basis of his subsequent duty and happiness" (6). A strong sense

⁴W. B. Hamilton's article entitled "Thomas McCulloch: Advocate of Non-Sectarian Education" discusses McCulloch's commitment to non-denominational education in early nineteenth-century Nova Scotia.

of duty arose from the interrelationships between the individual and society: "The existence of a social state produces a variety of offices and duties, which, by promoting the safety and comfort of the individual parts of society, ultimately tend to the benefit of the whole." Further, education was important because one could not perform one's duty "unless he have previously ascertained both its nature and the mode of performance" (7). In this duty to know one's social responsibilities and to perform them lay the necessity of teaching rhetoric, which was central to McCulloch's concept of learning:

A liberal education, beside unfolding the principles of science, is particularly calculated to qualify the mind both for the acquisition and the communication of knowledge. In every well regulated seminary, it is so conducted as to exercise the thinking powers; and, also, to connect the acquisition of knowledge with a corresponding improvement in the power of communication. (McCulloch 1819, 18)

To gain knowledge without the ability to act on it or communicate it would have defeated the purpose of McCulloch's academy. McCulloch therefore believed that the curriculum of King's, heavily emphasizing classical languages, was unsuited for Nova Scotia, for practical as well as for religious and social reasons.

McCulloch soon determined to establish a non-sectarian

school in Pictou. In 1809, he opened the famous Pictou Academy, hoping to gain a degree-granting college for those unable to go to the Anglicans' King's College at Windsor. The legislative council in Halifax, however, controlled by elitist English attitudes and jealous of any competition for King's College, stood in his way. To gain degrees, therefore, Pictou graduates (most of them Presbyterian, since the legislative council, against McCulloch's wishes, had also not allowed a non-denominational school) had to travel to the United States or to Scotland. Three important educators of the next generation, J. W. Dawson, president of McGill College, George Munro Grant, president of Queen's College at Kingston, and William Brydon Jack, president of the University of New Brunswick, proceeded from Pictou to Scotland to receive M.A.s from Glasgow, McCulloch's alma mater.

On the surface, the Pictou Academy course of studies may have appeared to parallel that of King's College, except perhaps in the emphasis on the practical subjects in mathematics and natural philosophy, reflecting McCulloch's high interest and wide reputation in geology. The 1830 statutes of Pictou, for instance, required the following curriculum:

- First year: Latin and Greek;
- Second Year: Logic, including general Grammar and Rhetoric; Latin and Greek continued;
- Third Year: Moral Philosophy, Mathematics with their practical applications, Algebra;

Fourth Year: Natural Philosophy, Mathematics and
Algebra (qtd. in McMullin 146)

William McCulloch, the son of Thomas McCulloch, wrote in the biography of the elder McCulloch, however, that as part of his teaching in Grammar and Rhetoric at Pictou, McCulloch stressed analysis and composition in English (179). Further, Scottish universities taught the classical curriculum as well, but, it is clear that in Scottish teaching the focus of studies was set by the professor, not by the curriculum. McCulloch's concerns for the practical education of his students determined that they would be well versed in the fundamentals of rhetoric in the vernacular, oral as well as written.

In 1838, McCulloch left Pictou Academy to become the first president of Dalhousie College in Halifax. This college too grew out of a reaction to the Anglican exclusiveness of King's College. In 1816, George Ramsay, Ninth Earl of Dalhousie, was appointed as lieutenant-governor to Nova Scotia. A Scot, he noted the paucity of educational opportunities for non-Anglicans, so in 1818 he founded a liberal, non-denominational college, modelled on the University of Edinburgh. Resistance from the legislative council kept Dalhousie from opening till long after Lord Dalhousie himself had left the colony. In 1838, sectarian strife within the Nova Scotia Presbyterian community, present almost from McCulloch's earliest days in Pictou, finally led to McCulloch's removal from Pictou to take up the presidency at

Dalhousie. Unfortunately, McCulloch died after only five years in Halifax. Unable to continue without him, Dalhousie reorganized as a high school until 1863, when Nova Scotians rallied to support its revival as a non-sectarian university.

McCulloch's 1838 inaugural address at Dalhousie stressed the necessity of a practical education. He supported studying the classical languages, but for specific reasons: that Hebrew, Greek and Latin helped one understand the classical writings, especially the Christian scriptures. "He who teaches these languages in Dalhousie College should know his business well," he said, as respectability required. However, learning one's native tongue was more important:

But that boys should in Halifax or elsewhere spend six or seven years upon Latin and Greek and then four more in college partly occupied with the same languages is a waste of human life adapted neither to the circumstances or the prosperity of Nova Scotia. . . . If Dalhousie College acquire usefulness and eminence it will be not by an imitation of Oxford, but as an institution of science and practical intelligence. (qtd. in Harris 1976, 33)

Dalhousie opened with only sixteen students, most of them without a good preparation, so McCulloch held special night classes in composition and logic (Harvey 1938, 52-3). McCulloch used Lindley Murray's English Grammar, with the subtitle "Adapted for Dif-

ferent Classes of Learners." McCulloch also resisted an undue emphasis on the classics, in spite of strong pressure from Dr. Crawley, a King's-educated convert to the Baptists and a rival to McCulloch for the presidency of Dalhousie.⁵ The Scottish influence of McCulloch thus led to a practical emphasis on both writing and oratory in early colonial Nova Scotia, first in Pictou Academy and then in Dalhousie College.

In New Brunswick, the Nova Scotia educational problems deriving from Anglican elitism repeated themselves. A college was first envisioned by Rev. John Odell, poet, clergyman, doctor, politician and first provincial secretary. Odell was also one of the group of Loyalist clergy that originally petitioned for a college while still in New York, in 1783. Having emigrated to New Brunswick by 1785, Odell, with other New Brunswick leaders, petitioned Governor Thomas Carleton for "an academy of liberal arts and sciences" (Bailey 16). Unlike Parr in Nova Scotia, Carleton responded immediately, setting aside 6,000 acres of land in the parish of Fredericton. By 1787 an academy was in operation, but it failed to prosper. The New Brunswick historian A. G. Bailey sees five reasons for the weakness of the academy, which New Brunswick proposed to elevate to degree-granting sta-

⁵Crawley insisted that the liberal and noble sentiments fostered in the mother country arose from England's emphasis on classical literature. McCulloch, resisting Crawley's emphasis, held that religion, not the classics, had ennobled the British (Harvey 1938, 52-3).

tus: the area lacked qualified instructors; too few students enrolled (17 in the academy in 1793); the 1793 draft charter restricted matriculation to Anglicans; Bishop Inglis' opposition to the New Brunswick college because it would weaken the college at Windsor nearby; and, finally, an unspoken policy to rule by the divide-and-conquer mentality, meant to keep colonies from mutual cooperation, consciously implemented by London after the 1776 American rebellion (17-18).

The last three of these five reasons relate to concerns regarding political control of the colony rather than to education. In these three concerns, the Anglican church was to act as the hand of London's colonial policy. In the history of British North America, the Anglican church and official colonial policy were inevitably intertwined, given the union of church and state in England, and thus in the colonies. Problems arising from this union inevitably bedeviled British North America.

Originally chartered as the College of New Brunswick, the Fredericton institution, in 1828, attempted to gain popular support by abolishing the Anglican restrictions on both students and faculty, and to gain the English crown's support by asking for a new charter. The college was thus renamed King's College. Although the crown agreed to the new charter and provided modest annual funding, the plan failed, owing to the continuing classical curriculum, which New Brunswick timber merchants considered a waste of time. Further, the continued Anglican elitist attitudes

of the college, a practical factor that the revised statutes did not alter, irritated many, whether wealthy or not. The problems at Fredericton were not solved until 1855-60, when a commission of educators from outside the province recommended changes, which were implemented largely after the 1859 resignation of Oxford-educated President Edwin Jacob.

In Upper Canada, religious and social friction deriving from Church of England restrictions to mass education once again led to problems, although a strong Methodist presence complicated the Upper Canada situation somewhat. As in Nova Scotia, strong personalities were involved, one of the strongest that of the Rev. John Strachan, in 1839 to become the Anglican Bishop of Toronto. Strachan was invited to Upper Canada by John Graves Simcoe, Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada from 1791-95. Simcoe's attitudes toward education were atypical for an Englishman. Immediately upon being appointed governor, Simcoe determined to establish a school system culminating in a university in order to keep young men from having to gain their education in America, where their political sensibilities would be perverted (Ross 9). To pay for this system, and to finance the work of the church, Simcoe arranged to have set aside huge tracts of public land.⁶

⁶Educated at Eton and at Oxford, Simcoe nevertheless saw the need for education in the colony. He argued that "a college of a higher class would be eminently useful, and would give a tone of principle and manners that would be of infinite support to Government" (Hodgins I, 11). Simcoe, therefore, set in motion legislation, approved in 1798, that appropriated almost 300,000 acres as an endowment for a university (Ross 1896, 11).

Before he could complete his plans, however, he was replaced. Prior to leaving, however, he invited John Strachan, a recent Aberdeen graduate reputed to be a good teacher, to come to Canada to help in the organization of "a college or university." When Strachan arrived in Kingston on the last day of 1799, he was, of course, disappointed in his expectations, but, impoverished after the long journey, he was forced to stay in Upper Canada.

Simcoe's reassignment from British North America before Strachan's arrival forced the young Scot to alter his plans. Following three years as a private tutor in Kingston, Strachan entered the ministry of the Church of England and moved to Cornwall, where he became famous for the manner in which he taught at the Cornwall Grammar School, attended by many the children of Upper Canada's Tory elite. Strachan's educational philosophy is reflected in a letter to one of his students:

In conducting your education, one of my principal objects has always been to fit you for discharging with credit the duties of any office to which you may hereafter be called. To accomplish this, it was necessary for you to be accustomed frequently to depend upon, and think for yourselves: accordingly I have always encouraged this disposition, which when preserved within due bounds, is one of the greatest benefits that can possibility be acquired. (qtd. in Scadding 161)

George Spragge, an editor of Strachan's letters, suggests

that Strachan expected his students "for their own sakes, for the sake of the colony, and, very probably, for the effectual carrying out of his own plans, to take a prominent place in public life." To train his pupils for their future vocations, he gave them practice in debating, the issues chosen frequently being famous debates from the British House of Commons. By this method he also familiarized his students with the British parliamentary system, thus preparing them for future leadership (Spragge xi-xii).⁷

The stress on facility in English oratory set Strachan's Cornwall grammar school apart from the traditional upper-class, Anglican view of education. Strachan's focus on debate may have been rooted in two motives, the one compatible with other Anglican views, the other not. On the one hand, Strachan's students in Cornwall were members of Tory establishment families, so Strachan was convinced that these students would become community leaders. Hence they were to be prepared to take their place in society, able to assert traditional views effectively. On the other hand, being a Scotsman, Strachan had grown up in an environment in which education was the right of every citizen. Even as an Anglican, Strachan appears to have espoused traditional Scottish values in education. In the Anglican Christian

⁷A comprehensive discussion of Strachan's teaching at Cornwall, where he appears to have conceived much of his later educational philosophy, is given in G. W. Spragge, "The Cornwall School Under John Strachan," in Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records 34 (1942): 63-85.

Record of 1819, Strachan stated clearly his belief in a democratic education intimately associated with Christianity.

It was reserved for Christianity to suggest and put into practice the sublime work of educating a whole people. . . . Accordingly, the Christian Church has, in every country, where it has been established, shown a becoming solicitude for the education of youth, and been at great pain in directing their minds to a knowledge of the leading and important doctrines of the holy scriptures. Nor is the praise of this conduct confined to one, but is equally due to all denominations. (qtd. in Purdy 1962, 55)

Not for the young Strachan was the common upper class Anglican view that education threatened the social order.

Strachan's early acceptance of other Christian denominations later narrowed from the charity of this 1819 article. The problem appeared to increase as Strachan rose in the Church of England hierarchy, for he accepted more and more the Anglican position that the Church of England deserved an exclusive position within the social structure of British North America, similar to the position the Anglican church enjoyed in England. In an 1836 sermon to the clergy of the Established Church of Upper Canada, he affirmed the biblical precedents of union between church and state, citing the history of Jewish support for the temple in ancient Israel. He begged his opponents to "look to England and

Scotland, each of which had a religious establishment, to which they were mainly indebted for their vast superiority to other nations" (qtd. in Ryerson 1883, 215). Writing to the Rev. Dr. Thomas Chalmers of Edinburgh in 1832, he reviewed an argument with Bishop Hobart of New York about the American model of separating church and state:

Such influence [of the American Episcopal Church] on the manner and habits of the people is next to nothing. . . . Add to this the dependence of your clergy upon the people for support--a state of things which is attended with most pernicious consequences. . . . It is the duty of Christian nations to constitute within their boundaries, ecclesiastical establishment. (qtd. in Ryerson 1883, 215)

As Strachan's official duties in the Church of England led to an ever-increasing advocacy for the Church, Strachan's increasingly narrow views on the priority of the Church of England in the colony led to a shift in his educational priorities.

Strachan's concern about a weak episcopal church was but one of several fears related to the influence of American ways. Drawn into leadership of the local militia in the War of 1812, he came to share Loyalist sentiments that despised American political ideals. He thus feared the propagation of those ideals in

American education.⁸ Strachan was particularly appalled by the "atheistic" approach to education following from the separation of church and state. Regardless of his other positions, the bedrock of Strachan's educational philosophy was that all education must be founded on Christian principles. In his 1836 address to Church of England clergy he asked, "Now what is solid education but the knowledge of the Gospel? . . . Is not the word of God the true mine of christian education?" (46). In the 1832 letter to Rev. Thomas Chalmers in Edinburgh, he stated,

The first best purpose of education, and which has given holiness and glory to every scheme for its improvement, is to connect thought and principle by the

⁸Strachan's attitude toward America is revealed in an 1815 funeral sermon honoring Richard Cartwright, a Loyalist magistrate. Strachan's sermon followed praise of Britain with a vitriolic description of America in the Napoleonic wars:

The American Government, like cormorants, delighted in the contests which agitated Europe, laughed at the groans of the dying, and fed upon the slain, had no sympathy with the fallen; and when at length the despot had trampled upon all the continental nations, and nothing was seen but desolation and despair, when Britain alone was left to combat with his colossal power, and her means of resistance appeared to be fast diminishing, this government, lost to every feeling of honor and glory, hastened to join itself to the oppressor of nations, and to congratulate him on the total destruction of the liberty of the world. . . . Posterity, better than the present age, will be able to appreciate the conduct of the two governments during the convulsions in Europe, and while Britain will appear an example of magnanimity, unequalled in history, the star that has directed the European family to happiness and peace, America will be consigned to bitter execration, as the betrayer of the liberty and independence of mankind. (Strachan 1815, 39-40)

fullest demonstration of truth. This brings forth all that is religious in man; it makes him the true worshipper of God and the self-denying friend of his species. (Strachan 1832, 32)

Possibly referring to events following the French Revolution, as well as to British unrest leading to the Reform Act of 1832, Strachan revealed a growing aristocratic view of society that permitted Anglican elitism in education. He asked,

What do we see in Europe as the consequence of knowledge without religion? The perversion of public principle, the daily weakening of the bonds of union between the humble ranks of society and their natural guardians and protectors, growing insubordination, disregard to the laws, increase of crime, the denunciation of good men, mockery of religion, impatience of just control and salutary restraint, contempt of sound learning and experience, and the interruption of honest industry. (Strachan 1832, 28)

The bedrock of all education for Strachan was faith in the tenets of the Christian religion. In this, Strachan would have had the agreement of all other leading educators in British North America. The problem lay in how that faith should be practiced.

Strachan's rising power within the Church of England, his concern for education generally, and for an educated clergy within the Anglican Church specifically, his concern that the

morals of young men be protected from anarchic American principles, and his political influence--all these circumstances and concerns thrust him into the struggle to establish a university in Upper Canada. In 1815 already, Strachan had submitted to Sir Gordon Drummond, acting administrator of Upper Canada, a report on education in the colony. Obviously deriving from Strachan's Scottish heritage, the report had contained a universal educational scheme for Upper Canada, including a university. Strachan's system was based on the success of his grammar school at Cornwall (Purdy 1964, 45-64). The scheme did not stipulate Church of England professors in the college, nor did a school act that Strachan drafted in 1816 call for Church of England school teachers. In proposing a college at York, Strachan had also anticipated a non-sectarian institution. This institution was, however, to be controlled by an Anglican board and an Anglican president. The plan also stressed rhetorical concerns in the vernacular, and practical studies rather than predominantly classical texts.

However, in 1827, when Strachan went to England to win funding and a charter for a university in Upper Canada, many of his earlier liberal attitudes toward education seemed to vanish. In a pamphlet entitled An Appeal to the Friends of Religion and Literature, In Behalf of the University of Upper Canada, Strachan presented the proposed university as "essentially a Missionary College," important in preserving the young men of Upper Canada

from the corruption of an American education (14). The charter, written under Strachan's supervision in England, left King's College under strictly sectarian governance, although students were not required to submit to the Thirty-nine Articles--but they were expected to attend the daily Anglican chapel services.

Based primarily on the argument that public money was being used for strictly sectarian purposes, Strachan's 1827 charter raised such opposition in Upper Canada that the university did not open until 1843. Against his own wishes, Strachan, now Bishop of Toronto, was appointed president of the new King's College. Strachan believed that the controversy of more than a decade would simply be renewed if he took a prominent role in the college. Further, he did not wish to highlight the sectarian nature of the college. In the matter of a practical English curriculum, Strachan was also overruled. In spite of his pandering to English educational biases in raising money in 1827, as late as 1837 Strachan had promoted a curriculum which was to include instruction in both "Classical and Modern Literature", with Modern Literature including both English and foreign languages. This division was also to include Logic, Rhetoric, Grammar, Composition, Style, and Modern History, served by two professors. Unlike Oxford and Cambridge, but like Scottish universities, the institution was to include the professions of Theology, Jurisprudence and Medicine (Ross 1896, Appendix C). This curriculum, based again on Strachan's Cornwall experience,

had already been rejected by Lieutenant-Governor John Colborne in 1828. Colborne had demanded that King's College use a standard classical curriculum, based on Oxford models. In spite of Colborne's rejection, Strachan again put forward his curriculum, which appears to have been accepted by the College Board in June 1837, when the Board expected to open the college shortly (Ross 278). However, when the opening of King's College was delayed until 1843, it began with a solidly classical curriculum.

The main force behind the 1843 classical curriculum was not Bishop Strachan but the Rev. John McCaul, a scholar of high reputation from Dublin's Trinity College, the Irish daughter of Oxford. McCaul's official title was Professor of Classical Literature, Logic, Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. The course at King's covered in three years most of what required four in Dublin. R. A. Falconer, University of Toronto President from 1907 to 1932, labelled the exams for 1844 "long and thorough" (Falconer 1927, 109). The course was so difficult that it attracted most of its students from Upper Canada College, an Anglican preparatory school at which McCaul had served as principal before 1843. Upper Canada College had been established in 1829, in the years that King's College opening was delayed.

From the perspective of the Anglican governors of King's College, there were good reasons for a conservative, classical curriculum in 1843. As every student of Canadian history knows, the attacks on social inequities by Joseph Papineau in Lower

Canada and by William Lyon Mackenzie in Upper Canada finally led, in the fall of 1837, to populist uprisings, brief but shocking to The Family Compact, the colony's ruling group closely inter-related by marriage and business ties. King's College, was intimately connected with this power base in Toronto. D. C. Masters' history of Toronto points out that of the original King's faculty, five members were related to well-known Family Compact members, either by marriage or blood.⁹ The 1837 rebellion shocked leading Torontonians, themselves among the most conservative citizens in British North America,¹⁰ into a reactionary shell. Given that non-Anglican students were not debarred from matriculation, the university's teaching of oratory and written rhetoric would simply have meant educating more men like William Lyon Mackenzie or other outspoken opponents of the Tories.

The curriculum in rhetoric and composition at King's, like the curriculum at the other colleges discussed in this chapter, derived from the social values and political views of those in

⁹D. C. Masters traces the family relationships as evidence for arguing that "the university had. . . an official and Anglican air" (40). Masters argues that "From the time of the original act chartering the University of King's College in 1827 it had appeared certain that the University would be little better than a branch of the Family Compact. This probability seemed confirmed when King's College was finally opened in 1843, instruction beginning in the old Parliament Buildings. The Compact was strongly represented in the University Council of 1842" (39).

¹⁰Charles Dickens in 1842 wrote that "the wild and rabid Toryism of Toronto was appalling" (qtd. in Masters 20).

power in the university. Oxford-educated Tories in the colonies expected higher education to provide a graduate with the stamp of culture, which meant a facility in the classical languages, an aesthetic appreciation of classical literature, and a well-developed mind. The purpose of higher education was to provide a liberal education, the object of which was knowledge unattached to any particular end, neither theological nor financial.

For Tory leaders in the colonies, an added advantage in the classical curriculum--though perhaps an advantage unspoken--was that university graduates would not be ready speakers and writers in the vernacular, a point of prime importance in a university admitting all applicants, regardless of religious affiliation. Further, a graduate of the classical curriculum would be thoroughly imbued with noble thoughts and concerns for social stability, and thus not given to radical, political action.

Before 1837, the developments in King's College in Toronto could have been influenced by Strachan's Scottish views that stressed universal access to education, views that affirmed the value of an education for everyone in society. By 1843, however (after the 1837 uprisings), Strachan had become Bishop of Toronto, and his views on education had become conservative, consistent with the Anglican emphasis on an elitist, classical education rather than the practical, rhetorical emphasis of his teaching in Cornwall. Strachan's address at the opening of King's College in 1843 made no mention of the loss of the ver-

macular curriculum in rhetoric.

King's College was not John Strachan's only college-related interest. From his Cornwall days onward, Strachan had had a continuing personal interest in the growth of McGill College in Montreal. Indeed, he had discussed with James McGill, a wealthy Montreal entrepreneur related to Strachan by marriage, the possibility of McGill's leaving a bequest for public education. When the Hon. James McGill died in 1813, he left a tract of land and a sum of 10,000 pounds to build a university. As one of McGill's four executors, Strachan became involved in planning the Montreal college from the first. In February 1815, he wrote letters to various persons involved in the enterprise, giving his views about how to proceed. The importance of the college, again, lay in the fact that its absence forced young men to go to England, a dangerous and expensive venture¹¹, or to go to America, an even worse possibility, since America presented untold religious and political dangers for impressionable minds.¹² The

¹¹Strachan wrote to Thomas Chalmers in Edinburgh that in the American colonial period, owing to the lack of Anglican supervision in British North America,

every candidate for the ministry was under the necessity of going to Europe for ordination--a voyage so dangerous, from the imperfect state of navigation at that period, that no less than one-fifth of the young men who aspired to serve the Lord in the sanctuary, perished in the ocean. (Strachan 1832, 5)

¹²In his famous Appeal to the Friends of Religion and Literature, Strachan in 1827 raised funds for King's College with anti-American arguments such as the following:

Now in the United States a custom prevails unknown to

college of his plans was to have no religious tests, although the religious character of the college was to be ensured by having the principal a Church of England clergyman, with his department being Moral Philosophy, Logic and Rhetoric. The institution was to be modeled on the "Scotch and German Universities. . . because much more may be done at one fourth of the Expence." Oxford and Cambridge were praised for "so rich and populous and learned a country as England," but not for a colony. Similarly, McGill was not to hire graduates from England: "Learning they may have in abundance, but the industry the labour (I may say drudgery) and accommodation to circumstance cannot be expected of them" (Spragge 68-9). However, legal maneuvers by McGill's step-son, who hoped to win the McGill property for himself, delayed the opening of the college. During the delay, strong Anglican interests gradually came to dominate the curriculum. McGill College,

or unpracticed by any other nation; in all other countries morals and religion are made the basis of public instruction, and the first books put into the hands of children teach them the domestic, the social, and religious virtues; but in the United States politics pervade the whole system of education; the school books from the very first elements are stuffed with praises of their own institutions and breathe hatred to every thing English.

To such a country our youth may go strongly attached to their native land and to all its establishments, but by hearing them continually depreciated and those of America praised, this attachment will in many be gradually weakened; and some may become fascinated with that liberty which has degenerated into licentiousness, and imbibe, perhaps unconsciously, sentiments unfriendly to things of which Englishmen are proud. (Strachan 1827, 5-6)

therefore, did not open until 1829. Unlike the King's Colleges, however, it matriculated students from all religions. Its setting in Montreal isolated it from the religious strife in other areas of British North America, since Montreal had a history of religious cooperation.¹³ Although the college was truly non-sectarian, attracting students of various protestant denominations as well as Roman Catholics, the influence of Anglican leadership resulted in a classical curriculum, with the Rev. W. T. Leach appointed Professor of Classical Literature in 1846. Leach was a graduate of Edinburgh, but, like Strachan, a Church of England cleric. He held posts in both the university and the church, from 1841 to 1865 as Rector of St. George's church in Montreal, and thereafter as archdeacon of Montreal. He served as Vice-President of McGill from 1846 until 1886 (Collard 503).

Another college that struggled for decades before finally assuming educational leadership was Queen's, a Presbyterian college in Kingston. As concerned as other religious groups about the lack of trained ministers in Upper Canada, the Presbyterians had originally requested that the publicly endowed King's College include a Presbyterian professor in its divinity faculty. Given the importance of the Presbyterian Church in affairs of state in Scotland, the Presbyterians of Upper Canada

¹³For twenty years before 1789 the Episcopal congregation used the Roman Catholic church building of the Recollect Fathers (MacMillan 33). Bishop Inglis of Nova Scotia preached in this church on his first visit to Montreal in 1784 (R. V. Harris 101).

considered their political rights equal to those of the Anglicans. But when King's was delayed in opening, the Presbyterians gained a charter for their own college, placing it at Kingston at a time when Kingston was considered the likely future capital city. Owing to the small student body and to an 1844 split in the Presbyterian Church just two years after Queen's opened, the college struggled simply to survive for more than two decades.

Another college established while King's College in Toronto delayed opening was Victoria College. Built in Cobourg, Victoria College had no ties with either Scotland or England. A Wesleyan Methodist college, modeled on an existing Wesleyan university in Connecticut (Hodgins IV, 110), Victoria inaugurated a new direction for rhetoric in English. It attempted to implement a rhetorical curriculum that would give Victoria graduates the practical expertise to communicate persuasively in English in both writing and speaking. In his inaugural speech at the opening of Victoria College on June 21, 1842, President Egerton Ryerson related his rhetorical concerns back to Aristotle and Cicero, stating that "the art of speaking and writing with purity, propriety, and elegance, is of the highest importance" (18). Ryerson also praised Greek and Roman culture for cultivating their own tongues. In like manner, he held, the contemporary world should strive for excellence in English, not through classical languages but through a direct study of the peoples' own tongue: "Why there should be provision for the teaching of dead and foreign lan-

guages, and none for the teaching of our own vernacular tongue, is a phenomenon for which I can assign no reason but custom and prejudice" (10). Deflecting arguments against his position, Ryerson quoted the tenth of Blair's Lectures in Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, which listed the advantages of English as a language over other languages owing to its rich vocabulary.

Ryerson considered both writing and speaking in his curriculum, first defining both: "Rhetoric. . .as relating to discourse; Belles-Lettres, to writing." He then added that "In an age of printing and writing--in all its varieties--to write well is of the last [i.e., most] importance."

The power which an eloquent orator exerts over an assembly, and able writer exerts over a country. The "pen of a ready writer" has frequently proved an instrument of more potent power, than the sword of the soldier, or the sceptre of the monarch. The "heavens are his sounding board," and a nation, if not the world, his audience; and his productions will be listened to with edification and delight, by thousands and millions whom the human voice could never reach. (1842, 18-19)

Ryerson was not willing to leave either of these important studies to chance, or to literary societies, as was so often the case, especially with practice in oratory, often considered extraneous to academic interests. The study of both writing and

speaking needed classroom instruction:

the oral and critical instructions of a competent judge of good speaking and composition must be superadded to rules, and will furnish the student with the most efficient aid in correcting the defects, remedying the blemishes, and cultivating the beauties of oratory and writing. (1842, 19)

Ryerson was aware that his proposed emphasis on practical English rhetoric was an innovation. He introduced the topic of English study in his inaugural by allowing that "the admission of an ENGLISH DEPARTMENT of Language, Science, and Literature, into a Collegiate Institution" [emphasis in original] might be regarded "a novelty, or innovation," but he was confident that this innovation would become as commonplace as the telescope, the microscope, or compass (10).

Ryerson's emphasis on composition and oratory derived from his Methodist environment, which, although strongly protestant, differed from the traditions of both Presbyterianism and Anglicanism.¹⁴ Unlike them, Methodism was not part of the official culture of the state, but an intensely private matter. The Calvinist Presbyterian doctrine of predestination placed responsibility for an individual's faith, and to some extent his behavior, on God, and Anglicanism emphasized the role of the com-

¹⁴See Goldwin French, "Egerton Ryerson and the Methodist Model for Upper Canada" in Egerton Ryerson and His Times, edited by N. McDonald and A. Chaiton.

munity in the worship and faith of an individual. Methodists, on the other hand, stressed the importance of each individual's relationship and duty to God. In his 1842 inaugural, Ryerson stressed that the study of theology alone did not qualify an individual to serve in the church:

To educate young men for the sacred ministry--irrespective of their talents or spiritual attainments and character--has filled some sections of the Christian Church with unconverted Ministers of God's Holy Word.

. . .When a young man who has been 'born from above' feels in his heart that constraining desire, that perpetual and special kindling within to save souls [emphasis in original] . . .what can be more rational and scriptural than for him to 'study to become a workman that needeth not to be ashamed?' (1842, 19-20)

This personal commitment gave Ryerson's Christianity a more charged sense of duty than the Anglicanism of Strachan, and even more than the Presbyterianism of McCulloch.

In its insistence on the primacy of the Christian tradition for the social, political and cultural order, Wesleyan Methodism was at one with Presbyterianism and Anglicanism. However, it differed from both in its insistence on the separation of church and state, since religion was a matter of the private conscience, not of social polity. From the emphasis on the individual flowed the concept of religious and civil liberty for all, although this

was not a licence for anti-social behavior. For Ryerson, public morality and respect for the crown were simply manifestations of true religion. But the intense focus on the individual made necessary the development of each individual in society, a necessity which involuntarily demanded universal education. The sense of personal duty to both God and man was reflected in Ryerson's early life, following his conversion to Methodism.¹⁵ His father was deeply disturbed by the turning of his sons, especially Egerton, from historic Episcopalianism. This parental disappointment strengthened Ryerson's resolve both to improve himself and to prove the utility of his newfound religion to a strict father:

From that time I became a diligent student, and new quickness and strength seemed to be imparted to my

¹⁵The intensely personal commitment to the Christian faith became important to Ryerson as a child. In his autobiography Ryerson relates a conversion experience so important that it remained with him through life:

At the close of the American War, in 1815, when I was twelve years of age, my three elder brothers, George, William, and John, became deeply religious, and I imbibed the same spirit. My consciousness of guilt and sinfulness was humbling, oppressive, and distressing; and my experience of relief, refreshing and joyous. In the end I simply trusted in Christ, and looked to Him for a present salvation; and, as I looked up in my bed, the light appeared to my mind, and, as I thought, to my bodily eye also, in the form of One, white-robed, who approached the bedside with a smile, and with more of the expression of the countenance of Titian's Christ than of any person whom I have ever seen. I turned, rose to my knees, bowed my head, and covered my face, rejoiced with trembling, saying to a brother who was lying beside me, that the Savior was now near us. (Ryerson 1883, 25)

understanding and memory. While working on the farm I did more than ordinary day's work, that it might show how industrious, instead of lazy, as some said, religion made a person. I studied between three and six o'clock in the morning, carried a book in my pocket during the day to improve odd moments by reading or learning, and then reviewed my studies of the day aloud while walking out in the evening. (26)

The high moral seriousness in practical as well as religious affairs reflected here would be Ryerson's public hallmark as both an itinerant Methodist minister, and, later, as the superintendent of education for Canada West and, after Confederation, for the province of Ontario. In 1877, the year after his retirement from office, Ryerson published Elements of Political Economy; Or, How Individuals and a Country Become Rich, in which he presented his philosophy of duty in pragmatic economic terms, applying to every individual the economic principles relating to business:

as all gains arise from small and successive accumulations, and as almost every product is liable to waste, it is manifest that habitual negligence . . . must greatly diminish, if it do not entirely consume, all the net revenue of an establishment. The effort of every man should be to unite every fraction of capital with industry, and to keep it so united continually.

Any gain, even the smallest, is better than no gain at all. (24)

Ryerson applied this economic principle to a country in relation to education. First, he defined education as qualifying the individual "to perform his duties and exercise his rights as a Christian citizen, whatever may be his circumstances, employment or profession" (1877, 150). He then related the education of individuals with the economy of a nation. Education, both by knowledge and by principles, fitted the student "to understand and value the laws and government of his country, and to perform his duties and exercise his rights as an intelligent, Christian citizen." In contrast, an illiterate citizen weakened civil government, thereby presenting a danger to security of life and property. The economic value of an education alone was demonstrated each time a skilled or educated laborer was paid a higher wage than an unskilled or uneducated worker (1877, 150).

Methodism's strong dual interest in the welfare of the individual and in the welfare of the state laid the base for a utilitarian approach to rhetoric in the vernacular. Only as individuals improved themselves could they be effective in society, and only as individuals in society improved themselves corporately could society itself advance. An educational system based on these principles would not foster or defend an elitist, classical curriculum in a public university. Like McCulloch, Ryerson supported classical learning, but this support was utili-

tarian, for without knowing Hebrew and Greek, ministers could not read the scriptures in their original tongue. Further, classical and sacred literature provided "both the mind and heart of the pupil with the conviction of the dignity and duty of uniting personal industry and enterprise with genius and learning in all the private and public relations of life" (1842, 15). Thus, the practical application of every kind of learning was, for Ryerson, paramount.

In his memoirs, Ryerson left a review of how he himself learned rhetorical excellence. In the introduction to the memoirs, J. G. Hodgins' writes of Ryerson,

He was an indefatigable student; and so thoroughly did he in early life ground himself in English subjects--grammar, logic, rhetoric--and the classics, and that, too, under the most adverse circumstances, that, in his subsequent active career as a writer and controversialist, he evinced a power and readiness with his tongue and pen, that often astonished those who were unacquainted with the laborious thoroughness of his previous mental preparation. (1883, xiv-xv)

Ryerson learned English grammar by the parsing method in a system which Ryerson termed "the most effective I have ever since witnessed, having charts, etc., to illustrate the agreement and government of words" (1883, 23). Ryerson followed the study of grammar with Murray's Expositions and Exercises, Kames' Elements

of Criticism, and Blair's Lectures on Rhetoric, of which he kept the notes till the end of his life. When one of his grammar teachers fell ill, Ryerson, at the age of fifteen, was asked to substitute. "Thus, before I was sixteen," he writes, "I was inducted as a teacher, by lecturing on my native language. This course of instruction, and exercises in English, have proved of the greatest advantage to me, not less in enabling me to study foreign languages than in using my own" (1883, 25). Apart from his grammar school training, Ryerson was largely self-taught, aided by the standard four-year apprenticeship for Methodist ministers without a formal higher education.

Ryerson's own career constantly proved to him the importance of rhetorical skills in both speaking and writing. His oratorical skills enabled him to serve his church and his God well, and therefore also his country, which to Loyalist Methodists was highly important. His writing skills, especially as demonstrated in a series of published letters to Strachan in 1828, won him honour and influence.¹⁶ This ability to influence others lay at the heart of rhetoric, and of education: "Not to be able to

¹⁶In 1827, Ryerson, a young Methodist minister, sprang to prominence in the clergy reserves debate about whether the Anglican church could act as a state church--thereby alone benefiting from the huge land tracts that Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe, in 1795, had set aside for the church. In 1827, dissenting ministers lacked even the legal right to perform marriages and official funeral duties. Ryerson also addressed the Anglican exclusiveness of the 1827 King's College charter, taking special offence at Strachan's charge that Methodist relationships with their American conference bred disloyalty to the British crown. (Ryerson 1828)

communicate our knowledge, is but little better than to be without knowledge. To be useful to others, and to be in the fullest sense advantageous to ourselves, our knowledge must be communicated" (1842, 18). But, again, the utility was for the society at large, not for the students themselves, as Ryerson stressed in the conclusion of his 1842 inaugural: "Self is not to be neglected, but, to prefer one's self to his country, is to prefer one to thousands."

The specific curriculum in English and rhetoric arising out of this philosophy was appended to Ryerson's inaugural address, for publication with it. Emphasizing studies that integrated the senior years of grammar school with college, the Victoria College preparatory division included spelling, reading, and writing, together with English grammar. In addition, Victoria College also contained a commercial department for those not taking the classical course. The curriculum guide stated, "To such pupils will be given as thorough a preparation as, through the English Language, can be imparted for the active business of life, either as Merchants, Engineers, or Mechanics," with the English component of the course focusing on English grammar and composition.

Distinctive about Victoria, however, was not only the philosophical emphasis on rhetoric and belles lettres, as understood by Ryerson, but also the division of the faculty. In the first year, when Ryerson served in Cobourg as president of the college,

he himself taught rhetoric--it was not taught by the classics professor, as was common in other Anglo-Canadian institutions before mid-century and for a decade or two after. A Rev. J. Spencer is listed as "Teacher in the English Department," probably an indication that he taught in the preparatory division. The same division of labor still held in 1848/49, with Rev. William Ormiston as Professor of Rhetoric and Mental Philosophy, Thomas G. Chesnut as English teacher, and John Wilson as Professor of Latin and Greek Languages (Classics).

Victoria's concern for rhetoric is reflected in the journals of S. S. Nelles, an early Victoria student, in the 1850s professor of rhetoric, and later college president. Nelles analyzed situations and speakers, and pondered and deliberated on arrangement, style and delivery, in both composition and oratory, especially in relation to preaching. Agreeing with Cicero, Nelles wrote in his journal in the fall of 1848 that wide experience rather than rules should govern rhetoric: "Experience is the best Rhetoric. A man must be taught from within. It is little good to encase the mind in rules." Nelles agreed with Cicero's emphasis on emotion as well. In another undated journal entry he wrote, "The orator should think upon his theme until he not only understands every part of it, but feels it deeply" (File 29, [p. 26]). In order to be effective the speaker should concentrate on his subject: "Get life inward--think intensely--feel burningly and then let the words marshal themselves" (File 29,

Fall 1848). He applied this principle to composition as well as to oratory: "Write with fury and correct with phlegm" (Fall 1848).¹⁷

The curriculum at Victoria college thus broke entirely new ground in Anglo-Canadian colleges. A moment's reflection, of course, reveals that the utilitarian approach simply applied classical principles to British North America in the middle of the nineteenth century. Aristotle's definition of rhetoric as situational, and his stress on appropriateness--indeed, the emphasis on audience in all classical rhetoric--puts utility at the centre of rhetoric. In creating the Victoria curriculum,

¹⁷Nelles' journal entries cover topics ranging from presentation in oratory, to arrangement, to content. He much preferred a subdued to a Demosthenic style (File 30, January 1849, pp. 27, 29); he believed in a plain introduction (File 29, June 1847), a logical body, and an emotional, but still subdued, conclusion (File 30, p. 29); he stressed a strong emphasis on unity in both oratory and writing (File 29, Jan. 1849).

Ryerson was obviously a model for Nelles, both positively and negatively. Observing Ryerson's oratory at a conference in Toronto in June 1847, he wrote,

Dr. Ryerson made a lengthy oration on the Union question. And prefaced it with a huge exordium about himself. His speech was full of sophistry and seemed to have little weight--not because they detected his sophisms but because Dr. Ryerson has lost his influence. No one trusts him. He has too much vanity to succeed in anything--least of all in genuine eloquence. (File 29)

However, later Nelles praised Ryerson's style, perhaps because it especially fit Nelles' own interest in a controlled, low-key presentation: "There is a certain measured slowness of utterance which adds force to delivery. A lingering of the syllables--yet not so as to drag" (File 30, after June 27). Nelles acknowledged that this manner was Rev. Mr. Ryerson's great forte, but it required great presence of mind and preparation, and was difficult for a young speaker.

Ryerson simply followed the advice of Aristotle and Cicero, as indicated by his references to them in his inauguration speech.

In spite of the political controversy surrounding the founding of the three King's College, Pictou Academy and Dalhousie College, and McGill, Queen's and Victoria Colleges, these colleges all supported a curriculum based on fundamental religious and social values. Besides all sharing a British protestant Christian culture, these colleges also shared in the values relating to that culture: traditional individual and public morality arising from Christian values, an appreciation of the worth of an individual, the importance of developing that individual through education, and a high appreciation of the British crown and allegiance to it. Further, the social and cultural context of those colonists that valued an education did not include wide economic divergence: in the absence of a hereditary upper class, support for college education came from the middle class. Finally, with the colonial situation solidly middle class, the emphasis on economics was paramount. Given this commonality, the divergence in the curriculum of these colleges is puzzling if their individual cultural roots are ignored. From a late twentieth-century perspective, therefore, the English insistence on a classical curriculum might be puzzling, given the practical demands of a colonial economy. From a modern perspective, the question is not why Victoria College chose to stress rhetorical practice in English as of the highest goal of the

curriculum, but rather why the other colleges did not. Did the other colleges not share Ryerson's views that a college graduate should be able to communicate readily what he had learned?

To answer this question, we must turn to the specific colonial culture of each of the three groups reviewed in this chapter. The Anglican and Presbyterian college constituencies derived largely from England and Scotland rather than from the immediate situation in the various colonies in British North America. Of all the college presidents before mid-century, Ryerson was the only one native born. His conversion from Episcopalianism, structured on a national hierarchical model, to Methodism, based on a congregationalist form of church governance, reinforced immediate and practical interests rather than hierarchical values in church and society. Added to this, Ryerson was largely self-educated, so his attitudes toward education were shaped by his experience as a circuit preacher within the Methodist conventions as well as by the general thrust of new-world Methodism, which stressed the need for an educated ministry. In contrast, the concerns of the Presbyterian and Anglican colleges were both rooted in the social situation of Britain. Divisions within Scottish Presbyterianism, for instance, continued to affect the lives of institutions like Pictou Academy, Dalhousie College and Queen's College through to the end of the century. The college constituencies of first-generation colonists, therefore, had values and attitudes rooted in Britain rather than in the colon-

ies.

However, Scottish settlers pulsed with vigor in both intellectual and religious endeavors. Combined with a thorough-going faith in democracy, these attitudes demanded access to education. The late eighteenth-century Scottish desire for English culture modified the traditional concern for classical learning, especially in language and literature. In Scotland, this concern for English learning translated into rhetorical education in both elocution and composition at the end of the eighteenth century, as well as in an aesthetic interest in English literature, especially at Edinburgh. For McCulloch in Nova Scotia, all these Scottish attitudes resulted in basic English literacy courses, as necessary, and in a general educational program that, according to historian D. C. Harvey in 1933, "moulded a generation of fellow Scots as journalists, teachers, lawyers, scientists, and clergymen" and "a series of intellectual movements that have not yet spent themselves" (15).

Anglican concerns in education were also attached to an old world culture. Unlike democratic ideals in Presbyterianism, however, Anglican ideals were molded by Oxford and Cambridge, which were part of the social structure of the ruling class in England, and thus thoroughly elitist in both entrance requirements and curriculum, in addition to being expensive. The requirements for students to swear allegiance to the Thirty-nine Articles, either at matriculation or graduation, ensured that the

educational thrust at Oxford and Cambridge would not be stamped by a utilitarianism that became the hallmark of the rising industrial class of early nineteenth-century England. The anti-utilitarian stance was intensified by the reaction of Oxford and Cambridge to Scottish attacks in the early decades of the nineteenth century. Transferred to British North America, these attitudes resulted in an emphasis on classics in language and literature, meant, theoretically at least, to develop the students' mind rather than his estate. Faculty and supporters of the King's Colleges did not see their curriculum as out of place in a colony. They believed that the human condition was the same in all situations. That human condition demanded a liberal education that would help the student to think critically and creatively. If those thinking powers were developed, the student would naturally learn the utilitarian rhetorical skills that the Scots taught and that the Methodists placed foremost in their curriculum. To quote John Henry Newman, a true liberal education gave a man "a clear conscious view of his own opinions and judgments, a truth in developing them, an eloquence in expressing them, and a force in urging them" (216). Toward this end, the classical curriculum included rhetoric and poetics--but in Latin and Greek rather than in English. Furthermore, toward this end the classical curriculum taught rhetoric not as a "knack," but as

an "art,"¹⁸ not toward an immediate use, but toward the ultimate goal of educating a responsible, productive member of the community.

In practical, political terms, however, the classical education was meant to set an Anglican university graduate apart from (in the Tory view, above) his fellow citizens. This elitism was supported by the effective political structure of the colonies that placed decision-making powers in the hands of a Tory legislative council with enough power to defy even the wishes of a governor. Hence the liberal arts curricula of the three King's Colleges (Windsor, Fredericton, and Toronto) as well as the composition of the student body, whether by official or unofficial entrance requirements, reflected the concerns of Oxford and Cambridge. These concerns were further supported by faculty of the King's colleges, invariably graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, or of Trinity in Dublin, modeled after Oxford.

To understand the later nineteenth-century development of English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges, however, one cannot focus exclusively on the early nineteenth-century differences among the three educational traditions associated with the Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Methodists. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the deep-rooted divisions separating the three traditions in rhetoric would gradually disappear, producing

¹⁸In Plato's Gorgias, Socrates defines an "art" as an activity giving thought to the soul's best interest; a "knack" is concerned only with the soul's pleasure (74).

in all Anglo-Canadian colleges a common English curriculum strong and resilient enough to resist significant change for almost a century. This later unity reflected a common philosophical substratum among all the traditions. The components of this substratum were the Christian religion, traditional individual and public morality arising from Christian values, a high appreciation for the British crown, and allegiance to it, and, finally, an aesthetic appreciation of literature, fostered by the traditional classical curriculum in all the early colleges, by the emphasis on "taste" encouraged by the belletristic tradition of Hugh Blair, and by the growing emphasis on text as an object of study in an increasingly scientific culture.

The developments of the next decades, therefore, had their roots in the Old World, so we must now turn back to trace Victorian developments in Britain, before returning again to see how Anglo-Canadian colleges reacted to these changes, both in rhetoric itself and in areas that affected the development of rhetoric.

CHAPTER 3: ENGLISH STUDIES IN VICTORIAN BRITAIN

British traditions played a central part in the development of British North America's first English-speaking universities in the first half of the nineteenth century. Apart from Victoria College, in Cobourg, Upper Canada, all the early anglophone colleges examined in the present study were influenced by either the English or Scottish academic heritage. In the Maritimes, two King's Colleges, one in Nova Scotia and one in New Brunswick, were opened by the Anglican Church in the first decade. Another King's College opened in Toronto in 1843. These three colleges taught a curriculum modeled on that of Oxford College in England. Within the context of a liberal education consciously dissociating their curricula from a professional career, these Anglican colleges emphasized classical learning in language and content. The purpose of education at a King's College was to teach the intellectual culture of the British ruling class. This culture ostensibly included critical and creative thought, facility in the classical languages and in classical and Christian thought, and an appreciation of upper class English cultural mores.

Because of the strong Anglican orientation of the King's Colleges, non-Anglican colonists were obliged to establish their own colleges. The Scots established Queen's College in Kingston, and strongly influenced Dalhousie College in the Maritimes. Scottish influence was also strong in McGill College, in Montreal, although McGill originally opened as a non-denominational institution in 1829 and operated under Anglican control until

mid-century. The Scottish educators in British North America affirmed the value of classical culture, but they also insisted that a colonial college education must have a basic utilitarian value. The Scots, therefore, insisted on teaching English rhetoric, both written and spoken, in addition to teaching the classical curriculum containing rhetoric and poetics in Latin and Greek. Vehemently opposing the religious exclusiveness of the Anglican colleges, the Scots emphasized open access to their colleges. The colonial Scots derived their educational values from their homeland's universities at Edinburgh, Glasgow, Aberdeen and St. Andrews.

The influence of British universities continued unabated in the second half of the nineteenth century. The general influence of Scottish and English educational traditions and the direct impact of British-educated graduates ensured the prominence of British culture in British North America (after 1867, the Dominion of Canada). Educational developments in Scotland and England thus continued to have a profound effect on Canadian institutions, and thus on the Canadian rhetorical curriculum. As the century advanced, these developments in Britain included intellectual movements in society at large, curricular developments within colleges affected by these general social movements, and specific developments in the discipline of rhetoric itself. The complexity of social developments in Britain during Queen Victoria's reign defy brief analysis. However, forced to use a

single word to describe the era, one would do well to say, "change." In The Victorian Frame of Mind, Walter Houghton leads into his first paragraph by noting that Victorians recognized that they lived in a time of transition (1). At the beginning of Queen Victoria's reign in 1837, neither Oxford nor Cambridge even considered English literature for their curricula. By 1901, both had committed themselves to it. Indeed, in all of Great Britain in 1837, only the recently-established University of London taught literature in the vernacular as a separate course.

One of the most basic stimuli for the radical change in educational thought that eventually brought English studies to all colleges in the nation was the shift from a religious toward a secularized society. In 1826, the University of London itself had its birth in University College, at first called "the Godless institution on Gower Street," because the break between the Anglican church and education was then a radical concept. By century's end, religious domination of educational inquiry was considered intolerable. This transition from religious to secular thought, which saw educational institutions gradually break their ties to formal religion, began in eighteenth century thought already, but it gained strong momentum in the nineteenth century, spurred on by the philosophies of Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, by the science of Charles Lyell and Charles Darwin, and by new biblical criticism originating in German universities.

The general focus on critical thought fostered by German universities had other profound effects on the British curriculum, one of the most important being a strong movement toward specialization. As long as higher education insisted on a single curriculum based on the medieval trivium and quadrivium, a curriculum concerned with transmitting a traditional culture from generation to generation, structural changes in university studies remained difficult. However, as education came to focus on discreet subject areas, curricular changes appeared with ever greater ease. In England, this new focus on discreet areas of learning led initially to the establishing of Mechanics Institutes, originally providing technical training for the new class of working men in industrial England at the same time as the University of London was being established. A keen public interest in English literature, however, soon saw the Mechanics Institutes focus attention on vernacular literature. This popular interest then led to the introduction of English studies into the University of London. The new focus on discreet areas of study also aided the rise of women's education. By the 1870s, women began to have a significant impact in college-level studies, especially in the study of English literature.

The study of rhetoric and poetics within the college setting historically belonged to the classics curriculum, which included not only the study of classical languages beyond the grammar school level, but also the study of Greek and Latin poetry,

drama, and oratory, as well as the classical theory relating to these fields. As English studies gained prominence--in London as early as the 1830s, and in Edinburgh beginning in 1845, and from there spreading to Glasgow and Aberdeen--the study of rhetorical theory and poetics in English grew as more and more attention was given to the reading of native literature and the writing of the English language. With this shift of rhetoric and poetics from classics to English, however, the focus of rhetoric changed from oratory and persuasion to prose composition focusing on style, and the focus of poetics soon incorporated an emphasis on moral culture in addition to the traditional emphasis on aesthetics derived from the study of classical literature. The stress on moral culture mixed with aesthetics was especially strong in England after mid-century, with Matthew Arnold spearheading a movement that saw British cultural ideals embedded in English literature become a substitute for traditional religion. This emphasis on English literature as a moral and aesthetic guide for the nation eventually gained enough popular support that, by the end of the century, even Oxford and Cambridge, newly freed from formal ties to the Anglican Church,¹ were forced to introduce English studies into their curricula.

All of the factors listed above--cultural secularization, academic specialization, women's education, the shift of rhetoric

¹The seventeenth-century Test Acts, which had required matriculants at Oxford and graduates at Cambridge to affirm their allegiance to Anglican dogma, were repealed in 1871 (Moorman 409).

and poetics from classics to English, and, finally, the emphasis on cultural ideals in literature--were carried from England to British North America in the second half of the nineteenth century, so they require close review as the basis of change in Anglo-Canadian education. Secularization was undoubtedly the most general of these features, and thus had the broadest influence. As the works of scientists such as Charles Lyell and Charles Darwin gained acceptance around mid-century and later, traditional faith in Christian values was shaken.² Higher biblical criticism, originating in Germany³ added to the doubt in-

²Charles Lyell published a three-volume study entitled Principles of Geology (1830-33), which found that natural processes could explain geological phenomena, but that these processes required far longer than provided by a traditional reading of Genesis. Charles Darwin's On the Origin of Species (1859) argued that evolution based on natural selection could account for the development of life on earth.

³Cultural historian Brian Fraser defines Higher Criticism and relates it to secularization as follows:

Higher Criticism was the critical study of the text in Scripture in its original historical setting, as distinct from Lower Criticism, which endeavored to arrive at the original text. It had its modern origins in the eighteenth century, where Biblical Scholars tried to establish a pure science of Biblical research that would yield impartial, objective answers to the questions posed by repetitions, discrepancies and contradictions in the canonical arrangement of the Scriptures. They developed an historical-critical method to analyze historical and literary questions. In the atmosphere of free inquiry provided by the loose ties between the German churches and the universities, many German scholars followed their conclusions into unbelief, unable to reconcile their critical understanding of the Bible with the Christian orthodoxy of the day. (28)

stilled by those who came to follow Darwin's evolutionary thought. In his study of Victorian England, Walter Houghton reflects that "Victorians were utterly unprepared for the radical crisis in thought and society which burst over England" (66). James Anthony Froude, Carlyle's biographer, wrote, "All round us, the intellectual lightships had broken from their moorings, and it was then a new and trying experience" (qtd. in Houghton 66).

Britain's foremost literary artists reflected the anguish of the new era. As early as 1830, Thomas Carlyle sensed the coming of the new secular age in Sartor Resartus. Carlyle's protagonist recognises that "for a pure moral nature, the loss of . . . religious belief was the loss of everything," but he cannot help himself: "Doubt had darkened into Unbelief," he writes; "shade after shade goes grimly over your soul, till you have the fixed, starless, Tartarean black" ("The Everlasting No"). As late as 1867, Matthew Arnold felt the same condition, addressed most notably in "Dover Beach":

The Sea of Faith

Was once, too, at the full, and round earth's shore

Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furled.

But now I only hear

Its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar,

Retreating, to the breath

Of the night wind, down the vast edges drear

And naked shingles of the world.

In 1850, even before Darwin's Of the Origin of Species had appeared, Tennyson's "In Memoriam" already asked,

Are God and Nature then at strife,
That Nature lends such evil dreams?
So careful of the type she seems,
So careless of the single life. (LV)

The roots of this challenge to traditional religious faith went back to the Renaissance and were intimately related to the whole focus of higher learning in Western Europe. The crisis in faith was thus inevitably linked to the university curriculum. In England, Francis Bacon's Advancement of Learning (1605), for example, had asserted the need to gain knowledge through personal experience and the use of the physical senses. This approach to learning ran counter to the medieval university emphasis, which focused on the transmission of knowledge deriving from revelation transmitted through the Christian tradition, modified by classical Greek and Latin culture. In the medieval university, the trivium taught the traditional classical languages in grammar, the traditional pattern of thought in logic, and the traditional transmission of that thought in rhetoric. The quadrivium then focused on the content of the culture transmitted from generation to generation. And in the Middle Ages, the Catholic church controlled the content of the curriculum. Part of that control lay in the fact that all students studied the same curriculum.

Though somewhat modified, this medieval approach to educa-

tion was essentially the classical curriculum of the early nineteenth century in England and Scotland. All students studied the classical languages, all studied essentially the same curriculum, and all learning was acceptable to ecclesiastical authorities, both in Presbyterian Scotland and in Anglican England. In such an atmosphere, new learning, which included the study of the vernacular, which itself tied learning to a contemporary rather than a past tradition, inevitably threatened the existing structure. The advocates of the new, experimental learning in the nineteenth century thus looked to Germany, where the problems relating to the classical curriculum had been dealt with.

The German solution involved three major prerequisites. To become relevant in the nineteenth century, the curriculum had to be vernacular, specialized, and freed from church--or state--control. The vernacular was necessary because classical languages were simply too inflexible to communicate the wealth of new knowledge and the patterns of thought demanded in the nineteenth century.⁴ Specialization was necessary because the ex-

⁴To illustrate his argument in favor of the vernacular, Friederich Paulsen's 1906 study of German universities cites the argument of a Catholic theologian who had lectured in Latin:

Nothing could be more desirable and convenient for the mediocre and weak teacher, who has only the traditional to impart, than the use of the Latin language. His own lack of clearness of thought and meagreness of ideas can be admirably disguised in the well-worn ruts and impoverished idioms of this language in its modern form. Commonplaces which would be unbearable when clothed in German always sound somewhat more respectable in Latin disguise" (Paulsen 50).

plosion of knowledge demanded that research be restricted to discreet areas.⁵ Freedom from Christian dogma and political interference was necessary because the search for new knowledge grew out of Baconian and Lockian premises that knowledge originated in physical human experience rather than from authorities deriving dogma from religious or political tradition.

Early Victorian social values were, of course, Christian, and the classical curriculum of British universities reinforced those values. In Scotland, the universities, though open to all religious denominations, were the capstones of an educational system rooted in John Knox's sixteenth-century Presbyterian reformation. In England, Oxford and Cambridge were formally tied to the Church of England, with students having to swear allegiance to the Thirty-nine Articles, and with the professors holding formal church positions. As British university culture gained a Baconian perspective in learning it inevitably developed philosophical tensions with its traditions rooted in Christian and classical thought. These tensions between the universities and the state, which combined both political and religious conventions, grew as the century progressed, as illustrated in the early Victorian examination of Benjamin Jowett, the future Master of Balliol College, who wrote of his ordination as a priest in

⁵The development of specialization in German universities is presented well in Ben-David and Zlowczower's "Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies," in the European Journal of Sociology 3 (1962): 45-84.

1845:

The Bishop asked, among other questions, in what sense the candidate signed the [Thirty-nine] Articles. 'In Paley's sense.' "What does Paley say?" 'That it is an absurdity if the Legislature meant to say that you assented to four or five hundred disputed propositions. It only meant that you were an attached member of the Church of England.' The answer satisfied the Bishop.

(Faber 184)

For Jowett, advancement at Oxford required ordination as an Anglican priest, a requirement stipulated by the civil government. The new learning, however, required freedom from traditional restrictions to free thought. By the 1850s, even so conservative a scholar as John Henry Newman, in The Idea of a University (1852), argued for the new freedom of thought within the context of a liberal education.

The tensions between Christian traditions and contemporary learning increased until higher learning was freed from Church control,⁶ although the process was slow. The influence of the

⁶The career of Charles Lyell illustrates this growing divergence between learning and Church. Lyell matriculated at Oxford in 1816, and studied law upon graduating. His geological interests, however, led to his publishing Principles of Geology (1830-33), which stressed close observation as a basis of theory. He won repeated professional honors, and was knighted in 1848. He also taught briefly at King's College in London. He was, therefore, a leading figure in English culture, respected in both religious and scientific circles. Although his own geological work refuted traditional reading of the biblical creation account, and although he was impressed by Darwin's work, he ini-

church and state on learning in England was brought home to Matthew Arnold in 1865, when he went to the Continent to examine education. He was especially impressed by German academic freedom:

Lehrfreiheit and Lernfreiheit, liberty for the teacher and liberty for the learner; and Wissenschaft, science, knowledge systematically pursued and prized in and for itself, are the fundamental ideas of the system.

(Arnold 1874, 165)

This emphasis on freedom of the mind fitted the traditional Oxford and Cambridge emphasis on a liberal education, for Oxford and Cambridge stressed the disinterested nature of learning. Just as education was to be free from professional interests at the beginning of the century, it was now to be free from religious control. Following this Oxford tradition back through Newman to the beginning of the century, Arnold stressed:

The aim and office of instruction, say many people, is to make a man a good citizen, or a good Christian, or a gentleman; or it is to fit him to get on in the world, or it is to enable him to do his duty in that state of

tially questioned the evolutionary hypothesis, but in 1865 he affirmed Darwin's views, thereby alienating many of his earlier supporters within the church. Of this shift, Darwin stated, "Considering his age, his former views, and position in society, I think his action has been heroic" (Macomber 209). Even before 1865, however, Lyell agitated for educational reform in English universities; he objected to church control of thought in college studies.

life to which he is called. It is none of these, and the modern spirit more and more discerns it to be none of these. . . .its prime direct aim is to enable a man to know himself and the world. (Arnold 1874, 169)

The thrust of mid-Victorian higher education in England thus urged the freeing of Oxford and Cambridge from narrow Church of England interests. Further, the rise of the University of London, especially of University College, also led the way in freeing higher education from church control. The problems of religious control in Scotland were not, of course, as severe as those especially in Oxford and Cambridge, for Scottish universities were not formally controlled by the church.

The growing secularization of society as a whole, and the gradual secularization of the universities, was accompanied by the second feature of German learning; namely, academic specialization, itself associated with the use of the vernacular in university instruction. The new focus of learning rooted in human experience rather than on a given body of transmitted knowledge forced an ever narrower focus in the individual pursuit of information. The early university curriculum had seen professors move from chair to chair, as Spalding did in moving from Edinburgh's chair of rhetoric to Glasgow's chair of logic in 1845, for instance. Further, the traditional curriculum did not clearly distinguish courses of study. The object of education was the development of the student as much as it was the trans-

mission of a distinct body of knowledge by a professor in a distinct chair. Thus, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, composition at Edinburgh was taught in both rhetoric and logic, with logic the more important. In England, the lack of specialization was reflected in Oxford's use of dons, who assisted the students in all branches of learning. As the century wore on, however, this practice of professors moving from discipline to discipline faded as courses of study became composed of ever more discreet bodies of teaching and research. As Britain lagged in providing specialized instruction, increasing numbers of scholars were attracted to German universities. Germany offered specialized studies in which successful research was recognized by doctoral degrees. In his tour of the Continent in 1865, Matthew Arnold emphasized the German concern for Wissenschaft (science), stating that though the British lacked Germany's Lernfreiheit and Lehrfreiheit (freedom to learn and freedom to teach), it was especially in science that Britain had "most need to borrow from the German universities" (1874, 166). This emphasis on Wissenschaft was focused not on the physical world alone, on geology, chemistry and physics, for instance, but also on a thorough learning of both the spirit and power of antiquity, gained through a study of the original works (1874, 179). The gradual evolution of British higher education would thus see the doctoral degree change from an honorary to an earned

research degree.⁷

The concept of knowledge valued for its own sake rather than for the sake of creating an English gentleman was central to the growth of full specialization in England. However, the birth of English studies in England did not have to wait for the establishing of doctoral programs in Oxford and Cambridge, or even in the University of London. Early in the nineteenth century, already, reformers saw the need for educating the masses for openly utilitarian reasons. For progressive thinkers like the parliamentarian Henry Brougham, the whole educational system needed a much more utilitarian focus than that provided by Church of England institutions. The changes wrought by the Industrial Revolution led to a social and industrial complexity requiring a much more widespread literacy than had previously been needed. Out of this need rose the Mechanics' Institutes, the first in London founded by Henry Brougham as early as 1823. By 1850 over 500 such adult education cells were bringing literary culture as well as science to the masses (Palmer 31).

⁷Abraham Flexner's 1930 study of the development of American British and German universities sees the "new universities" function as that of developing knowledge (311). Mid-victorian Oxford and Cambridge could not do this.

Despite the efforts of philosophers and reformers, the English universities. . . formed a close social and intellectual circle up to almost the last quarter of the nineteenth century. They were. . . organs of the Anglican Church; they were hostile to dissent; they were as institutions concerned with the production of a type--the English gentleman, a moral and social rather than an intellectual type. (224)

The original purpose of the Mechanics' Institutes was to give working men an understanding of the scientific principles underlying their new mechanical trades. But from the beginning the appetite for useful knowledge, and for self-improvement, took other forms as well.

. . . most of them included lectures on English literature in their programmes, and through their libraries they enabled many members to develop the reading habit and to make some acquaintance with the national literature. (Palmer 33)

Because literary lectures required no background, they were generally more accessible to the working men than technical lectures. Literary discussions, therefore, soon outranked mechanical lectures. Further, many reformers believed that "lectures on literature to mechanics would make them less open to corruption by the abundance of cheap sensational fiction then coming into circulation" (Palmer 34).

Also related to the development of English studies in England, as well as to reforms that led to the development of Mechanics' Institutes, was the rise of women's education. Educational reformers such as Henry Brougham and F. D. Maurice stressed the need for education in all of society, female as well as male. Concurrent with the growth of specialization in Britain, therefore, came the rise of working men's education, then of women's education, and later the merging of the sexes in co-

education. The role of English studies was important to the advancement of women's education from the beginning. The common Victorian concept of the female role in society was that of "the submissive wife whose whole excuse for being was to love, honor, obey--and amuse--her lord and master, and to manage his household and bring up his children" (Houghton 348). For the middle and upper classes, women, especially young women, were social ornaments. Beatrice Potter Webb described the "London Season" of the 'eighties as follows:

with its derivative country-house visiting, [it] was regarded by wealthy parents as the equivalent, for their daughters, of the university education and professional training afforded for their sons; the reason being that marriage to a man of their own or a higher social grade was the only recognised vocation for women not compelled to earn their own livelihood. (qtd. in Ideas and Beliefs 352)

Such frivolity conflicted with a deeply-rooted moral earnestness in Victorian society, a moral earnestness often associated with both women and with literature. Since women were considered less capable of rigorous thought than men, English was more suitable than Classics for the sensitive sex, since, as already seen in the emphasis on English literature in the Mechanics' Institutes, the study of English literature did not require the intellectual rigor demanded by classical studies in the

university curricula. According to Terry Eagleton, English was considered "an untaxing sort of affair, concerned with the finer feelings rather than with the more virile topics of bona fide academic 'disciplines,' . . . a convenient sort of non-subject to palm off on the ladies" (28). Eagleton quotes a witness to an 1877 Royal Commission, suggesting that English literature might be a suitable subject for "women. . .and the second- and third-rate men who . . .became schoolmasters" (28). Though women were considered intellectually inferior, they were welcomed as new students because they filled classes in the new colleges. Further, because of their sex, they did not threaten their male professors with the loss of jobs (McMurtry 13).

However, the integration of women into regular university classes proceeded slowly, with the fear of declining morals often cited as a barrier to advancement in this venture. In 1863, University College in London amended its charter to allow women into classes. According to Henry Solly, the first course allowing women to enrol was in Post-Biblical Hebrew (308). Presumably the authorities considered this so esoteric a course that no female with non-academic interests (such as would corrupt young men's morals) would enrol. In 1878, University College opened degrees to women, and in that year Henry Morley, who had been teaching at women's colleges and in women's extension classes for years, opened his lectures to co-education. The practice of mixed classes spread only gradually, in both England and Scot-

land, with integration coming to Glasgow, for instance, in 1894. But everywhere the moral role of English literature was equated with the guiding and uplifting qualities of women. Ruskin's "Of Queen's Gardens" reviews the evidence in Homer, Dante, Shakespeare and Scott, where women are "infallibly faithful and wise counsellors," by their virtue and wisdom redeeming men from weakness and vice (qtd. in Houghton 350).

This relationship of English literature with cultural ideals was not restricted to co-education. The growing importance of English studies in a whole culture which, except for the University of London, had long rejected the need for such study in both language and especially in literature, reflected the depth of change in British culture in the last decades of the century. As suggested above, the major impetus for the rise of English studies in Victorian England was the sense of lostness resulting from the fading power of the Christian faith in the first half of the century already. Robert Scholes points out that literary interpretation arises out a reader's sense of incompleteness, and criticism arises out of a sense of disorder in a literary work (22-25). The rise of both criticism and interpretation in English studies in the second half of the nineteenth century thus reflected a new dissonance in society: it was no longer true that any reader could understand fully every author, not because the author was deliberately confusing but because social values and cultural beliefs had shifted to such an extent that deepest

cultural assumptions were no longer shared. The rising secularism, associated with a new scientific world view and with both utilitarian philosophy and the social disruption brought by the Industrial Revolution, forced British society to re-evaluate its beliefs at the deepest levels of national consciousness. Terry Eagleton writes baldly, "If one were asked to provide a single explanation for the growth of English studies in the later nineteenth century, one could do worse than reply: 'the failure of religion'" (22).

The interest in English literature was, therefore, a general social phenomenon, rather than one specifically academic. In the second half of the century, Chandos Classics, a popular, inexpensive publication of British classics, sold 3.5 million volumes, and this series was only one of many available at modest cost (Palmer 35). Richard Altick points out that the sale in monthly parts of Dickens' novels averaged 40,000 copies, and from mid-century onward, popular papers like the Family Herald and the London Journal had circulations into six figures. The depth of feeling toward British literary figures, Altick suggests, can only be given in anecdote:

It is not irrelevant to recall the many stories of Scott's fame among all classes of society--for example, of a London workman accosting Charles Lamb to point in awe to the author of Waverley cross the street. We hear of the old charwoman who never missed a subscription

tea conducted on the first Monday of every month at a snuff shop over which she lodged, when the landlord read the newest number of Dombey and Son . . . [or] of the vagrant in Covent Gardens who . . . plucked Tennyson's sleeve, saying, "Look here, sir, here am I. I've been drunk for six days out of seven, but if you will shake me by the hand, I'm damned if I ever get drunk again. (2)

In both England and Scotland, this was the social environment that shaped English studies, both in poetics and criticism as well as in rhetoric and composition.

Owing to the differing social and educational traditions in Scotland and England, the curricular developments in the two countries proceeded largely independently, though developments in both countries were strongly influenced by the general secularization of society and the burgeoning popularity of English literature, beginning even before the first years of Queen Victoria's reign. In both countries, too, English studies developed in parallel patterns, with both rhetoric and poetics gradually shifting from classics to English, and rhetoric itself shifting from a traditional emphasis on persuasion to an emphasis on style in written composition. Further, both countries saw a shift in poetics from a strong focus on aesthetics in classics to a rising focus on moral culture in English studies, though this movement was stronger in England than in Scotland. Finally, toward the

end of the century, both countries experienced a strong shift toward idealism in the study of literature. In England, this shift was led by Matthew Arnold, and in Scotland by Benjamin Jowett's Balliol school of neo-Hegelians at Glasgow: especially Edward Caird in philosophy, and John Nichol in English literature. This blend of Scottish philosophical idealism and English cultural idealism would later be carried to Canada by both Scottish and English traditions to form a remarkably strong idealistic focus that would dominate Anglo-Canadian English studies into the second half of the twentieth century.

In Scotland, the shift of poetics and rhetoric from classics to English studies took different routes at individual universities. The premier position in rhetoric in the nation was, of course, Hugh Blair's historic chair in rhetoric at the University of Edinburgh. In lecturing on rhetoric in the vernacular before the beginning of the nineteenth century, Blair had already begun the shift of rhetoric and poetics from classics to English studies. However, since the Edinburgh chair in rhetoric was to remain unique in Scotland until after mid-century, the main thrust in converting classical rhetoric into English studies occurred in the nineteenth century. Blair had been the first of three clergymen to hold this chair; the last was the Reverend Dr. Andrew Brown, offered the chair after Walter Scott turned it down in 1801 (Meikle 95). According to a Royal Commission appointed in 1826, the object of the course for Brown was to

convert the art of Criticism, which had hitherto rested on the authority of illustrious names and classical works, into a Science, by referring the productions of genius, in all the departments of elegant design, to those operations and laws of our sensitive and intellectual nature, to which everything that aspires to please must be accommodated. (qtd. in Meikle 96-7)

The Royal Commission Report, however, noted that practice fell far below the ideal: "much of the Professor's time was . . . employed in minute remarks on the choice of words, the structure of sentences, and the errors or inadvertances which obstructed the perspicuity of the composition" (qtd. in Meikle 97). Because regular attendance in the class was not required for a degree, the commissioners recommended that "the separate Rhetoric class ought not to be continued but should be again united with the class of Logic" (qtd. in Meikle 97).

This reintegration of logic and rhetoric was not to occur. When Brown's inauspicious career ended in 1834, the Tories had taken power from the Whigs, so they kept the Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres at Edinburgh, perhaps to reward one of their own supporters with an appointment to it. The chair thus became the domain of lawyers for the next thirty years: George Moir (1834-39), William Spalding (1839-45), and William Edmonstoune Aytoun (1845-65). The last of these is the most important for our study, for Aytoun's revitalization of Hugh Blair's Edinburgh

Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres led to the formally legislated introduction of English literature into the Scottish university system.

Aytoun's success was the result of conscious preparation, undoubtedly based on the popularity of English literature in British society at the time. In his youth, Aytoun had studied English literature at the Edinburgh Academy, which, in the early nineteenth century, offered the only class of that nature in Britain (Meikle 100). After completing college, Aytoun went to Germany in 1833, to write and to study literature for one winter. Like other young Scots, he wished to follow Scott and Carlyle in securing literary fame. "I am very anxious to increase, if I can, any reputation I may have acquired," he explained in a letter to his father, noting that that would not be done by keeping his hands in his pockets. Aytoun's real motive, however, lay deeper than a desire for public recognition as a writer, as his letter indicated:

The Chair of Belles-Lettres, which in the time of Blair was the best attended in the College, must, in the common course of events, be vacant in the course of a few years. In its present state it is not likely that any very distinguished name will be found among the candidates, and if such should be the case, I shall make a push for it. (qtd. in Meikle 101)

Unfortunately for Aytoun, William Spalding gained the position in

1839, so Aytoun was forced to practice law for a total of twelve years before gaining his goal. In this period he did, indeed, gain literary recognition by contributions to Blackwood's Magazine, as well as to other newly established literary journals. He also published The Gaultier Ballads and Lays of the Scottish Cavaliers, which brought him lasting fame. Aytoun's literary interests were, therefore, widely established by the time he was finally appointed to Edinburgh's Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in 1845 (Meikle 101).

Given the focus of his commitment to English letters, Aytoun's objectives in the class were literary rather than rhetorical from the beginning. His aspirations proved to be in tune with general sentiments, for he inherited a class of thirty and left the class twenty years later with an enrolment of one hundred and fifty (Meikle 103). However, Aytoun did not consider the teaching of literature in isolation an acceptable practice. In an article entitled "Scottish Universities," in Blackwood's Magazine in 1858, Aytoun called for Scottish chairs of English Literature that would include "the important studies of composition and delivery." He wrote, "No such Chair exists in any of the Scottish Universities, except that of Edinburgh, in which it is disguised under the name of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres." The practical rhetorical content of his course was important, for Aytoun argued that attendance upon such lectures should be made compulsory, not only for intending graduates, but especially for

all who sought entrance into divinity programs (Blackwoods, Vol. 83, 90). Meikle reviews Aytoun's own course listed in the university calendar for 1864-65 as follows:

- (1) Lectures on composition which . . . "have been carefully revised."
- (2) Examination of style as exhibited by the most eminent English authors.
- (3) The art of public speaking--including the management of the voice and method of delivery.
- (4) A complete review of British literature. . .each epoch being considered referentially to the external history and social development of the country.
- (5) As the Rhetorical part of the course [is] strictly practical and useful, the Professor "will not prelect upon the scheme of Formal Rhetoric according to the Aristotelian method, beyond an explanation of its principles. . . . Subsequent to the Christmas recess the Professor will occasionally give elocutionary readings. (Meikle 102)

Aytoun gave four lectures a week for six months in the year. He laid great stress on weekly essays about a variety of topics, not only about literature. In the 1850s Aytoun "infected his class" with enthusiasm for Scottish Rights. "I have a great class this winter," he wrote, "which adds to my other discomforts, for the youth have caught the spirit of the time--are all young Scot-

landers, eager to write and make speeches, and are frantic for reputation. I have as much manuscript in the shape of exercises as could roast an ox to correct next week" (qtd. in Meikle 102).

Aytoun's large literature classes attracted the particular attention of the Scottish university commission of 1858-62, which doubled his salary to two hundred pounds, in addition to class fees, and recommended not only that the Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres be renamed the Chair of Rhetoric and English Literature, but also that English literature should be introduced to the national Scottish curriculum. The commissioners' reasons are given in their 1863 report:

In explaining the reasons which rendered it necessary, in our opinion, that a Professorship of this branch should be founded in the University of Glasgow, we showed, by a reference to the striking increase in the number of students of the Professor in Edinburgh, that greater importance than formerly is now attached to the study of English Literature, as a branch of education. The success which has attended the labours of the distinguished Professor, who now occupies the Edinburgh Chair, has contributed in no small degree to this result. Our inquiries satisfied us, that the students of that University derived the most marked benefit from attendance on his lectures; and we concluded that it was desirable, that similar opportunities of instruc-

tion should be afforded to the students of the other Universities. In Glasgow, the number of the students in the Faculty of Arts justified, in our opinion, the foundation of a separate Chair for the purpose; and already we have seen cause to be assured of its success. In St. Andrew's, and in Aberdeen, the subject has been assigned to the Professor of Logic and the value, which is attached to the course in these universities, is shown by the fact that, although in the one the class has been instituted for not more than two sessions and in the other for not more than three, it is already one of the most numerous attended classes in either University. Considering the importance which belongs to the study of the English Language and Literature, as part of a liberal education, we did not hesitate to prescribe attendance on the course to all candidates for degrees in Arts. (General Report, 1863, xxix)

As the commissioners noticed, Aytoun had correctly read the prevailing currents of scholarly interest in his introduction of English literature.

In developing his curriculum in rhetoric and poetics in the vernacular, Aytoun had included both composition and oratory. However, the emphasis was on practice, not on theory. The public speaking focus was "practical and useful." Aytoun's curriculum

explicitly stated that "Formal Rhetoric according to the Aristotelian method" would not be stressed. In this he embarked in a direction that others would follow as rhetoric shifted from classics to English; namely, that the formal theory of rhetoric would gradually fall away, leaving first oratory and composition without a theoretical base, and then, as oratory fell away, leaving composition studies without the strong theoretical foundation that classical rhetoric itself had had in the Aristotelian and Ciceronian traditions.

In 1865, David Masson succeeded Aytoun, but, following the recommendation of the Universities Commission, the professorship was renamed as the Chair of Rhetoric and English Literature.⁸ Masson affirmed the direction Aytoun had set for the study of English language and literature by asserting the preeminence of literary works as a whole over the traditional belletristic approach, which focused more on using existing writing as models in both taste and composition than on examining the literary work

⁸Masson entered Marischal College, Aberdeen, at the age of thirteen, intending on the study of divinity. However, owing to the "Disruption" (in which the evangelical wing of the Church of Scotland broke away from the moderate wing over the issue of patronage appointments to the ministry) Masson did not take a church position. Instead, he took up journalism, eventually going to London, where Alexander Bain, a childhood friend from Aberdeen, introduced him to influential literary circles in 1847. In 1852 Masson was appointed professor at University College, London, where English language and literature became an option for a degree in Modern Languages in 1859 (McMurtry 120).

as a self-contained whole.⁹ Masson and his immediate successors examined the works as historical documents in the study of culture as well. Jo McMurtry's history of the rise of English studies presents the difference between the eighteenth-century belletristic and nineteenth-century literary approaches this way:

The term belles lettres, though it does have to do with the study of literature, connotes aesthetic appeal, standards of taste, rather than the linguistic and historical continuum appropriate to the subject as Masson and many of his contemporaries saw it. In combination with the study of rhetoric, belles lettres tended to treat literature as a kind of window display, to be taken in snippets, an extract here and an epigram there, as illustrations for rhetorical techniques.

(122)

Masson thus treated literature as a reflection of national culture rather than as a model of individual style. This shift in

⁹In Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, Blair concludes his introductory chapter by dividing his lectures into five sections: the nature of taste and the sources of its pleasures, language, style, eloquence, and "a critical examination of the most distinguished species of composition." In each section, Blair's aim is to detail individual topics in rhetoric rather than the impact of the whole in an author's work. The nature of his study is reflected in the last section, in which the lectures discuss up to five authors. The study of individual authors in a given lecture is illustrated in Volume I, Ch. 24, titled "Critical Examination of the Style in a Passage of Dean Swift's Writings," where individual sentences are discussed, or in Volume II, Ch. 27, subtitled, "Extracts from Demosthenes," where the discussion of Demosthenes is restricted largely to argument, although the lecture also treats style and expression.

focus did not preclude the total use of authors as models, but it did reflect a shift in interest from literature as stylistic model in composition to literature as a reflection and repository of culture.

Traditional rhetorical theory, using models, was not set aside immediately. However, Masson tried to separate the various elements of the new instruction in English. Masson divided the various elements of his instruction in rhetoric, language, and literature into distinct studies. The first part of his full-year course, which he taught from 1865 on for thirty years, dealt with style and with rhetorical classification: "a sorting out of all literature into a number of categories--'historical and descriptive literature,' 'expository or didactic literature' and so on." The second part "presented a chronological survey in which the writers from each period were described, with the important ones 'reviewed more at large,'" in addition to a review of the history of the English language. Part three allowed one hour weekly for "'practical instruction in English composition,' . . . from the theoretical to the practical. Students wrote brief exercises in the classroom and turned in others, composed at more leisure, on assigned subjects" (McMurtry 124).

Given Masson's extended syllabus, the content of the Edinburgh course was obviously more broad than deep. The historical review of English literature dominated, but the literary analysis

was also important. James Barrie, one of Masson's students, recalled Masson's lectures as follows:

Masson always comes to my memory first knocking nails into his desk or trying to tear the gas-bracket from its socket. He said that the Danes scattered over England, taking such hold as a nail takes when it is driven into wood. For the moment he saw his desk turned into England; he whirled an invisible hammer in the air, and down it came on the desk with a crash. No one who sat under Masson can forget how the Danes nailed themselves upon England. His desk is thick with their tombstones. It was when his mind groped for an image that he clutched the bracket. He seemed to tear his good things out of it. Silence overcame the class. Some were fascinated by the man; others trembled for the bracket. It shook, groaned, and yielded. Masson said another of the things that made his lectures literature; the crisis was passed; and everybody breathed again. He masters a subject by letting it master him; for though his critical reputation is built on honesty, it is his enthusiasm that makes his work warm with life. Sometimes he entered the classroom so full of what he had to say that he began before he reached his desk. If he was in the middle of a peroration when the bell rang, even the back-benches forgot

to empty. (Bellot 287-88)

The focus of Masson's literature classes is further given in a 2,000-word essay assignment on the Fool in King Lear, as recorded in a student's records: "What is wanted is not an abstract of King Lear but try to clutch the one character and study and explain Shakespeare's notion of the character and what is his function--what is his business in the play" (qtd. in McMurtry 127). The literary history, therefore, was not given in outline, but in as much reading of the primary works as the students could manage. Though Oxford often objected to such close reading, Masson praised the Germans for leading the way in this approach to literary analysis: "The English say that this is all nonsense but it is not The German method is a right one if well pursued" (qtd. in McMurtry 128).

A further indication of Masson's interest is reflected in the 1883 M.A. level exam, typical of Masson's exams for his entire period at Edinburgh. The first hour of the three-hour exam required an essay, length not stipulated, on one of two authors, or a comparison of two, all based on specific parts of works, both poetry and prose. Composition as well as content was important. The two remaining hours included questions ranging widely in the history of both literature and rhetoric, as indicated in the following excerpts from the exam:

1. Explain and illustrate any two of the following phrases from the Lectures" (phrases ranging from

Addison to Aristotle);

. . .

4. Name three important English prose writers between 1300 and 1400.

. . .

6. What were the main varieties of English dialect in the fourteenth century, and how can they be distinguished from one another?
7. Annotate shortly as many as you can of the following passages [seven passages from literature given]. (McMurtry 127 - 131).

History, analysis, language and composition were therefore parts of Masson's instruction, but parts he kept as discrete from each other as possible. Significantly, nowhere is there a mention of oratory, which seems to have fallen away with the founding of the new chair of Rhetoric and English literature. After Aytoun, Edinburgh's rhetorical study, in English at least, had switched to composition.

At Glasgow, the first professor in the new field of English was John Nichol, like Masson, a publishing literary critic. Like both Aytoun and Masson at Edinburgh, Nichol therefore brought to his new position a keen appreciation of public attitudes toward the growing study of English literature. Owing to his broad education as well, Nichol was able to place the study of English literature and language into a wide cultural context. Like

Masson, he was a native Scot who had gone south to finish his education. A graduate of Benjamin Jowett's Balliol College, Nichol brought to Scotland a personal knowledge of English and European intellectuals when he returned to his alma mater in 1862. At Balliol, Nichol became acquainted with not only Mill and Carlyle, but also with foreign intellectuals like the Hungarian revolutionary Ferenc Kossuth and the Italian Giuseppe Mazzini. Above all, however, Nichol gained from Balliol College an appreciation of German academic ideals highly admired by Jowett, among them a strong attachment to idealistic philosophy, rooted in German Hegelianism. At Balliol, Nichol founded "The Old Mortality Club," a group of Hegelian idealists noted for their revolutionary ideas and their avid readings of Browning (Richter 80). The club included Edward Caird, later to become Scotland's leading proponent of Neo-Hegelianism. Nichol completed his classical studies at Oxford but, owing to his refusal to accept the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, he was not granted the M.A. (Richter 86). James Cappon, a student of Nichol's at Glasgow, described him as having "the finest literary culture," but one who kept a sharp distinction between the study of literary effects and general philosophy of life (Cappon 1909, 266).

Stephen Potter's The Muse in Chains states that though Nichol was the first to be given the chair of English in Glasgow, the subject itself was not without history there, for at the beginning of the century William Richardson, Professor of Human-

ity, had written notable essays on Shakespeare's dramatic characters. Further, Robert Buchanan had included English classics in his philosophy course by mid-century (Potter 121-2). In this connection, Jo McMurtry comments, "It is useful to keep in mind that the growth of English studies in the universities was sustained from beneath, so to speak, by [an] increasing popular awareness" (62). R. D. Anderson's history of Scottish higher education makes the same point:

At both Glasgow and Dundee, there was a feeling that 'liberal culture' was something desirable and that only the arts training of the universities could give it. The term 'culture' was a new one, and was seized on by those who sought to define the elusive liberal character of a university education. Matthew Arnold's Culture and Anarchy of 1869, which insisted particularly on the need to liberalize the values of the philistine middle class did much to popularize the concept, and references show that it was much read in Scotland, as were Arnold's studies of those continental countries where the state did so much more than it did in Britain to provide for the educational needs of the bourgeoisie. (Anderson 82)

The rise of English studies in Scotland, therefore, did not occur in a vacuum. Within the universities themselves, the whole traditional curriculum was constantly under review through most

of the century. As a new study in Victorian Scotland, English was central to this restructuring, which, of course, met resistance in some sectors. Addressing an education commission in 1876, John Struthers of the Aberdeen Medical School, supported by Alexander Bain, Professor of Logic, and a leading curricular reformer, stated that classics professors and "those educated under the old system" saw "English literature, modern languages and literature, mental science and natural science as but worthless intruders" (Anderson 92). The shifting curriculum relating to English involved more than simply a shift from rhetoric and belles lettres to a study of English literature. As rhetoric became associated with English literature in the new chairs, it became associated with a study of the English language and gained an emphasis on composition that it had not previously had. But, in becoming related to English literature, rhetoric's classical emphasis on persuasion changed. H. J. C. Grierson, who studied rhetoric at Aberdeen and taught at both Aberdeen and Edinburgh, beginning in 1893, saw Aristotle's persuasive emphasis develop a dual focus. Grierson cited Alexander Bain as interested in both "style--words, sentences, paragraphs, figures of speech," and "Emotional Qualities of Style. . . studied not, as by Aristotle, as instruments to persuade, but rather by the poet to give aesthetic pleasure" (vi-vii). Grierson thus saw in Bain the rhetorical or practical intention, on the one hand, and the literary or aesthetic intention, on the other hand. The first ultimately

related to science, which, in the final analysis, sought to reveal natural phenomena in their ultimate form and relationships to one another. The second related to "the great poetic phrase or line. . .the sincere supreme expression of the heart--the heart which is as full of mysteries which only genius can reveal as is the world of nature" (Grierson 27). Both became important in Scottish universities as both rhetoric and poetics developed into integral parts of the English curriculum.

At Aberdeen, however, the approach under Bain differed from that at Edinburgh or Glasgow. At Edinburgh, Aytoun had identified the literary focus when he stated that his students, having caught the spirit of the time, were "frantic for reputation." After Aytoun, Masson had attempted to fence composition off from literature, dedicating a separate hour to composition but teaching literature as the history of culture in the rest of the course. At Aberdeen University, where the now mandatory English Language and Literature program had been assigned to Logic, Alexander Bain recognized the problems in combining literature with composition. But Bain went further than Masson in trying to deal with them, especially in excluding social and moral discussion from his instruction. Bain's approach to English Language and Literature derived from his studies in psychology rather than from a literary and journalistic culture, such as

Masson and Nichol had brought to their instruction.¹⁰ Further, Bain was counted among the utilitarian school of Bentley and Mill, a school deriving from philosophical realism. This philosophical base contrasted especially with Nichol's approach, which was rooted in Hegelian idealism. Both Nichol and Masson, therefore, emphasized philosophical, aesthetic and cultural ideals in their teaching; Bain emphasized compositional style.

As the years went by, Bain developed an approach that clearly privileged practical rhetoric over cultural analysis and commentary, that preferred contemporary writers to older classical writers, and that considered composition more important than "taste." Bain argued strongly that the function of an English class was to teach rhetoric, both written and oral, consciously using contemporary English writers as models in discussing both the logical and emotional qualities of style in both composition and oratory. Bain differed from his contemporaries in that he considered English an inappropriate subject for teaching culture

¹⁰For more than thirty years Bain taught composition and oratory, and published textbooks and critical works on composition and rhetoric based on his work in psychology, gaining an international reputation in both psychology and rhetoric. In 1876 William James wrote that "The two philosophers of indubitably the widest influence in England and America since Mill's death are Bain and Spencer," and Edwin Lewis, author of The History of the Paragraph (1894) called Bain "perhaps the ablest writer on rhetoric since Aristotle" (qtd. in Lunsford, 1982, 291-2). Two central publications clarifying Bain's approach to teaching English Language and Literature were an article entitled simply "On Teaching English," which appeared in The Fortnightly Review in 1869, and a book by the same title published in London in 1887. (The article was reprinted widely, including serial republication in The Journal of Education (Quebec), 1869-70).

and morality:

The end here maintained as predominant under all circumstances, is training in prose composition; in other words, to improve the pupils to the utmost in expressing themselves well, whether in writing or in speech. If there be any ends besides, either they should be ministerial to the crowning end, or, supposing them to have an independent value, they are to stand on one side when that end is concerned. The cultivation of Taste is partly ministerial to composition, and partly a source of enjoyment; but composition first, pleasure afterwards.

Bain's views on the study of Shakespeare illustrate the first of these positions:

I by no means regard as useless the many excellent annotated editions or portions of our classic authors--Shakespeare plays, and so forth. I think, however, that their value is not in the schoolroom, but in the stage immediately following--the beginning of self-culture. In fact, they are most useful to readers of mature age. . . . They are not exclusively addressed to the pupils of the English class, and I cannot point to any other class in our school system where they could come in suitably. (Bain 1887, 19)

Much nineteenth-century criticism, especially in England, was

heavily moralistic, using English literature as a source for transmitting cultural values. Bain rejected this approach for pedagogical reasons. The annotated editions of literary works, he held,

are a mixture of literary criticism, philosophy, ethics, and religion, which I do not object to in my miscellaneous reading, but should decidedly object to in the instruction of a class. Holding, as I do, strong views on the division of labour in teaching, I should disapprove of expounding so many diverse themes in that random fashion. (1887, 19)

He also chose Shakespeare to illustrate his argument for appropriateness of models. Comparing sixteenth-century language with nineteenth-century forms might be useful for explaining points about the history of particular idioms, but that was not the object of composition classes:

Discussions of antiquarian grammar, idiom, and vocabulary; changes in the use of particular words; explanation of figurative allusions; interpretations of doubtful passages--are of course not devoid of interest, but they cannot do much to assist the pupil in mastering the living English tongue. (Bain 1887, 16-17)

The focus of English in a composition class for Bain was "principally the power of expressing ourselves adequately on every occasion requiring us to employ our native tongue" (Bain

1887, 21). In this context, the duty of the professor was to help the students do what they were least able to do themselves: "to discriminate the good and the less good in composition, throughout all the grammatical and other circumstances that operate in style" (1887, 21). Bain held that wide reading failed to foster a progressive sharpening of discrimination owing to the distracting usages of authors. And, contrary to the theory and practice of his contemporaries, Bain held that the assigning of essay writing, even in composition classes, was a fault rather than a benefit, chiefly because it passed "beyond the true province of the English teacher" (1887, 25).

He avoided the mixed focus in writing as he did in reading. Bain held that essay writing demanded both intentional and stylistic expertise, a dual requirement that rendered the exercise composite and therefore unsuitable in composition instruction.

If there is any principle in education more sacred than another, it is to do one definite thing at a time.

. . . The reason is not simply that the mind should be concentrated on one single subject of study; it is, farther, that you cannot carry on two subjects abreast, and make them both consecutive, or observe the natural course from elementary to difficult. (1887, 25)

Bain praised the assigning of essays in a "knowledge class," for it tested effectively the student's knowledge of a subject, but in such an essay the teaching of expression was clearly

secondary, not the central concern of the professor. Assigning of essays in an English class, especially essays with general topics related to culture and morality so prevalent in Victorian society, also violated another axiom in Bain's teaching; namely, that

pupils should not be called upon for any species of work that may not have been fully explained beforehand--that their own faculties, co-operating with each one's known attainments, are not perfectly competent to execute. . . .If you depart ever so little from the principle of testing pupils on your own teaching, and on nothing beyond, you open the door for any amount of abuse. (Bain 1887, 27)

Bain stressed the use of models, chiefly from contemporary writers. His own textbooks were largely collections of excerpts modeling various rhetorical principles. He required students to write essays only with the topics and an outline given, or, better yet, he suggested that English teachers require students to analyze texts closely, to write summaries, and to translate poems into prose. The object of these exercises was strictly stylistic excellence, not philosophical or cultural content, for he recognized that in the union of the two, poetry invariably displaced oratory (1887, 223), and literary criticism displaced composition: "when a man gets into literary criticism at large, the temptation to deviate into matters that have no value for the

predominating end of a teacher of English, is far beyond the lure of alcohol, tobacco, or any sensual stimulation" (1869, 213). Indeed, contrary to the position of most of his contemporaries, Bain did not believe that poetry taught public morality exceptionally well, for the chief aim of poetry was pleasure, an aim no poet could afford to neglect if he wished to be read. Though poetry presented ideals, Bain held that these were more admired in contemplation than in imitation: "Although, now and then, we are caught hold of by an ideal, it is not so often from poetry, as from sober history, or still soberer observation of what passes before us" (1887, 224-5).

In principle, Bain did not reject the use of literature for discussing cultural issues. However, given the college situation that was still largely classical, though English was making inroads, he argued that the English teacher had no choice but to focus narrowly on rhetorical questions:

Doubtless, if we had a share of the many hours devoted in the schools to Greek and Latin, we should not have to pronounce so severe an exclusion of Anglo-Saxon, of Elizabethan and seventeenth-century men, and of all the elegant literature of criticism, and in general of whatever is immediately pleasing in our subject. We might allow now and then a short digression, a momentary indulgence, in what we have so sternly reserved for the evening fireside, or the popular lecture.

(1869, 214)

Bain thus saw clearly the difference between criticism and composition in the English class, together with the dangers involved in a superficially considered expectation that the two could be easily combined. In recognizing this danger, Bain's concerns did not differ in total from the concerns of David Masson, for instance, or John Nichol, who also separated rhetoric from criticism. Bain simply went further than they did in excluding criticism from his English classes. It should, however, be clear that Bain used English literature to illustrate his rhetorical principles and to help his students become conscious of excellence in literary style, including poetic style. From this, it was but a short step to focus on aesthetic concerns of criticism. As H. J. C. Grierson notes, the second volume of Bain's textbook, Rhetoric and Composition, did include "Emotional Qualities of Style," studied not as instruments of persuasion, in the Aristotelian framework, but rather as poetic devices used for aesthetic pleasure (Grierson v-vi).

Alexander Bain's emphasis, therefore, illustrates the historical shift of rhetoric from classics to English, as well as the concomitant shift from rhetoric as persuasion to rhetoric as composition, with the chief emphasis on style, whether in writing or oratory. Bain included both in his rhetoric classes. And though the shift from classics to English for Bain did not stress aesthetic criticism to the extent that Masson and Nichol did,

Bain's emphasis on poetic concerns within the context of rhetoric included the basis of aesthetic criticism. In his emphasis on oratory, however, Bain differed from the later nineteenth century in Scotland, for in Glasgow and Edinburgh rhetoric and English dropped the study of oratory.¹¹

In attacking English courses that went beyond the teaching of style in English, especially the teaching of cultural content in morality, Bain's target included England's more than Scotland's professors. In the south, the tradition of emphasizing moral values in literature was inherent in the very birth of English studies. The literary focus, especially at University College in London, arose out of the context of English studies which differed in its development from the context in Scotland. Scottish universities had historically required the writing of essays in the vernacular. In the middle of the eighteenth century, beginning with Adam Smith's lectures, discussion of literature had itself been conducted in the vernacular, with Edinburgh leading the way to a study of rhetoric in English. Oxford and Cambridge rejected this non-classical approach, the rejection hardening after the Scottish attacks on the British universities in the first decades of the nineteenth century. The teaching of English literature at the University of London was, therefore,

¹¹Bain's texts were popular in Canada. McGill lists Bain in its calendars as early as 1870-71, through to 1890-91. The University of Toronto calendar cites Bain from 1881 to 1891, and Dalhousie's J. G. Schurman listed Bain in 1883-84. (See also Nan Johnson, 1988, 866.)

decidedly reformist. However, since Coplestone's defense of the Oxford system had stressed that the classics cultivated the mind and elevated the soul of the student, it followed naturally that University of London proponents of teaching English would also stress the mental and social virtues potential in teaching English language and literature. The emphasis on morality at King's College was, therefore, evident in lectures of the Reverend Dale from the beginning. Dale stated explicitly that he esteemed it his duty to use English literature to "inculcate lessons of virtue" (Palmer 20; see also above, Ch. 2).

In England, then, the study of national literature, from the very beginning part of a whole reform movement in populist education, was for the English masses a movement which consciously used education, especially the study of literature, to develop the social consciousness of the working class, anticipating by three decades Matthew Arnold's attempt to educate British philistines. The union of literature and social reform was overt in F. D. Maurice, successor to the Rev. Dale at King's College in 1840. During his thirteen years at King's, Maurice founded the Christian Socialist movement and later, London's Working Men's College. For Maurice, literature in the King's College classroom or in the Working Men's College was a vehicle for spreading the principles in which he believed, principles which continued in English literature the traditions of transmitting cultural values upon which the whole classical tradition and Christian values had

been based. For Maurice and other reformers, English literature offered contact with the culture's great minds, past and present, and it created a bond between men, regardless of social class or historical epoch. Maurice sought simply to arouse enthusiasm for great literature by 'the best kind of criticism which delights to draw forth the sense and beauty of a book, and is able to do so because the heart of the critic is in sympathy with the heart of the writer' (Palmer 37). In England, the birth of English as a discipline, therefore, had an idealistic focus that, especially under Matthew Arnold, would drive this study for more than a century.

As a consequence of the emphasis on morality in English literature, teaching composition within English studies at the University of London was secondary. Prior to Maurice's departure in 1853, King's College had already begun losing influence, since its function as a stepping-stone to Oxford and Cambridge waned when the University of London began giving its own degrees (Palmer 53). (King's, therefore, offered its students the Anglican restrictions of Oxford and Cambridge, but not their prestige.) To combat the falling enrolment, King's reduced the proportion of classics and mathematics to allow time for an increase in lectures on history and literature from two to four hours a week. As part of its reform, King's also included English composition for the first time. In making these reforms, King's reflected the utilitarian demands of its London constituents, whom it

wished to attract into its lecture halls.

In English studies, however, King's could not compete with the classes at University College, where the deciding factor appeared to be the lectures of David Masson, and then of Henry Morley. Morley began lecturing in university extension in 1857 and succeeded Masson in 1864, when Masson left for Edinburgh. Morley had 52 students in his first year; this doubled within a decade, and tripled by 1885. In Morley's first years the syllabus included Anglo-Saxon, a selection of works in Middle English, composition, and history of the language, all offered in the last two years of the three-year program. The honours degree, instituted in the late 1850s, required extra reading in the history of English literature, in Old English texts, in Shakespeare, and in Bacon. In Morley's later years, some courses in the structure and history of English were moved to the first year.

Composition, however, was considered an advanced course, linked to Latin rhetoric (McMurtry 50-52), and taught late in the students' program. In this, English composition clearly illustrated the transition of rhetoric from classics to English, for it built on the traditional Greek and Latin base but overtly applied that learning in a study of the vernacular. Initially, it emphasized classifying the figures of speech and argumentative strategies. However, as in Scotland, the primary emphasis soon shifted from persuasion to style, concurrent with the switch from

classical oratory to English composition, which was taught "by way of precept and example" (McMurtry 52), and associated with criticism. One of Morley's class exams reflects the orientation:

1. Discuss separately the considerations that determine choice and position of words in an English sentence.
2. Describe briefly the argument by which Wordsworth justified the style of his "Lyrical Ballads."
3. Compare, with reference to first principles the styles of any three important living writers.
4. Write a short essay on the principles of criticism. (qtd. in McMurtry 52)

H. S. Solly, Morley's biographer, points out that Morley's teaching continued to include extension lectures up to 1878. In these lectures, as well as in his University College lectures, Morley assigned written exercises, which he himself marked, presumably until he gained an assistant in the 1870s (McMurtry 53). Owing to his heavy lecture load, however, Morley did not assign "huge batches of weekly themes" (McMurtry 53). The strength of Morley's classes was not composition, but literature--taught with an emphasis on culture, not rhetoric.

The accounts of those who attended Morley's classes emphasize his focus on historical background, and especially on morality. Charles Moyse, Molson Professor of English at McGill in the 1890s, remembered Morley well in a letter to H. S. Solly,

Morley's biographer:

Earnestness, which might be defined as massive rather than impetuous, lay at the root of his character, and made him so potent an influence on young minds. . . . Here was seen his great strength, and, in certain cases, his weakness. Form was to him a secondary matter, and while he did not overlook finish, his eye preferred to dwell on something didactic. (qtd. in Solly 288)

For Morley, English literature was not written to amuse, but to elevate:

to find out the right and to do it, the wrong and to undo it. . . . Life is not a jest or a long guffaw, any more than a dinner is whipped syllabub. Whipped syllabub is very nice in its own little place, but a man who professes to live on it, lives neither wisely nor well. (288)

According to Moyse, Morley considered interpretation more important than criticism, for which he cared little:

First interpret, then criticise, he would often say.

. . . I remember asking him once if he had read a certain review of Tennyson's "In Memoriam." "No, I have not," he replied; "why should I? If 'In Memoriam' were unknown to me, I should read it for myself; but I think I know it as well as, and even better than, the re-

viewer. Life is too short to be wasted in scampering over magazine articles in the attempt to find novel-ties." I asked him if there were not critics and critics. "Certainly," he replied, "but those whose duty it is to look after the streets of literature should be properly trained, and should know weeds when they see them. The average reviewer knows everything, and hence his readers know little or nothing. Keep your reviews chiefly on the shelf: take your books, and use your brains." (288)

For Morley, literature was, therefore, meant to engage the reader in issues of practical morality. Also in a letter to Solly, the director of the Reading School for Girls, at which Morley lectured for twelve years, emphasized Morley's accent on the impact of literature on the morality of his auditors:

his great aim was to reveal to his hearers the inner thought which was the soul of the work, and so to open their eyes to the perception of the ideal, that seeing "the highest," they might "love it," and aspire towards it; but at the same time he always kept in view that aspiration could only lead to the ideal through duty.
(qtd. in Solly 287)

H. H. Bellot's history of University College, quotes Gower Street in the 'Seventies to illustrate Morley's approach once again, an approach which the author, B. P. Newman, presents as a

combining of morality with an intimacy with England's greatest writers. Newman states that Morley spoke "with a breath from the pulpit thrown in. That he was inclined to preach cannot be denied, and he certainly would not have thanked anyone for attempting."

He never strained after effect. His manner was simple, natural, almost conversational. But he spoke with the authority that comes from first-hand knowledge. He was upon terms of such close and familiar intimacy with the great English writers that you felt he was the very man to introduce you to them. (qtd. in Bellot 338)

Charles Moyse remembered Morley's discussion of literature with its international context.

The comparative view of literature as he presented it, and it was never so clearly presented before, threw a flood of light on the development of English thought. His students often heard more about Italy and France than about England. The English are a part of Europe in their literature, but they have generally the national mark to show. So he said, time and again. (qtd. in Solly 290)

Biographical material too was a part of this background, so it also entered into the lectures attended by Moyse. Morley held that an author lived in his time, so the time had to be examined to know the literature: "When I am told that a genius is al-

together independent of his age, I ask for facts, and the facts mostly lean the other way" (qtd. in Solly 290). Studied for its cultural values, literature naturally led into a study of the whole culture, not only the literary culture.

Morley's study of English literature extended beyond the university. Since he continued to teach extension courses, even while lecturing at University College, Morely had a hectic weekly schedule, which Solly gives from a letter in the late autumn of 1878. "College is vigorous and my own work brisk," Solly wrote to his son. "I felt my tongue curling up on Saturday night, and thought it was tired, so counted the lectures, and found I had given twenty-seven in the week, the greatest number yet" (Solly 317). These lectures were spread throughout London, and even beyond, so the time spent in travel added to Morley's burden. In addition to lecturing, Morley also edited the Cassel's "National Library" for five years. This was a low-cost series of English authors issued in weekly volumes, each containing about two hundred pages in a 4" x 6" format. Each author sold between 50,000 to 100,000 copies, throughout Britain, America, Canada, and Australia (McMurtry 61).

As noted above, Morley's lecture load would necessarily have militated against extensive attention to composition. Even though composition was considered a senior course, and therefore had a smaller enrolment than introductory courses, Morley's full student load--in the late 1870s, up to 2000 students annually--

would not have permitted him marking time. The lecture format itself would have discouraged detailed attention to composition as well. However, the weakness of composition in Morley's program and in programs like his lay in the thrust of the lecture content. Palmer argues that "the old rhetorical connection of reading with writing had almost disappeared by the middle of the century," even before Morley's time (40). As a corrective against scientific rationalism, the romantics already had isolated the function of literature "as a culture of the feelings":

the attitude is typified in John Stuart Mill's tribute to the healing powers of Wordsworth's poetry, after the mental crisis of his early maturity, an episode of his Autobiography which is so central to an understanding of the nineteenth century. This attitude is closely related to the idea of literature as a 'culture' in a wider sense; the literature of the past is called in to redress the balance of the present. However inadequately it was articulated, there was a widespread feeling that the spiritual and physical conditions of the industrial revolution impoverished the cultural lives of a large class of people, that they had been cut off from their traditional past, and that therefore they needed to be given new means of establishing connections with a national cultural heritage. (Palmer 40)

Palmer argues, as well, that "the study of English literature had developed in England as the poor man's classics, as part of a liberal human education, providing a cultural continuity that otherwise seemed in danger of extinction in the social upheavals of a new industrial democracy" (78). In his introductory lecture as Professor of English at the newly-founded Queen's College for Women in 1848, Charles Kingsley spoke of literature as "the autobiography of a nation," and F. D. Maurice similarly expressed the view that "we cannot safely separate our literary pursuits, even our literary recreations, from the history and life of our nation" (qtd. in Palmer 38). An 1860 article by the Rev. H. G. Morrison in Macmillan's Magazine stated,

By means of that literature. . . the student will learn to appreciate the temper with which great minds approach the consideration of great questions; he will discover that truth is many-sided, that it is not identical or merely coextensive with individual opinion, and that the world is a good deal wider than his own set, party or class. And such a lesson the middle classes of this country greatly need. They are generally honest in their opinions, but in too many cases they are narrow. (qtd. in Palmer 45).

Literature was thus a new guide in the transmission of cultural sensibility and morality. In the relationships linking culture, learning and morality, England's traditional leaders

were Oxford and Cambridge. They had traditionally connected higher education and morality within the framework of the state religion. The moral leadership of the two old state universities by mid-century, however, had been undermined by the ongoing ostentation displayed by the students. To combat this rising hedonism, the Oxford movement called the university community--as well as the whole Church of England--back to a life of piety. When, however, this supposedly positive movement led to the defection of John Henry Newman to Roman Catholicism in 1845, the traditional critics of the universities were vindicated. Newman's conversion proved that Oxford and Cambridge were not as necessary for the welfare of the Church of England as its defenders had suggested. In fact, as one journal wrote, "for years the Universities have been the seat of a dangerous, and too successful conspiracy against the faith of which they were supposed to be the bulwarks" (qtd. in Stone 317). Because of Oxford's waning religious influence in the second half of the century, its classical curriculum no longer carried the moral and social prestige that it once had, and therefore the power to act as a curricular model.

A further blow to the classical, centralist force of Oxford and Cambridge was delivered by the introduction of the civil service examination. In 1855, a commission that included Benjamin Jowett and Lord Macaulay was set up to help the East India Company find the best prospects for postings abroad. The commis-

sion devised an exam whose purpose was to ensure that the British way of life and British traditions would be carried abroad by the young men serving in India. When the East India Company dissolved a few years later, the civil service exam became an enormously important screening process for entry into the British civil service. The importance of an acceptable cultural training remained central to the exam. Thus English language and literature were allotted a proportionately heavy weighting in the marks, as explained by the commission:

Foremost among these subjects we place our own language and literature. One or more themes for English composition ought to be proposed. Two papers of questions ought to be set. One of these ought to be so framed as to enable the candidates to show their knowledge of the. . . institutions of our country; the other ought to be so framed as to enable them to show the extent of their knowledge of our poets, wits, and philosophers. (qtd. in Palmer 46)

In 1867 G. W. Dasent, Maurice's successor at King's, explained to the Taunton Commission on education how he examined candidates in English literature:

I should take forty or fifty passages, selected from what I call fair authors--Shakespeare, Milton, Pope, and some of the later writers, Sir Walter Scott and Tennyson. I have set this question over and over,

again. "Here is a passage. State where it comes from, explain any peculiarities of English in it, and state the context so far as you are able to do so." (qtd. in Palmer 46)

Given this emphasis on English language and literature, the civil service examination gave an advantage to graduates of colleges that taught English composition and literature.

Educators throughout Britain quickly recognized, however, that this examination's stress on facts led to superficiality in literary interpretation, producing a burgeoning industry in literary histories that focused on examinable facts that would help crammers do well in the examination. Oxford and Cambridge derided this tendency of the civil service examination to reduce the teaching of English literature to sets of crammable facts. Stoutly, they stressed the non-utilitarian nature of a true liberal education, thereby justifying their classical curricula that continued to exclude English literature. Nevertheless, dissatisfaction with Anglican exclusiveness and the Oxford/Cambridge curriculum grew. Across the Irish Sea, Church of England control of Trinity College in Dublin, structured on the Oxford model, led to the creation of non-Anglican Queen's Colleges at Belfast, Cork, and Galway in 1849. Matriculation at Queen's required English grammar and composition, the latter carried on into the first year's instruction. Lectures in English literature were offered in the third year, so Ireland as well as Eng-

land had the advantage of both the Oxford and the University of London models.

From the founding of University College in London in 1826 and Aytoun's accession to the Edinburgh Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres 1845 onward, all Great Britain, therefore, saw a shift in the rhetorical curriculum of the traditional college program of studies. In England, Scotland, and Ireland, emphasis on English literature grew in all but the strongly classical curricula of the colleges controlled by the Anglican church. The 1855 founding of the civil service examination, with its emphasis on facts in the history of British culture, produced a rash of histories of British literature, two of the most important written by William Spalding, Aytoun's predecessor at Edinburgh, and George Lillie Craik, professor of English at Queen's in Belfast. With this turn to cultural history, English literature, therefore, more and more crowded classics in the traditional curriculum. And as rhetoric and poetics shifted from the classics to English, the focus of composition became more and more focused on style, closely related to the rising interest in aesthetics as classical poetic theory gained importance in English studies.

The shift to reading and to aesthetic and moral criticism was stronger in England than in Scotland. Utilitarian concerns kept the teaching of rhetoric alive in Masson's classes at Edinburgh, and in Nichol's at Glasgow. And at Aberdeen, of course, Bain saw his foremost duty as the teaching of rhetoric. In

England, however, the strong emphasis on education as liberal rather than practical weighted the balance heavily in favor of poetics. In teaching English literature, the University of London argued against Oxford and Cambridge that the writings of native authors could foster high and noble thought as well as classical writings could. Further, especially in England, social disruptions resulting from an ever growing industrialization led to an ever greater demand for a widely accessible source of noble sentiments in print, literature that could foster the development of the human spirit. All of these factors led to a privileging of reading over writing in England, of poetics over rhetoric.

The strongest proponent of English literature as a means of inculcating social and cultural values for the British middle class was, of course, Matthew Arnold. Born in 1822, Arnold experienced "the shock of mighty thoughts" ("Empedocles on Etna") of the early Victorian period. He recorded the emotion of this shock in his poetry, much of it published before his appointment as Professor of Poetry at Oxford in 1857. However, even while publishing his poetry, he was already looking forward to a more directly active social role than that of poet. In his 1853 "Preface to Poems," he reasoned that "Empedocles on Etna" failed as a poem because its mood of despair led to suicide rather than to noble action. Situations in which "there is everything to be endured, nothing to be done," he reasoned, did not produce poetic pleasure, though they might be mimetic of the human situation, as

required in Aristotle's Poetics. Unable to foster action in his poetry, Arnold turned to prose criticism to point his countrymen to a life of mental culture that, on one hand, could affirm traditional values in the face of the rampant materialism of the new industrial age, and, on the other hand, could deal with the loss of faith that the Victorian age was experiencing.

Terry Eagleton states that "Arnold was always preternaturally sensitive to the needs of his social class." The urgent social need was to 'Hellenize' or cultivate the philistine middle class that had proved "unable to underpin their political and economic power with a suitably rich and subtle ideology" (24). Eagleton sees Arnold as imbuing the middle class with "something of the traditional style of the aristocracy," who had "something of the ideological wherewithal to lend a hand to their middle-class masters" (24).

Arnold began "Literature and Science" by defending Plato's idealism against "practical people" that disparagingly talked "with a smile of Plato and of his absolute ideas" (486). His defence against this British philistinism was an appeal to perfection as an ideal, an ideal enshrined in his concept of culture. Culture, Arnold wrote, "directs . . . attention to the natural current there is in human affairs, and to its continual working" (473). Arnold here and elsewhere defined culture as "the best that has been thought and known" (475). Culture was "the study of perfection. . . which consists in becoming some-

thing rather than in having something, in an inward condition of the mind and spirit, not in an outward set of circumstances" ("Sweetness and Light" 462). This idea of perfection was, of course, "at variance with the mechanical and material civilization in esteem" in Britain at the time (462). Arnold related culture to religion, which said, "'The kingdom of God is within you'" (461). Culture, therefore, appeared as a common denominator, as a Hegelian higher category, as the ground out of which both religion and poetry spring. The language of the Bible, Arnold stated in Literature and Dogma, was at once both literary and religious; it was "language thrown out at an object of consciousness not fully grasped, which inspired emotion." Arnold explained further, "Evidently, if the object be one not fully to be grasped, and one to inspire emotion, the language of figure and feeling will satisfy us better about it, will cover more of what we seek to express, than the language of literal fact and science" (30-31). In a broad sweep of thought similar to Carlyle's, Arnold turned to both Goethe and Quintilian to argue that art, science, and morality, all touched by emotion, resulted in religion (Literature and Dogma 16).

In "The Study of Poetry" (1880), Arnold presented poetry as the answer to the problems of faith reflected in his poetry. In the first paragraph he set his theme:

The future of poetry is immense, because in poetry, where it is worthy of its high destinies, our race, as

time goes on, will find an ever surer and surer stay. There is not a creed which is not shaken, not an accredited dogma which is not shown to be questionable, not a received tradition which does not threaten to dissolve.

He continued in the second paragraph:

More and more mankind will discover that we have to turn to poetry to interpret life for us, to console us, to sustain us. Without poetry, our science will appear incomplete; and most of what now passes with us for religion and philosophy will be replaced by poetry.

(501)

This position regarding poetry led Arnold to state that "the best poetry will be found to have a power of forming, sustaining, and delighting us, as nothing else can" (503). Given this faith in poetry, small wonder that a generation later George Gordon, an early Oxford Professor of English Literature, stated in his inaugural address,

England is sick, and . . . English literature must save it. The Churches (as I understand) having failed, and social remedies being slow, English literature has now a triple function : still, I suppose to delight and instruct us, but also, and above all, to save our souls and heal the State." (qtd. in Eagleton 23)

In spite of the easy transfer of religion to poetry, the

study of English literature as a legitimate college-level enterprise occurred slowly at both Oxford and Cambridge. The "poor man's classics" found a hard entry into the bastions of England's establishment. Some of the reasons for this we have already seen in previous chapters: above all, Oxford and Cambridge defended their curriculum by emphasizing that they provided a liberal, not a utilitarian education, which they considered a reading of the vernacular literature to be. In addition, the class structure of England separated its citizens in both body and mind, so the curricular difference between Oxford and Cambridge, on the one hand, and the dissenting and provincial colleges that had arisen in the latter decades of the nineteenth century, on the other hand, reflected the social exclusiveness of the older universities.

However, a continued emphasis on the ideals that Arnold had championed in literature gradually broke down institutional barriers. In an address to the London Extension Society in 1887, Liberal statesman and man of letters John Morley defined literature in terms of social ideals, and then added

because I am possessed, and desire to see others possessed, by that conception of literary study, that I watch with the greatest sympathy and admiration the efforts of those who are striving so hard, and I hope, so successfully, to bring the systematic and methodical study of our own literature, in connection with other

literature, among the subjects for teaching and examination in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

(qtd. in Palmer 93-4)

Change came slowly. In 1891 a memorial signed by 108 Oxford members, including the leading philologists, was presented to the Hebdomadal Council. This letter recognized the increasing need for teachers and lecturers "competent to handle the subject [English literature] efficiently" (qtd. in Palmer 107). In December 1893, the Oxford Congregation voted 110 to 70 to establish an English School. The debate reflected, however, that even then many supporters of the position did not consider the new course of high merit. One member of the Hebdomadal Council's Committee supported establishing an English School because it would draw off weaker candidates from the Literae Humaniores School. Another professor "reminded the Congregation that 'the women should be considered, and the second and third-rate men who were to become schoolmasters'" (qtd. in Palmer 111). Thus, even after the course was established, it limped between philology and literature, no new professor having been engaged (Palmer 112-116). With the coming of Walter Raleigh in 1904, however, the future of English Literature at Oxford was secured.

Cambridge had chosen rather to follow philology with Skeat. As a result, the development of English Literature took longer, not coming into its own until 1926, when the school of English reached the form in which it influenced the next decades, espe-

cially in the person of F. R. Leavis, through whom the idealism of the late nineteenth century bore rich fruit.¹² The focus on the ideal in English literature, even at Oxford and Cambridge, soon led to the faltering of other English studies interests, such as philology and composition. In the early 1940s Dover Wilson complained, "our university departments of English are in the main departments for the training of literary critics, and pay far too little attention to the student's own power of expression" (qtd. in Grierson v). The concern for practical studies such as rhetoric or composition had not fitted into the concerns of Oxford and Cambridge in the nineteenth century. The advent of English Literature did not change those concerns; furthermore, the strong emphasis on literature gradually eroded a concern for rhetoric, or composition, even in Scotland, where rhetoric had traditionally had great influence. Significantly, Professor Wilson's comments above were made while Wilson was a professor in Aberdeen, where he had gone in 1935, after eleven years at King's College, London.

Wilson's comments are relayed in Herbert J. C. Grierson's Rhetoric and English Composition, in the preface of which Grierson reviews the beginning of his teaching career at Aberdeen in 1893. He reminds his readers that this was the school of Bain, and of his successor, William Minto, under whom Rhetoric had become English Composition. Grierson recalls his trepidation at

¹²See Eagleton, Ch. 1.

giving a hundred lectures on English Literature, for he had himself enjoyed just fifty lectures at Aberdeen before going to Oxford, where, of course, he had not studied English literature formally. Grierson thus recalls being relieved to know that he could begin his course in literature by reviewing rhetoric, for this review would allow him "more time to get ready for the formidable task of tracing the history of English Literature" (iii). From this comfort in Rhetoric and fear of teaching literature to Wilson's position just over a generation later reflects the remarkable change in focus in Scottish higher education--indeed, in the focus of English Literature throughout Britain. The idealism discussed in this chapter was particularly suited to poetry, for, as Grierson points out, poetic literature aims at "something to which both philosophy and theology have assigned the highest place of all, namely contemplation, the impassioned vision of the worth of things." He adds, "poetry does not depend on any practical effect it may achieve, but on its revelation of emotional truth, of what we call value" (27). Rhetoric or oratory, on the other hand, has a practical intention, an "end beyond itself" (26). As literature took over from rhetoric and philology, it had a built-in bias against the practical, which led to its strangling of composition, especially when taught in conjunction with literary criticism.

While the transmission of a cultural ideal, therefore, became the strength of English studies programs, its weakness lay

in the loss of the practical rhetorical arts that had been the hallmark of the classical university program. Unfortunately, the weakness deplored by Dover Wilson in Britain was carried to Canada, where the social context fostered a situation even more desperate than that in Britain. Before this study turns back to Canada, however, one further topic must be reviewed to understand the full importance of the emphasis on ideals in literature for Anglo-Canadian culture from the end of the nineteenth century through the first half of the twentieth. That is the topic of philosophical idealism, introduced to Canada through the Queen's College appointment of John Watson, a Glasgow graduate, to replace John Clark Murray, who went to McGill in 1872. With Watson's appointment, Queen's not only gained an international stature in idealist philosophy, but, more importantly for Canada, it became a leader in liberal thought in the nation. When Queen's in 1888 appointed as its new English specialist, James Cappon, another Glasgow graduate also committed to idealist philosophy, Queen's not only consolidated its leadership in philosophy but also provided Canada with a critical, rational base for Matthew Arnold's approach to literature.

Even in England, Arnold's emphasis on the ideal in culture had been supported by a philosophical idealism deriving ultimately from the German Enlightenment, with Leibnitz and Kant leading to Hegel's dialectical idealism. As a student of German culture, and of its influence on Carlyle and Coleridge, for instance,

Arnold was also aware of Kantian and Hegelian thought. Philosophically, Kant's Critique of Pure Reason had asserted that everything, including religion and law-giving must submit to criticism (B XXX). Nothing was left unchallenged. Here Hegel offered a way out, especially to those who refused to jettison Christianity, which they considered fundamental to their social and political culture, as well as to their religion. Upon being introduced to Hegel, Benjamin Jowett, Master of Balliol, (Matthew Arnold's college while Arnold was an Oxford student), wrote to a friend, "One must go on. . .or perish in the attempt, that is to say, give up Metaphysics altogether. It is impossible to be satisfied with any other system after you have begun with this" (qtd. in Faber 181). Born in 1817, Jowett's own roots gave him the stability of the Church of England before the full force of science and skepticism broke after mid-century, but Jowett still felt the need for a new beginning. He wrote to Florence Nightingale that "something needs to be done for the educated, similar to what J. Wesley did for the poor" (Faber 16). Hegel's philosophical system appealed to those intellectuals whose traditional beliefs had been undermined not only by eighteenth- and nineteenth-century philosophy but by nineteenth-century science as well.

Two of Jowett's Balliol students, T. H. Green and Edward Caird, were to carry neo-Hegelianism through England and Scotland, and thus to North America. After mid-century, Britain was

powerfully influenced by the empirical utilitarianism of John Stuart Mill and his distrust of metaphysics. Neo-Hegelianism attempted to counter the thrust of Bentham and Mill. The nature of Green's idealist philosophy is reflected in an 1872 letter requesting Green to lecture to a private society whose membership included F. H. Bradley, later to become the leading idealist philosopher at Oxford. The society strove to make an "earnest effort to bring speculation into relation with modern life instead of making it an intellectual luxury, and to deal with various branches of science, physical, social, political, metaphysical, aesthetic, as part of a whole instead of in abstract separation" (Richter 159-60). The Shakespearean scholar A. C. Bradley is reported to have told a friend that "Green had saved his soul" (Richter 14). Green's synthetic idealism argued that "the natural world cannot be self-contained and ultimate." Nature presupposes "a principle that is not natural," a "spiritual principle." Further, "there is no merely given sense experience, and . . . all experience implies some sort of intelligent organization" (Acton 115).

In Glasgow, Edward Caird held the chair of Moral Philosophy from 1866 to 1893, after which Caird returned to Balliol to succeed Jowett, his mentor. Caird strove to integrate Christianity with a critically consistent philosophical system in his classes. He strove to integrate traditional idealistic philosophy into his own comprehensive scheme, as, he maintained, must

be done by any philosopher:

His system in principle must be complete; all its contents must be deemed to be nothing more nor less than elements of one articulated truth, however imperfectly ideas have been followed into their consequences, and though it remains but a rational faith. Philosophy never can be eclectic; and its authority like that of the moral law must be universal and admit of no compromise. (Jones, Muirhead 248)

Caird's philosophy focused on the continuity of existence underlying physical reality. For his biographers, Caird, "had nothing to say except this--that the law of all finite life is that of living through dying, of conserving in merging, of gaining in giving." For Caird, "the inmost throb of the universal life of the spirit which dwells in all things and is through dwelling therein, was this return through outgoing, this spendthrift self-enrichment." The central principle of religion, in turn, was faith in "the Being who sustains the natural and moral order of our life" (Jones, Muirhead 255). Caird's philosophy had a strong appeal for Scottish Presbyterianism, which had a tradition of intellectual rigour combined with strong Christian commitment. For followers of Caird, the conflicts of science and faith were effectively dissolved.

Neo-Hegelianism was wedded to English literature in the Glasgow classes of John Nichol, Caird's fellow student at Bal-

liol, and his early rival for the chair of philosophy at Glasgow¹³. James Cappon, later of Queen's College in Kingston, studied under both at Glasgow. He thus came to Queen's well prepared to use literature to counter any arguments for utility and materialism based on the philosophies of Hume and Mill, both of whose systems, for Cappon, "moved in the same plane of thought" (Cappon 1909, 267).

The appointment of Canada's first full-time English professors, Cappon and W. J. Alexander, a student of Morley's, therefore, signalled much more than the addition of new options in the Anglo-Canadian college curriculum. It brought to the new nation a specialized curriculum solidly built upon the strength of Christianity's idealistic epistemology, but with that original idealism now reinterpreted by a philosophical system adapted to integrate new knowledge discovered by a strongly materialistic Baconian science. A primary object of the new idealism was to ensure the students' continued faith in traditional cultural values, which, in Canada consisted of belief in the primacy of the intellectual life--as opposed to faith in material reality--

¹³In 1866 Jowett had, in fact, supported the candidacy of Nichol, Professor of English Literature, for the position in philosophy, but Caird's support at Glasgow led Nichol to withdraw in favor of Caird. The Scottish tradition at Balliol was strong, perhaps deriving from the founding of Balliol by the father of John de Balliol, Scottish King from 1292-96. Adam Smith had also lectured at Balliol. Henry Jones, also a Scottish philosopher and graduate of Balliol, reports another witty Scot as quipping, "Yes all good Scotsmen go to Balliol--even in this life" (Jones, Muirhead 128n).

and a commitment to the higher welfare of society, which translated into a firm commitment to the British crown and to a British political ideology, combined with a denial of self aggrandizement deriving from material philosophies and pleasures. In short, nothing but the sacred text had changed. In Canadian higher education, at least in the liberal arts, Matthew Arnold's objective of substituting literature for religion was therefore reached. In the broad study of rhetoric and poetics, the ideal had triumphed over the utilitarian, the philosophical over the practical. In this process, traditional rhetoric was diminished to composition, part of its theoretical base either assimilated by poetics or, most often, reduced to stylistics. The new focus on British literature, however, gave the Anglo-Canadian curriculum a new lodestar. How that was done, the details of the curriculum, the views of those that brought about this substitution, and the final results for English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges--all these are details for the next two chapters.

CHAPTER 4: ANGLO-CANADIAN DEVELOPMENTS, 1853 - 1884

Educational developments relating to English studies in Victorian England and Scotland had direct effects on the college curriculum in British North America both before and after Confederation. Indeed, British influences almost totally controlled the development of Anglo-Canadian English studies until the end of the nineteenth century. Two major professorial appointments in the second half of the nineteenth century, the first in 1853 and the second in 1884, both reflected as well as influenced this development. The present chapter discusses the first of these appointments and the subsequent evolution of Anglo-Canadian English studies between 1853 and 1884; the next chapter focuses on the second appointment and the period from 1884 to the century's end.

The second half of the nineteenth century saw Anglo-Canadian colleges as a whole move from religious toward secular control, a shift that reflected a growing secularization in society generally, in Canada as well as in the Britain. This secularization was reflected in the colonial English studies curriculum just as it had been in the English studies curriculum in England and Scotland. Concomitant with this secularization came specialization. The traditional curriculum common to all students gave way to options and to specialization, which, in English studies, reached its final phase in 1884. In the transitional period from 1853 to

1884, rhetoric in Anglo-Canadian colleges followed the lead set in Britain, first, by shifting from classics to English, and then by shifting from rhetoric as persuasion to English studies as poetics. In Canada, however, the second shift did not immediately follow the first, as it did in Britain, for both written and spoken rhetoric continued to be stressed in Canada, both before and after Confederation. Not until English as a specialty was finally established with the hiring of literature specialists, beginning in 1884, did rhetoric begin to fade to its ultimate position as just a part, often subordinate, of the first-year English curriculum.

The year 1853 was marked by the arrival of British North America's first professor designated specifically to teach English language and literature. Officially appointed as Professor of History and English Literature, Daniel Wilson came to the University of Toronto to coordinate this colonial institution's English studies curriculum with recent English studies developments in Britain. The small size of the newly reorganized college in Toronto, of course, demanded the dual role for Wilson. Wilson's appointment indicated the beginning of an Anglo-Canadian shift toward specialization, of which the teaching of English literature and language was a first symptom. Wilson's arrival, therefore, also marked the beginning of the dissolution of the unified curriculum in British North America, and the beginning of the shift of rhetoric and poetics from classics to English.

A chronology of British developments sets Wilson's appointment and subsequent developments in Canada into a British perspective. In 1845 William Aytoun had ascended the chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in Edinburgh, thereby changing its focus from English grammar and composition to English literature. Five years earlier, the reformer F. D. Maurice had succeeded to the chair of English at King's College in London. And in 1852, the year before Daniel Wilson arrived in Toronto, David Masson had begun teaching English literature at University College in London. In 1858, English Language and Literature would become an official option within the Modern Languages offerings at University College in London (McMurtry 120). In the same year, a Scottish universities' commission, impressed by Aytoun's successes at Edinburgh, would call for English literature to be introduced in all Scottish universities.

Given Daniel Wilson's own professional interest as a man of letters in the vernacular, as well as these strong affirmations of English literature in both English and Scotland, Wilson was clearly a man to change the direction of liberal studies when he arrived at Toronto in 1853. Wilson had attended the University of Edinburgh in the pre-Aytoun days, leaving in 1837. However, as a young Scot anxious for a literary reputation, he maintained close contact with educational developments in both Scotland and

England. Upon leaving university¹, he went to London, where he supported himself by art work and writing. After a few years he returned to Edinburgh, where, in 1847, he published a two-volume historical work, Memorials of Edinburgh in Olden Time, complete with 126 sketches by his own pen. This work was followed in 1851 by The Archaeology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland, which drew from historian Henry Hallam (father of Arthur Henry Hallam) the praise that Wilson's was the most scientific treatment of the archaeological evidence ever written ("Daniel Wilson" 139). The prestige of Wilson's work led to an appointment as secretary to the Scottish Society of Antiquaries, and, in 1853, election as honorary member of that society, a tribute limited to but twenty individuals.

At Wilson's death in 1893, William Kingsford's memorial address to the Royal Society of Canada noted that Wilson's early work appealed to popular interest, especially to a Scotland blessed by the halo of Scott's romantic genius. Much of Wilson's later work, however, work that appeared in leading scientific circles in Britain, America and Canada², was often of a scien-

¹As was common in Scotland at the time, Wilson did not pursue a formal degree. In recognition of his literary work, he was awarded honorary degrees later, the first coming from St. Andrews in 1851 (Harris 1988, 13).

²Wilson's major ethnological work was Prehistoric Man: Researches into the Origin of Civilization in the Old and New Worlds (1863). In addition to his earlier works on Edinburgh, and on Scottish prehistory, Wilson published a second work on Edinburgh in 1878, plus monographs of biography, verse, and fantasy. Learned articles appeared in the "Proceedings" of the

tific nature and of a calibre that appealed only to educated readers. In many ways Wilson's combination of popular and academic concerns typified the situation in rhetoric and English studies in British North America between 1853 and 1884. On the one hand, Wilson was acutely sensitive to the changing demands on rhetoric and English studies during his tenure at Toronto; on the other hand, Wilson insisted on an intellectual thoroughness that protected his Toronto curriculum against attacks both practical and philosophical. Both types of attacks were made during this transitional period that saw the early classical curriculum begin to shift to a study of oral and written composition and of literature in the vernacular.

Wilson's appointment reflected not only future developments but also the changes that had taken place in Toronto in the decades preceding his appointment. First, the Anglican King's College, the pride of the Toronto Tories in 1843, was no more, having been replaced by a state-administered institution. What had happened to King's College was symptomatic of a reorientation in British North American higher education that would strongly influence the development of English studies in the coming decades. In Britain, the turn to the contemporary from the classi-

society of Antiquaries of Scotland, the London Anthropological Institute, the British and American Associations for the Advancement of Science; in the Journal of the Canadian Institute; and in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. Wilson contributed to the eighth and ninth editions of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, as well as to numerous Canadian periodicals.

cal was fed by the Industrial Revolution, and by an ever greater emphasis on a scientific education modeled especially on German higher education. In the British North American colonies, the new British traditions were modified by the colonial situation. This situation in 1853 still saw higher education strongly influenced by religious interests, but a growing secularization had by now begun, reflected both in institutional realities as well as in popular thought. As we have seen in Chapter 2, the college movement in British North America before 1850 was highly fragmented, with rivalries rooted in religious and national differences. In the Maritimes, the Anglican King's Colleges at Windsor and at Fredericton modeled their curricula on the classical-/Anglican interests of Oxford. At Pictou, and then at Dalhousie, Thomas McCulloch had built the curriculum around his and his constituency's Scottish, Presbyterian education, which emphasized practical knowledge, suitable to the economic situation of the colony. And in Upper Canada, Egerton Ryerson's Methodism at Victoria College had emphasized rhetoric in the vernacular. At Toronto, the Tories had followed the Oxford classicism associated with British Anglicanism. The decade preceding the arrival of Wilson at Toronto had thus seen three primary traditions develop: an emphasis on rhetoric in the vernacular associated with Methodism, Oxford classicism associated with the Anglican Tories, and Scottish pragmatism associated with Presbyterianism. These primary religious affiliations dissolved in

most institutions in the decades surrounding Confederation, and even where they remained, they played an ever diminishing role in the development of the English studies curriculum.

In Upper Canada, the 1827 King's College charter had placed control of the college in the hands of the Church of England. With King's College had gone not only control of higher education in Toronto, but an endowment of over 200,000 acres. Public debate about Anglican control of both the college and the endowment led to the introduction of four separate bills in the years following 1843. Passage of the last of these bills took control of King's College from the Church of England as of December 31, 1849, and provided for a non-denominational University of Toronto as of New Year's Day, 1850. The endowment went with the new college. In 1853, another University of Toronto Act reorganized the institution directly on the model of the University of London. The act stipulated that instruction be carried out in affiliated colleges, but that the examinations and degrees be controlled by the University. The legislation was based on the hope that colleges such as Victoria and Queen's, whose supporters had decried the earlier control of King's and the distribution of funds from the endowment, would affiliate with the new institution, thereby allowing these institutions a share of the endowment. In the meantime, the teaching of the reconstituted University of Toronto was to be done through University College, a new instructional arm of the institution. As events unfolded, Vic-

toria College did not affiliate with the University of Toronto until near the end of the century, and Queen's never did. Thus the problem of endowment led to further bitter debate, culminating in a strong clash between Egerton Ryerson and Daniel Wilson in legislative hearings on the issue in 1860.³

The 1849 legislation provided for a Commission of Visitation to order the affairs of the new university. That commission called for curricular reform, significantly expanding the old King's College curriculum. The expansion included a chair for History and English Literature, perhaps modeled directly on the 1849 inauguration of such chairs at the new non-Anglican Queen's Colleges at Belfast, Cork and Galway (Harris 1988, 11-12). The change in curriculum did not take place until Wilson's second year at Toronto, when the Senate introduced a new four-year program, thereby altering the three-year course inherited from King's College. This four-year program introduced English in the first two years and an option of either Classics (Greek and Latin) or Modern Languages (English, French and German) in the fourth year. The 1860 calendar shows that rhetoric initially remained fixed to the Classics, the Rev. John McCaul, president of University College, in charge of the department entitled "Classical Literature, Logic, and Rhetoric" (17). In addition,

³Transcripts of the proceedings are published in Volume 15 of J. G. Hodgins, ed. Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada. . . . Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1894-1912. Some of the speeches, including those of both Wilson and Ryerson, were also published separately for distribution to supporters of each faction.

the new program introduced honors options in a number of courses, including English Language and Literature. The honors option required additional work, but exempted the students from selected exams in the pass program in the second and third years. The four-year program was introduced not to render the program more demanding but to add coursework to extend the program downward, thereby making it more accessible to matriculating students than it had been (Harris 1988, 14). This increase in lower level coursework became necessary when Bishop John Strachan founded Trinity College as a private Anglican institution after King's College was secularized. Until Trinity College opened in 1852, King's and then University College had become "almost a preserve for boys from Upper Canada College" (Falconer 113), an academy for the upper class, built as a forerunner to King's college during the period when the politics of Upper Canada had delayed the opening of the college as chartered in 1827.⁴ With

⁴At 1860 legislative hearings, Wilson displayed the original matriculation examination for King's, pointing out that it was borrowed from Trinity College, Dublin, brought to Toronto by Dublin's brilliant scholar, Dr. McCaul, now the president of University College. Wilson stressed that the requirements were higher than those of any Scottish university or of Oxford or Cambridge, but that they suited King's situation at the time:

When old King's College was practically confined to a small and exclusive class, and when Upper Canada College had its seventh form where youths were retained to their seventeenth or eighteenth year, and then transferred, with a College bursary or exhibition, to the higher institution, such a state of things was possible enough; and if it is desired that the old monopoly shall be restored, let us be informed of it, and our course will be an easy one. But meanwhile our decision has been, that if our true aim is to elevate the educa-

the opening of the new Anglican College, however, many of the Upper Canada College students moved to Trinity, thus leaving University College with its entrance requirements too high for other grammar schools, and therefore virtually without incoming students.

In the 1860 hearings before a legislative committee, Wilson defended the University College English program against charges by Egerton Ryerson, who spoke for Victoria and Queen's Colleges. Ryerson argued that the teaching of English literature and history indicated that the University College course now included grammar school material. Ryerson also rebuked Wilson for making room for these grammar school courses by allowing students options that ministered "to individual tastes and whims," and dealt out "snatches of knowledge on various subjects" (Hodgins XV, 124). In the heat of debate⁵, Ryerson apparently forgot his

tion of the whole province, we must provide a matriculation adapted to the specific capacity of the grammar Schools. Any other system, while pretending to elevate education, must either have restricted its whole advantages to a favoured and wealthy few; or been a mere deceptive paper programme. (Wilson 1860, 7)

⁵The debate became highly emotional and went far beyond finances and curriculum. Wilson recorded his conclusions to Ryerson's attacks in his journal: "A more annoying and distasteful controversy could not well be conceived, conducted as it was with an amount of vulgar personality inconceivable to educated men at home. At first I was simply disgusted with the whole business, but being compelled to go into it I plucked up heart of grace and found some grim satisfaction in mauling the unscrupulous assailants of our College militant" (Langton 80).

Wilson's description of the debate is supported by a notice in the Quebec Morning Chronicle of April 27, 1860:

own pride in Victoria's emphasis on English studies at Victoria's inaugural in 1842. Wilson's early course, however, was a departure from any course that Ryerson's Victoria had offered in its first years. Wilson was primarily an historian. The focus of his English program was, therefore, similar to the history of English literature course at Edinburgh, Glasgow and London. The 1860 calendar lists for the first year pass program Spalding's History of English Literature, with the description, "History of English Literature to the reign of Queen Elizabeth," adding for honors students "Origin and History of the English Language (Latham's English Language); its Orthographic and Etymological forms; its compound structure and intrusive Philological and Grammatical elements" (Harris 21). The second year pass program required the History of English Literature from Queen Elizabeth to Queen Anne (also Spalding's History). Honors students were given "Etymology and Synonyms," as well as "Syntactical and Rhetorical Analysis of Forms of English Composition." In the

The Parliamentary Committee on the subject of the Toronto University Endowment, concluded taking evidence yesterday. The great features of the discussion which has taken place in the committee Room, have been the speeches of Professor Wilson and Dr. Ryerson; the first on the side of the University, and the second on the side of the Sects. The orations of these gentlemen were beautifully spiced with personalities; and yesterday, we are told, the speech of the Upper Canada Superintendent of Education merged pathetically towards the close into a flood of tears, quite affecting to behold. Stern Legislators were found perceptibly and audibly blubbering, while the friends of the reverend speaker were altogether overcome. (Ryerson 1860, [2])

first two years of the program, Wilson taught the students History as well as English, but in the last two years he taught History in the sophomore year and English in the senior year. The final year, then, included Language and Literature for both pass and honors:

Language: History of the formation of the English Language, and Analysis of its Philological Elements (Latham's English Language; Fowler's English Language); Principles of Composition and Prosody, based on Critical Readings of English Classics.

Literature: History of English Literature from Queen Anne to the present time. (Spalding's Hist.; Craik's Hist.)

Literary analysis was also added in the final honors year with a "critical analysis of two of Shakespeare's Historical Dramas." A review of Wilson's course from the late 1850s to the mid 1870s reflects an emphasis, at least in the first two years, on factual material that Oxford disparagers of English literature called "crammer" material, suited to helping students pass examinations, the model for which continued to be the British civil service examination. The pass students' program thus focused on literary history in the first two years, with composition reserved for the fourth year. Honors students included philology and a history of the language from the first year, with composition added in the second. The pattern for pass students was, therefore, that

followed by King's College in London, with composition treated as an advanced course. Honors students wrote more than pass students: they had composition in the second year. After 1863, honors students wrote weekly exercises. Wilson's early English curriculum thus emphasized the history of the English language and literature for all students, with composition for honors students in the second year, but for pass students only in the fourth year. Composition for pass students was thus presented as a senior "finishing" course, much as rhetoric had been in many classical programs. But for honors students, composition was an integral part of the curriculum, linked with criticism for students that read original, whole works.

In 1877 the honors option was given a major revision throughout University College. For the pass course, Classics continued basic in all four years, with English required in three years. Professor Harris' history of English studies at Toronto notes that the third year of the revised course "exposed the pass student for the first time to an actual text--two cantos of Spenser's Faerie Queene (in 1877-78) or a book of Paradise Lost (in 1878-79)" (Harris 1988, 22).

The 1877 program in pass and honors changed only slightly in the following years, selected reading of British authors being alternated annually. The 1881 calendar listed a common core for English Language and Literature in the first, third and fourth years, with additional work for honors in each of the four years.

The 1881 calendar introduction focused the English curriculum as follows:

The Lectures will embrace the history and structure of the Language in relation to national progress and the development of English Literature; Rhetoric, with written exercises in English Composition and Rhetoric; Prosody; and critical readings of the authors required in the University Examinations.⁶

⁶The complete program in 1880-81 included the following courses:

First Year.

History and Etymology of the English Language. Rhetoric. History of English Literature, temp. Elizabeth and James I.

Books of Reference: Craik--History of Literature and Learning in English, B. V. Earle--The Philology of the English Tongue. Abbott and Seeley--English for English People. Bain--English Composition and Rhetoric.

ADDITIONAL FOR HONORS.

Prosody (Abbott and Seeley). History of English Literature, from Chaucer to Surrey (Craik's History of Literature and Learning in England, Bb. III., iv. Marsh's English Language and Literature, Lecture VI. to XI. inclusive). Prologue to Canterbury Tales and The Nonne Preste, His Tale . . . Shakespeare--Critical Reading of Coriolanus

Second Year.

FOR HONORS.

History of English Literature from the rise of the regular Drama to its proscription under the Commonwealth. (Craik's History. . . , Bb. V., VI. Marsh's English Language and Literature, Lects. XI. and XII. Shakespeare--Critical Reading of Henry VIII.

Third Year.

Milton--Paradise Lost, B. V.

ADDITIONAL FOR HONORS.

History of English Literature: Age of Milton and

The introduction obviously included the honors as well as the pass program. Honors students in Wilson's program introduced in 1877 continued to read more texts directly, and they wrote more essays than did the pass students. The pass program still emphasized factual material in literary history and in rhetoric and composition. Essay writing was still not considered as necessary for pass as for honors students, with honors tying essays strongly to literary analysis, of which the pass program in 1877 was given just a taste.

Wilson's late curriculum was, therefore, still much more distinctly Scottish than the McCaul curriculum had been. While McCaul's tradition was that of Trinity (Dublin), where McCaul had carried off high honors in the traditional classical program

Dryden. Critical Analysis of the following works:--
Shakespeare, Hamlet; Milton, Comus, Lycidas, Sonnets;
Dryden, Absalom and Achitophel.

Fourth Year

Principles of Composition, Grammar, and Etymology.
History of the Formation of the English Language.
Philology (Earle). History of Lit. from Dryden to
Wordsworth. Craik, History of Literature and learning
in England (Bb. VI. and VII.).

ADDITIONAL FOR HONORS.

The Augustan and Georgian Eras of English Literature (Craik's History. . . , B. VII.). Critical Reading of the following works: Shakespeare, King Lear, and As You Like It; Spenser, Faerie Queene, B. III., Cantos IV., V., and Shepherds Calendar, Eclogue X.; Milton, Paradise Lost, Bb. I., II., and Samson Agonistes; Pope, Dunciad, Bb. III, IV., Prologues to the Satires; Cowper, Task, B. V., and Retirement; Wordsworth, Excursion, B. IV., and Intimation of Immortality.

based on the Oxford curriculum, Wilson had attended Edinburgh, which stressed utility rather than classical culture.⁷ The Scottish belletristic emphasis on using literature as models in composition was clearly evident in Wilson's program, especially in the use of models in the honors program.

In 1880 Wilson succeeded McCaul as president of University College. Given Wilson's increased administrative load, the increasing number of students, and the rise of the study of philology in England as well as in Germany, it was natural to look to that expanding field for assistance. David R. Keys, an 1878 honors graduate in Modern Languages and History, one of Wilson's own students, had studied philology in Europe for two years after graduating from Toronto. He was hired to assist Wilson in 1883. Owing to Wilson's administrative burdens, Keys soon became the sole instructor in English. In 1887 Wilson was appointed president of the newly federated University of Toronto. It was in that position that he recommended to the provincial government the hiring of W. J. Alexander, who was to come from Dalhousie to once again revise the University College curriculum. Alexander's curriculum, though, would have more permanence than Wilson's. The Alexander curriculum would last, with only minor

⁷The differences between the two courses of studies mirrored personality differences between the two professors as well. Wilson's biographer, John Langton, the vice-chancellor of the University of Toronto in the 1850s and early 1860s, writes of rivalry between these two; indeed, he notes Wilson's "holy hatred with which he regards McCaul, a hatred most religiously returned" (qtd. in *Sissons* 111).

changes, for a half century, and be influential for decades longer.

The coming of Daniel Wilson to Toronto, therefore, marked the beginning of courses devoted exclusively to English. It also marked the formal introduction of rhetorical principles from Classics into English, initially with rhetoric in both subjects, but by 1880 largely in English alone.⁸ Over the more than thirty years of Wilson's responsibility for English, University College moved from introducing English literary history to having a fairly comprehensive program, at least for honors students, in English literary criticism of major authors, in history of the English language, and in composition, including rhetorical principles. Finally, as rhetoric came under the influence of English, the focus of essays, judging from the examination questions and calendar notices, shifted from general questions to essays on specific texts. In other words, the direction of composition instruction shifted from rhetoric alone, or rhetoric associated with belletristic models, as in the 1858 pass exam, to essays involving critical analysis, with the honors program leading the way. The shift from literary history to literary criticism followed the same pattern that had developed earlier in Scotland

⁸The 1880 Classics program lists McCaul, still the Classics professor, as giving lectures in rhetoric as part of the classical literature course, but the syllabus gives as texts only the second books of Aristotle's Rhetoric and Cicero's de Oratore, two of over forty entries in the calendar reading list for the fourth year.

and at the University of London. Under Wilson, oratory was largely ignored at the University of Toronto.

The University of Toronto was not Toronto's only college after 1852. New developments highlighted the emerging issue of religious versus secular control of education. As indicated above, when legislation secularizing King's College was passed by the colonial government in 1849, Bishop John Strachan, although seventy-two years of age, determined immediately to build a separate college for the Church of England in Toronto. Trinity College opened in 1852. As one reviewer in the 1952 centennial volume of the Trinity Review stated,

if the University of Toronto went more than half way to courting the devil through secularization, the University of Trinity college made a corresponding move in the opposite direction. It urged upon Edward [a representative charter student] a forthright discipline of mind, body, and soul, and directed his steps away from the "primrose path of dalliance" trod by his contemporaries at Queen's Park. It stood as a bastion of faith midst the "Protean infidelity" of the times.

(Trinity: 1852-1952 12).

With this religious orientation toward Anglicanism went a curricular conservatism. It is not surprising, therefore, that as late as 1880 Trinity College still followed a curriculum without options, based on classics, mathematics and divinity.

Not until 1884 did William Clark, hired as Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy the previous year, introduce English as one of five options in the final year of Trinity's three-year curriculum (Harris 1988, 43). The syllabus included Craik's History of Literature and Learning in England, which reflected the heavy historical emphasis of the course. Marsh's English Language provided the philological content of the program, but Clark also included one Shakespeare play and the first book of Paradise Lost. Composition continued to be required in Latin, but an essay requirement relating to the history and literature of given periods appeared in the calendar in 1886. Although late in starting and limited in scope, by the middle of the decade the Trinity program thus attempted to cover the areas of history, philology, and the reading and analysis of literary texts, with the final essay reflecting the student's ability to integrate what he had learned of the history of the British culture. The course was, therefore, clearly more related to introducing the student to British culture than to a serious education in history, philology, or literary analysis.

Victoria College, in Cobourg, and Queen's College, in Kingston, initially kept their early programs stable. Both struggled simply to keep their doors open, since they had no solid financial foundation, as did Toronto's University College, with its university's large public endowment. Given Victoria's precarious financial condition then, in addition to Ryerson's newfound

curricular conservatism as reflected in the 1860 hearings, it is not surprising that the Victoria curriculum changed little in its first quarter century. Nevertheless, Professor Harris notes that S.S. Nelles introduced some lectures in English literature as early as 1852. And Victoria's early commitment to the English language and composition resulted in composition and elocution courses in the first three years of the four-year course (Harris 1988, 6). The 1857 curriculum, for instance, also included literature in the fourth year, though the content of this course is not known. The strong emphasis on composition and elocution, that is, on the practical arts of rhetoric, was part of the strong emphasis on the practical use of English established by Ryerson at the birth of Victoria. The continued emphasis on rhetoric was also a reflection of the emphasis on preaching in this still relatively small denominational college, as well as to President Nelles' continuing interest in rhetoric, which led to the conflation of composition and divinity, as shown, for instance, in his 1867 Daily Diary, which shows the entry for February 16 as "Class in Composition at 8. Subject--Justification by Faith" (United Church Archives, Box 3, File 36). Though Victoria officially matriculated students from all denominations, to the end of the century it remained a college in which religion played a central part in the academic curriculum, and if the English studies course was to expand, it would have to fit into the religious orientation of this still strongly Methodist college.

Ryerson's 1860 concerns about English literature as unsuitable for the college curriculum notwithstanding, in 1868 Alfred Reynar, a former Victoria student and tutor, also ordained as a Wesleyan minister in 1866, returned from two years of study in Europe, primarily in Germany, to take up duties as Professor of Modern Languages. In touch with contemporary European and British developments, he quickly introduced the history of English literature, using Craik and Spalding as texts, and in 1873 introduced Shakespeare in a third-year elective for the pass course, following a pattern he had already set up in the honors program. Under Reynar, the offerings in English literature gradually expanded, with Reynar's interests clearly identified by Victoria's courses late in the century. The two-part freshman examination for 1890, for instance, focused on history and on Shakespeare's Coriolanus; freshman honors included Milton's Comus and Paradise Lost, Chaucer, and rhetoric and poetics. ("Compare prose and poetry, (a) as to the arrangement and connection of words, and (b) as to the choice of words.") In the sophomore year for English honors, the examination of 1890 focused on Hamlet and on the early nineteenth century. The junior year pass course in English covered the Faerie Queene, King Lear, Pope's Essay on Man, and Wordsworth's Excursion. Though somewhat more limited than the curriculum of University College, probably owing to Reynar's other duties (which the 1891 calendar show to be Dean of the Faculty of Arts as well as Professor of Modern Languages

and of English--R. S. Harris adds that he was also Professor of Rhetoric and Church History from 1871 on [1988, 27])--the drift of curricular development was certainly in the direction of an ever increasing emphasis on English literature, with an initial focus on the history of English literature, but this waned toward the end of the century.⁹ Reynar retained his position in English until his retirement in 1910. During this period of rapid change in English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges, the direction of development at Victoria paralleled the direction set at University College in Toronto, though the emphasis during Nelles' tenure as principal until 1887 retained a strong practical focus, and included oratory, not offered at most secular institutions.

If the early years at Victoria College were difficult owing to financial pressure, the situation at Queen's appears to have been doubly so. Only two years after inauguration in 1842, with only ten students the first year, Queen's was hard hit by a division in the Presbyterian Church in 1844. Then, in 1845, Rev. P. C. Campbell, Professor of Classics and Belles Lettres resigned, followed by the Principal, the Rev. Dr. Liddell, in 1846.

⁹ Interestingly, Victoria was one of the few major Anglo-Canadian institutions of this period in which the leading figure in English studies remained constant through the last thirty years of the century. Perhaps that was because Reynar was one of the earliest to come to English with something of a specialty, having studied in Germany for two years before taking up his Victoria College position. He was thus able to shift his instruction from rhetoric and history toward literary texts as the demand for reading British literature increased. In addition, his notebooks show him to have been highly committed to detailed literary criticism.

An interim appointment followed until 1853, with another president until 1860, when the Reverend Dr. Leitch, an astronomer and theologian, took office. Though a capable administrator, Leitch continued having troubles. Unfortunately, after only four years he died of heart failure. A semblance of stability came with Leitch's successor, the Rev. Dr. William Snodgrass, from St. Paul's Church in Montreal. Snodgrass was able to steer Queen's through a financial crisis when, in the same year, 1867-68, a government grant of \$5,000 per annum was withdrawn and the greater part of the college's endowment was lost in a bank failure. Under these circumstances, the Arts curriculum not only failed to develop, its cancellation was seriously considered. The 1864-65 calendar shows that English Grammar and Composition was taught in the first year, but no professor is listed. The textbook, Bullion's Analytical and Practical Grammar of the English Language, reflects that instruction focused on mechanical material, with lists of definitions and/or rules, with examples and exercises, and with virtually no rhetorical concerns.

Rhetoric, however, was taught in the first year of John Clark Murray's Classics program. Attached to Classics, Rhetoric at Queen's, like at Victoria, was a highly utilitarian study in English, including philology, style in composition, and elocution.¹⁰ The 1864-65 calendar lists Murray as examiner in Rhetoric

¹⁰The calendar lists the course of studies as follows:

A. Science of language. I. Language in general.

51. Its Nature. 52. Its Growth. 53. Its present

and English Literature for the previous year. The examination required a knowledge of the history of the English language, of rhetorical principles, of literary history, and of the history of drama. The questions were factual and do not appear to have required the reading of literary texts. Question 3, for instance, asked, "What is the difference between the genealogy of a language and the genealogy of its words?" Question 5 asked, "What is the fundamental law to be observed in the formation of style?" Question 9 required an historical knowledge of Shakespeare's canon, and question 10, the last, related to the dramatic unities.

In 1872, Murray left to teach philosophy at McGill. He was replaced at Queen's by the Rev. George Ferguson, a Queen's graduate. Ferguson's English pass course in "Rhetoric and English Literature" included the history of the English language,

Constituents. 54. Its Capabilities.

- B. Use of Language in the formation of style.
 - 51. Perspicuity, 52. Energy, 53. Simplicity, in (a) the choice of words, (b) the construction of sentences, and (c) the arrangement of an entire discourse.
- C. Elocution. 51. Orthoepey. 52. Reading. 53. Delivery.

The Student is also instructed by examination on the following textbooks: Latham's Handbook of the English Language, Whately's Rhetoric, and Collier's History of English Literature. The subjects of the University examination at the close of the session will be Latham's Handbook, Parts II., IV., and V.; Whately's Rhetoric, Part III.; Collier's History, the last four Eras.

Candidates for Honors must submit to an additional examination on Latham's Handbook, Part VI.; Collier's History, the third, fourth and fifth Eras; Milton's Paradise Lost, Books I. and II.

and English literature. The focus of the course, as reflected by the texts, was on composition and a factual literary and linguistic history.¹¹ The honors program, however, included, in addition to Anglo-Saxon, the analysis of a limited number of texts: "Battle of Maldon and History of King Lear from Layamon's Brut. Chaucer's Prologue and Knight's Tale. Spencer's 'Faerie Queene,' Books I and II." The examinations listed in the 1879-80 calendar reinforce the emphasis on facts that might have been drawn from the Craik and Taine textbooks.¹² The exam also

¹¹The texts were Max Mueller's Science of Language, Marsh's Lectures of the English Language, Maetzner's English Grammar, Craik's English Literature, and Taine's English Literature.

¹² Selected questions are as follows:

FIRST PAPER

6. Explain the double perfect in some english [sic] verbs,
sung, sang, drunk, drank, &c.
8. Explain the form "me thinketh."

SECOND PAPER

2. Give an outline of the poem of Beowulf. State any peculiar features in its poetry.
3. Classify Shakespeare's plays according to their periods.
9. State any excellencies as well as any defects in the Faerie Queene. What is the Spenserian stanza? What is there peculiar about Spenser's English?

A further question in the second paper, "Contrast Marlowe's Faust with Goethe's Faust," could not have asked for textual analysis, since this was not an exam in Modern Languages.

included basic questions in rhetoric and poetics, such as

9. In figures of speech distinguish between Metonymy and Synecdoche. State the different forms of each with examples.

. . . .

13. What do you understand by "Fine Art"? How far is Poetry a "Fine Art" ?

The course remained relatively unchanged until 1888, although the reading of whole works increased, with the 1888-89 offerings including lectures on Mill's On Liberty, Washington Irving's Alhambra, and Shakespeare's As You Like It. In addition, a note indicated that weekly essays were required in each class. Poetics thus gained importance at Queen's in the 1880s, but composition was not slighted, although elocution faded away.

For Queen's, as for University College, 1889 ended the period of non-specialization. The direction of Queen's development was similar to that of University College and Victoria, with the initial addition of the history of literature and the history of language to rhetoric, with the critical analysis of English literary texts coming last. At Queen's the emphasis on rhetoric in John Clark Murray's Classics program was much more utilitarian than anything offered at Toronto, perhaps because of the much stronger emphasis on poetics in the classical program under McCaul at University College, as well as the greater flexibility required of faculty members at the smaller Queen's, especially in

its years of struggle prior to the 1870s. In addition, the Scottish, Presbyterian roots of Queen's College would have emphasized a strong program in practical rhetoric, including composition and elocution. The study of oral rhetoric under John Clark Murray in the 1860s was also undoubtedly related to a Queen's concern for preaching, a hallmark of the Presbyterian Church from the Renaissance onward. In addition, the semi-rural setting of Queen's may have resulted in many students arriving at Queen's without a strong grammar school background, a weakness that would have been a factor fostering a basically utilitarian training in English, as is indicated by the use of Bullion's text, a "practical grammar," in the 1860s. This transitional period at Queen's, therefore, once again showed a wide variety of offerings in rhetoric and English, with local traditions playing a large part in the development of the curriculum. However, apart from the strong utilitarian emphasis on the rhetorical arts under John Clark Murray, the underlying direction of the curriculum was consistent with that of University College; namely, from rhetoric in a classics program to rhetoric in English, the introduction of literary history, and, finally, a move toward the direct reading of literary texts. The waning of elocution suggests a gradual moving toward consensus modeled on Toronto as well.

The leading Anglo-Canadian college in Canada in the early 1860s was Montreal's McGill. While the University of Toronto

battled Trinity, Victoria, and Queen's, J. W. Dawson's presidency at McGill ensured the fortunes of English higher education in Montreal. Dawson was a Nova Scotia Presbyterian, educated first at Pictou Academy and then at the University of Edinburgh. To come to McGill he had given up the position of superintendent of education for Nova Scotia, a post he had taken just five years earlier, at the age of thirty. He therefore came to Montreal as a young man, but, in addition to experience as an educator, he already had an international reputation as a geologist. Dawson advocated strongly the importance of developing the mental powers of every student, thereby emphasizing the classical and philosophical tradition of learning in Scotland, but he also insisted that independent study and observation, especially in the sciences, must take place in order to advance the cause of science. His attitude toward English studies reflected the same practical thoroughness, again reflecting his Scottish education and his background in rhetoric and belles lettres. In his 1855 inaugural address he first praised the classical languages, stating that "the large obligations that we owe to the literature of classical antiquity, as well as its present value, are thus sufficient to retain it as an important element in the higher education" (15). However, he recognized that "the too exclusive devotion to ancient literature" had given rise to just complaints, and in some instances had "threatened to sweep away such studies altogether from the collegiate course" (15). Dawson hoped that the linguis-

tic aspects of the classical languages would be taken care of in preparatory schools, so that the work of the university scholar might be devoted exclusively to "the higher beauties of classical literature, to study them with a discriminating and philosophical spirit" (16). For Dawson, classical studies thus were meant to develop the students' aesthetic and ethical sensibilities, more than just their linguistic knowledge.

In language, Dawson's chief focus in discourse was drawn to "our own English tongue,"

which bids fair, like the Greek of old, to be the principal vehicle for the world-wide diffusion of the highest ideas in science, in politics and in religion; and which possesses models of lofty thought and of elegant expression equal to anything in classical antiquity, and more intimately connected with our better political institutions, our higher religious views, and our greater advancement in the arts of life. The philosophical study of its grammar and philological relations, the principles of style and composition, the critical examination of its highest literary productions, and the history of its literature, are of paramount importance to men in any profession or occupation that may at any time require them to speak in public, or to write their mother tongue. (Dawson 1855, 17)

Dawson's arrival at McGill therefore immediately led to a totally new curriculum, with a radical shift away from the previously established classical course of studies modeled on Oxford. This shift was made possible not only by Dawson's curricular concerns, but also by his administrative ability and the general growth he brought to the college.¹³ English Literature was taught by the Rev. W. T. Leach, who had been appointed Professor of Classical Literature in 1846, but under Dawson switched to English Literature, in 1858 assuming a new professorship endowed by William Molson, son of John Molson of Montreal, a well-known transportation, banking and brewing entrepreneur. Leach was a graduate of Edinburgh, and, like John Strachan, a Scot who took holy orders in the Church of England. Concurrent with his teaching duties, which included the professorship in Logic, Mental and Moral Philosophy and Rhetoric, Leach served as vice-principal of McGill, and from 1865 onward, as Archdeacon of Montreal (Collard 503).

¹³By 1860, with the five-man faculty of 1854 doubled to ten, the calendar shows the following course of study:

First Year--Classics, French or German, English Literature, Mathematics, History, Elementary Chemistry.

Second Year--Classics, French or German, Logic, Mathematics, Botany, History, Elocution.

Third Year--Classics, French or German, Moral Philosophy and Mental Science, Mathematics, Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, Zoology or Chemistry.

Fourth Year--Classics, French or German, Rhetoric, Natural Philosophy and Astronomy, Mineralogy and Geology.

The 1860 McGill calendar lists the course in English Literature, offered only in the first year, as covering the history of the English language, English grammar, and the history of English literature and criticism of literary works, the latter using Spalding's textbook. A note in the calendar indicates that composition exercises were included in the course. Rhetoric, taught in the fourth year, however, was a study distinct from composition. The 1860 calendar lists Rhetoric as follows:

History, Sphere, Uses, &c.--Exposition and Classification of Rhetorical Figures--Style--Different Species of Composition and Rules applicable to each.

This was the traditional rhetoric program, whose objective was excellence in public discourse rather than the analysis of literature, the objective of the Wilson's 1870s rhetoric in University College, Toronto.

In addition, the calendar listed a special course in Oratory and Elocution, taught one hour a week to second-year students by the elocution master of the McGill High School (Harris 1988, 18). The English language and rhetoric program instituted under Dawson was, therefore, highly utilitarian, focusing on the English language (including history, grammar, and literature), and on rhetoric (which taught the students the theory of language use), including both written composition and oratory. This practical focus was reflected in the final line of the calendar entry on Oratory and Elocution, which read "Extempore Speaking--the means

of acquiring it." The English and Rhetoric program of 1860-61, however, as yet included little direct contact with literary works.

The emphasis on literature was soon to come. By 1864-65 Leach had developed an honors program which included works from Chaucer, Spenser, Marlowe, Shakespeare, Milton, Bacon, Dryden, and Pope (Harris 1988, 24). As occurred at Toronto, however, the direct reading of literary works was not immediately included in the pass program, though the English pass program itself expanded. By 1870, the calendar included English Literature in each of the first three years, but the texts through the decade continued to be literary histories.¹⁴ However, a close attention to composition was reflected in the inclusion of Alexander Bain's English Grammar. Rhetoric, still taught from Whately's text, was moved back to the third year. But the emphasis on literature by 1871 saw Oratory and Elocution dropped as a requirement, though it continued as an option for some time (Harris 1988, 18).

¹⁴The 1877 examinations reflect a continuing emphasis on general histories for the pass course. Questions on literature include the following:

9. Give some account of the chief romances of the Arthurian scenes.
10. State what you remember of the remarks of the Troubadour poetry.
11. Relate the story of Guy of Warwick.
12. Enumerate the Canterbury Tales and give the story of the Prioress.
13. Give the substance of the critical remarks on the productions of Lydgate, and mention his principal productions.

In 1872 McGill enticed John Clark Murray from Queen's, so Leach was able to give up his teaching of philosophy. Then in 1879, with administrative duties mounting, Leach was further assisted by the arrival of Charles E. Moyse, a former student of Henry Morley at University College, London. Moyse was brought in not as a specialist, but to teach English literature as well as history. In 1881, however, Moyse assumed the Molson chair of English Language and Literature. The assistance of Moyse led to further expansion in English. In 1880-81, the year before Moyse assumed the Molson chair, a fourth year pass course on special subjects was included in the calendar; the course included Chaucer's Prologue and Shakespeare's Hamlet. The second year listed "a detailed course on some period of English literature." Whately's Rhetoric remained the basis of the third year of the English Language and Literature program.

Under Dawson and Leach, the McGill program in the English language arts thus became one of the most practical in all the colleges included in this study. Not only did it contain in its basic program oratory and elocution (which was later available at night, for an extra fee), but it included rhetoric in the English program from the mid-1860s on. Composition was stressed throughout, as were grammar and the history of the language and literature. And as soon as staffing appears to have allowed it, McGill expanded the offerings in literary works. Unlike Toronto, which turned to philology when assistance became available, McGill

introduced the reading of literary works into the pass curriculum. However, the history of the language and literature maintained precedence over the reading of literary texts. Like Toronto, McGill initiated literary analysis and the reading of specific literary texts in the honors program, undoubtedly also following the early pattern set in Britain. However, the growing influence of English literature was marked already in Leach's regime, and with the coming of Moyse, that aspect of the program grew, by 1881 already replacing the material on the history of the English language.

The rising preeminence of University College in Toronto and McGill in Montreal in part reflects the economic ascendancy of these two cities in Canada. But other factors also played a role in the slow development of the eastern universities in the 1860s, not the least of which were the continued difficulties resulting from initial Anglican exclusiveness in higher education. In New Brunswick, the Anglican traditions at King's College in Fredericton brought conflict to a head by mid-century. Though the college had been freed from Church of England restrictions in 1828, resistance to the college's Tory foundations continued, with criticism focused on the narrow curriculum. In 1854, the legislature empowered Governor Edmund Head to appoint a commission of inquiry to study the college. Governor Head himself saw the need for a broader curriculum than that being offered. He feared that the son of a merchant at Miramichi or Saint John

"would reap but little benefit from the Principal's two weekly lectures on Aristotle's Ethics or Horace's Epistles, however valuable they would be as portions of a complete academical course in the Oxford system" (Bailey 28). Oxford-educated, President Edwin Jacob resisted the changes advocated by the majority of his faculty and then by the governor's commission, which included J.W. Dawson, at that time still superintendent of education in Nova Scotia, Egerton Ryerson, superintendent of education in Upper Canada, and Francis Wayland, president of Brown University and internationally renowned as an educational theorist. In 1851, in response to discussion in the legislature to change the college into an agricultural school, Dr. Jacob clarified his educational philosophy at the annual Encaenial Exercises. His speech presented clearly the traditional attitude imported from British Anglicanism's exclusive university context in Oxford and Cambridge:

we must not listen to the cry which calls us from the pursuit of truth and virtue to the lower paths and grosser occupations of the multitude; we will not yield to the suggestions which would tempt us to pander to the unworthy passions, flatter the prejudices and vain conceits, or court the boisterous plaudits, of factions or the casual crowd. But we may, we must, we will, as far as it shall please God to grant us power and opportunity, exert our best endeavors to communicate know-

ledge intrinsically valuable, with the disposition to use it for the common benefit. (qtd. in Bailey 62)

"The fact remains, however," says Professor Desmond Pacey, "that in Jacob's thirty years as president, only one hundred and one candidates had been granted the B.A." (qtd. in Bailey 62).

Governor Head's commission recommended the following modernized course for the University of New Brunswick: First Year: Greek, Latin, Mathematics, and Modern Languages, including English; Second Year: Chemistry, Natural History (Physics), Mineralogy, and Geology, in addition to three subjects of the first year; Final Year (of a three-year program): Natural Philosophy, English and History, Mental and Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity (Falconer 1927, 110). The 1862 calendar translated those recommendations into a weekly class in composition, in addition to classes using Quackenbos' Composition and Rhetoric. The subtitle of an 1876 edition of this textbook, written by the "Principal of the Collegiate School, New York," reflects a varied content, suitable for a class coming from diverse backgrounds: A Series of Practical Lesson on the Origin, History, and Peculiarities of the English Language, Punctuation, Taste, the Pleasures of the Imagination, Figures, Style, and its Essential Properties, Criticism, and the Various Departments of Prose and Poetical Composition; Illustrated with Copious Exercises. Adapted to Self-Instruction, and the Use of Schools and Colleges. From 1852 to 1871, the professor of modern languages, which at UNB included

English, was Baron Marshall D'Avray, educated at the French court by his father, tutor to the Duke of Orleans, later King Louis Philippe. D'Avray had come to New Brunswick in 1848 as master of a new provincial normal school. He also served as superintendent of education from 1854-58 (Hamilton 473). D'Avray's task in teaching English (and French) was not easy. His annual reports to the college president in 1863 and 1864 reflected the conditions and facilities, as well as the content of his course. In 1863, he reported his students' weakness in English writing:

The experience of every year has convinced me that however successfully a young man may have presented his studies in Classics, in Mathematics and in Science, he yet in almost every instance, fails in a knowledge of his native language unless he has in addition to other branches made it a subject of special study.

To remedy the problem, D'Avray had required his English literature class to write weekly "a comprehensive and exhaustive analysis of one or two Chapters of Quackenboss's [sic] Rhetoric," followed on the third day by an oral examination on the material. On Saturdays his students read "a Composition upon some subject which I have previously appointed & explained." The system was, therefore, based on analysis, on models, and on extended writing and speaking. According to D'Avray's reports, their compositions

showed "decided marks of progress in increased facility of expression and in greater correctness of style."

The 1863 report also reflected the straightened conditions of D'Avray's classroom situation. He deplored the need for combining classes of students in different years, pointing out that the proper sequence of moving from rhetoric to the history of literature (using Spalding's text) could not be followed.¹⁵ The report for 1864 repeated a number of the items mentioned in

15

I have always thought and I am daily more impressed with the conviction, that in order to ensure the Systematic progress of the Students both in English and in French, they ought to be divided into three classes: Freshmen, Junior, and Senior and I wish this to apply particularly to the English Classes in and for the following reasons: . . . a systematic course of study cannot be pursued, because in order to avoid making the Seniors use the same Text book as was employed in their Junior year, the Text book has to be changed, and although it would be most desirable that after having studied Quackenboss the Freshmen should study Spalding's History of English Literature, it is impossible to do so, and another work has to be substituted quite out of any regular course. The same remarks apply to the study of Composition and in a greater degree. The Freshmen cannot join the more advanced Class composed of Juniors & Seniors, and I am necessarily obligated to take them separately, and for a shorter time than I could wish, and of course to give less time also to the others. Permit me to mention another & very great advantage which would result from the formation of three Classes instead of two, & from the establishment of a systematic course of Study. I allude to the supply of necessary books which could then be provided by the University in sufficient numbers to meet the demand. (D'Avray 1863)

1863. D'Avray again cited the students' lack of preparation for college-level study and his work on the students' writing style, which improved to the point of showing "a knowledge and appreciation of the rules of Rhetoric," and a "freedom from the purile [sic] ideas childishly expressed," advances which proved "that the reasoning faculties [had] been exercised and. . .the Imagination . . . awakened to the sense of correct conception, logical inference and of pure expression" (d'Avray 1864). D'Avray's concerns reflected clearly a utilitarian approach, as opposed to President Jacob's earlier highly Oxonian conservatism.

D'Avray died in 1871, and was succeeded by Thomas Harrison (M.A., Dublin). The 1870-71 calendar listing Harrison provided little change in the curriculum, but by the beginning of the next decade the English curriculum shifted radically toward a reading of literature. By 1881, the Ordinary Course of the first year read extensively from Johnson's Lives of the Poets, as well as Shakespeare's Macbeth, in addition to studying grammar and composition. The second year read the poetry of Milton (short poems), Dryden and Pope, in addition to selections from Palgrave's Golden Treasury. The senior year substituted philosophy and economics for English. In the honors stream, the first year read Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare and Bacon; the second year read Milton's Paradise Lost (I and II), Cowper's The Task (II), Wordsworth, and selections from Matthew Arnold, in addition to further selections from Palgrave's Treasury. This shift toward

literature indicates that within thirty years New Brunswick too was swept along by the current flowing from the study of rhetoric in the classical languages to English composition in writing and speech, combined with the history of English, and ending in a reading of British literary texts in the vernacular.

Nova Scotia, like New Brunswick, was hampered from the beginning of the century by sectarian exclusiveness, but in Nova Scotia the Anglican college at Windsor struggled through the century, perhaps avoiding public demands for change because of its location away from a major city. The presence of Dalhousie in Halifax may also have detracted from a public focus on the conservative curriculum of King's College. King's, therefore, remained small and Anglican, with a unified Oxford-style curriculum. The 1870 calendar entry reflected the nature of the curriculum.

The course of instruction is so arranged as to embrace the successive study of the best Classical authors, the Hebrew Language, Logic, Rhetoric and Ethics; the several parts of Mathematics, Natural Philosophy and Astronomy; Chemistry and Natural History. The Modern Languages, comprising German, French, Italian and Spanish Literature and Conversation, are practically taught. All the students are instructed in the Greek Testament, in Bible History and the Evidences; and separate classes are formed for such members of the

University as desire instruction in Systematic Divinity and Pastoral Theology, with a view to entering on the ministry of the Church.

The study of rhetoric was conducted through the reading, in the original, of Aristotle's Rhetoric and of Cicero's De Oratore (Whately is added as supplementary reading). The only reference to English in the calendar is found in a note on "Exercises," which proposed a weekly thesis for an "Essay to be written in English and Latin alternately." King's pronounced conservatism was reflected in the fact that this weekly essay, alternating Latin with English, still followed the requirements of the original 1802 statutes. As late as 1876, Alexander Marling's The Canada Educational Directory and Year Book for 1876 lists no course in English at King's College in Windsor.

Given the traditional character of the King's College curriculum up to 1876, it is surprising then to find an English program focusing almost entirely on literature by 1880. The 1880-81 calendar lists for Responsions (an exam after the fourth term, but before the sixth) Richard III; Paradise Lost, Books I-III; Macaulay's Essays, "Warren Hastings"; and Trench's Study of Words. The examination for the B.A. also focused on English literature: Shakespeare's Henry VIII, Macbeth; Milton's Comus, and shorter poems; and Macaulay's Essays. The English literature exam also included Addison, and Hallam's Constitutional History, Formal Logic, and the composition of an English essay.

The honors examination included an additional four plays of Shakespeare, in addition to works of Spenser, Pope, Bacon, the History of English Language and Literature, Whately's Logic and Rhetoric, and, again, the composition of an English essay. Unique in this program was the strong emphasis on the reading of texts in the pass program, with the history of language and literature confined to the honors program. But even more unique was the sudden development of a literature program without the intermediate developmental stages emphasizing British literary history, and often philology, found in most of the other Anglo-Canadian colleges. The sudden shift at King's was similar to the sudden appearance of English literature at Trinity in Toronto, the other Anglican college in Canada at the time, though Trinity's program under William Clark also included a smattering of history and philology. The sudden strong emphasis on literature at Windsor suggests a strong emphasis on refined culture, which would have followed the Oxford tradition of Windsor as an exclusive Anglican college. The emphasis on aesthetics in the classics curriculum had become an emphasis on aesthetics in the vernacular.¹⁶

¹⁶These shifts from the classical curriculum to the vernacular at both King's and Trinity Colleges may have been influenced by revolutionary changes to Oxford and Cambridge, in the 1871 repeal of the British Test Acts, which had historically kept these two college exclusively Anglican (Moorman 409). The curricular changes to the Anglican colleges in Canada may also have been influenced by curricular innovation in England. W. W. Skeat was appointed to the new Elrington and Bosworth chair in English philology at Cambridge in 1778. King's College, in London, had,

This review of college curricula ends with Dalhousie, a leader in the development of the English curriculum in the last decades of the century. When Dalhousie reopened in 1863, after closing upon Thomas McCulloch's death in 1843, a second native Nova Scotian and also a Pictou graduate, James Ross, became president. Ross brought to Dalhousie the same energy that Dawson brought to McGill. Among the remarkable faculty that Ross attracted was James DeMille, professor of history and rhetoric, according to Robert Falconer, early twentieth-century president of the University of Toronto, "one of Nova Scotia's leading men of letters" (Falconer 1927, 101). DeMille was born in 1833, of stern Baptist parentage of loyalist stock. In 1849 he matriculated at the Baptists' Acadia College, but spent only one year there before embarking on an eighteen-month tour of Europe with his older brother. Upon returning from his travels, he enrolled as a sophomore at Brown University in Providence. In 1860 he accepted a professorship in Classics at Acadia University, but in 1864 he shifted to rhetoric and history at Dalhousie, where he remained until his death in 1880. He had extraordinarily wide interests and a wide knowledge of languages. Among his books left to Dalhousie College were hymnologies of the early Christian Church, and books in both classical and modern Greek, as well as in Persian, Sanskrit, Gaelic, Spanish, Icelandic, French, German

of course, had English literature since the days of F. D. Maurice at mid-century.

and Italian, many with his own marginalia. His works indicate this breadth of learning and reflect his reputation even today. In 1878 he published The Elements of Rhetoric, seven years in preparation. And in his papers he left two works published posthumously: A Strange Manuscript Found in a Copper Cylinder, an anti-utopian travel novel that today would probably be written as science fiction, and Behind the Veil, a mystical poem in which a mortal is guided into a brilliant realm beyond death in search of his love. During his lifetime, DeMille was noted chiefly for his numerous books for youth and for his historical novels. A brief reprint in an 1871 Dalhousie College Gazette (Jan. 5) illustrates DeMille's extraordinary output:

Prof. James DeMill, who won his first fame four years ago by the "Dodge Club" in Harper's is a rapid worker. He is under contract to furnish four serial stories to various magazines in the coming year; it is related that one of his books, "The B.O.W.C." was finished in six days; and he completed, in six weeks, manuscript [sic] which he sold for \$2,000. All this is in addition to his regular occupation as Professor of Dalhousie College, Halifax, and the use [of] his leisure in preparing a textbook on Rhetoric.--Toronto Leader.

("Dallusiensia")

Given his commercial success, DeMille was clearly in touch with social expectation in English language and literature.

Dalhousie's curriculum, like that of most other Anglo-Canadian colleges, included an honors and a pass program, both of four years, though students could reduce the term to three years by attending three summer sessions extending from mid-April through June. The honors program involved additional courses in classics and mathematics in the third and fourth years, as well as additional work in either English or history. One elective course was dropped in the fourth year. The 1871-72 calendar showed Dalhousie offering a Bachelor of Science program in addition to the B.A., the difference focusing on the B.Sc. trading the study of Greek for an additional course in the sciences. Rhetoric was included in the first year for both courses, and each summer a course in the history of modern literature was offered.

In 1871, the first year Rhetoric course included both Whately's Elements and Campbell's Philosophy, as well as Angus' Handbook (a 500-page British grammar-school textbook of rules, exercises and examples), and two elocution texts. This collection of texts was replaced by DeMille's own text in 1878, though the originals and others remained on a recommended reading list. By then DeMille's first year course had evolved into a rounded but demanding program, the extent of which can only be apprecia-

ted through a full description:

RHETORIC

The Course includes Style, Invention, Method, the General Departments of Literature, Narration, Description, Exposition, Oratory, Debate.

Exercises in English Composition daily.

Essays on Stated Subjects weekly.

Text Book: DeMill's Elements of Rhetoric¹⁷

Books recommended: Quintilian's Institutes of Oratory, Whately's Elements of Rhetoric, Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric

ELOCUTION

Exercises every week, after Christmas Holidays.

Books recommended: Porter's Analysis of the Principles of Rhetorical Delivery. Russell's Elocution. Sargent's Standard Speaker. Lewis, How to Read. Nova Scotia Readers, No. 6, and No. 7.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE

ANGLO-SAXON.--Text Books: Comparative Grammar of the Anglo-Saxon Languages, F.A. Marsh, LL.D. Anglo Saxon Reader, F.A. Marsh, LL.D.

¹⁷DeMille changed the spelling of the family name (MacMechan 1906, 409-410n).

EARLY ENGLISH.--Text Book: Specimens of Early English, by R. A. Morris, LL.D., and W. W. Skeat, M.A., Part Second.
Books recommended: Earle's Philology of the English Tongue. Smith's Student's English Language.

ENGLISH LITERATURE

Text Books: Shakespeare's Macbeth. Bacon's Essays, 1-28.

ENGLISH GRAMMAR

Text Books: Maetzer's English Grammar. Angus' Handbook.

That DeMille insisted on comprehensiveness is illustrated by the 1878 Rhetoric exam (four hours), which included questions ranging from rules for sentence arrangement to definitions of "aesthetic" and "sublime."¹⁸

¹⁸The following questions present something of the scope of DeMille's exams:

3. What is the general rule for the arrangement of words in a sentence? Show how unity may be best observed.
4. Explain the following terms and show their relation respectively to perspicuity,--conciseness, diffuseness, repetition, digress. Mention certain cases in which perspicuity is not aimed at.
5. Enumerate the figures of interrogation, and give an example of each. Define and illustrate the elliptical figures.
6. Explain the following terms applied to style--epigrammatic, illustrative suggestive [sic], classical. What is the difference between euphony and elegance?
10. Explain what is meant by the term aesthetics. What are the chief sources of the sublime?

In the whole Rhetoric and English program, DeMille stressed cultivation of the mind above the more utilitarian concerns in oratory and composition--though his emphasis on elocution, including rhetorical delivery, and on daily composition exercises and weekly essays indicate that he attended thoroughly to them.

His Elements of Rhetoric devotes nearly three hundred pages to style (the treatment of which Archibald MacMechan describes as "one of the clearest and most complete ever written" --MacMechan 1906, 415), ninety pages to arrangement, seventy-five to the emotions, and a final one hundred to the different literary modes, with oratory and poetry given the most extensive treatment. His preface to the volume, however, states that "While. . .a knowledge of rhetoric is of great importance to the writer, it may be shown to possess a still higher value as a means of culture and educational discipline" (iv). As a true Victorian, DeMille considered cultural ideals as the goal of all education, regardless of how practical the course of study. In the convocation address of 1878, he compared the mental resources of nation to physical wealth. To the question, "Can a young country afford to let its best intellects give themselves up to these higher studies in science, philosophy or literature?" he answered,

A young country may do perhaps quite as well by developing the intellects of its people, as by working out the resources of its soil. The little State of Athens, which was quite poor in material things, managed in

this way to make its mark on the world, and left behind it a greater name than that of such commercial and manufacturing cities as Tyre, Carthage, and Alexandria. Florence had a greater fame than Hamburg, he said. And the influence of Scotland in the British Empire was due to her trained intellects; and for the same cause New England had stamped its impress upon the United States (1878, 17).

For DeMille, the study of Rhetoric was central to education. The fact that he worked seven years on his rhetoric text when he produced novels within weeks suggests the importance that DeMille placed on this scholarly work. Rhetoric was related to improving the individual. If rhetoric for Aristotle was related to finding the available means of persuasion in every situation in order to preserve his own freedom--to avoid being taken advantage of by others--the importance of rhetoric for DeMille was to find the available means of preserving one's own freedom from the tyranny of the immediate, be it an exam or the craving for wealth: "An educated man is not known by his diploma, but by his power among men, by his love of learning for itself, his resolve to shun delights and live laborious days." A love of study, he held, is "the salt of life, a quickener of the mind, saving it from decay." DeMille praised Horace for "preaching the high doctrine that we can best satisfy ourselves by limiting our desires," and he quoted approvingly Wordsworth's "The world is too much with us" (Dalhousie Gazette, Dec. 7, 1878, 17).

DeMille's program at Dalhousie, therefore, rivalled, if not surpassed in scope McGill's program under W. T. Leach. Both offered the theory and practice of rhetoric in writing and speaking, both included a full history of the English language, and both included the direct reading of an historical range of English authors.

The McGill and Dalhousie curricula represented a fortunate but brief balance between rhetoric and poetics, between practice and philosophy, between utility and appreciation. Their programs resulted from the converging of two traditions, the classical, now waning, and the idealistic and literary, about to enter a century of strength. This brief transition merged the nineteenth-century traditions of both England and Scotland with the insistence on the rhetoric of speech, which, in late nineteenth-century Britain, only Alexander Bain stressed. The very fact that this vitality in the English language curriculum in Anglo-Canadian colleges occurred in the decades surrounding Canadian Confederation suggests that public debate almost certainly generated some of this vitality as people in the colonies looked toward new challenges, which opened new possibilities in numerous fields. This balanced curriculum also still espoused a central concern for the student's development as a rounded human being, who, upon graduation, would affirm traditional social values emphasizing commonly held social and ethical conventions, generally based on traditional Christian principles consonant with

Old Country ideals. Even political confederation, therefore, did not free the Canadian mind from a colonial bent, reflected directly in the fact that the 1867 British North America Act remained a child of the British crown. Ideological forces that would have a strong impact on the teaching of English in Britain would therefore be transmitted directly to Canada in just a matter of years.

DeMille died suddenly early in 1880. His department was temporarily assumed by Rev. William Lyall, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics. In 1883 a second replacement arrived, J. G. Schurman, a Canadian with an M.A. from the University of London, where Schurman had studied under Henry Morley. Schurman's stay at Dalhousie was just temporary, but with his arrival the curriculum changed. DeMille's focus had been comprehensive but general. Schurman's was narrower and more thorough. Elocution was immediately dropped, and DeMille's rhetoric text was replaced by Bain's. Under Schurman, English was extended into the second year, and the reading list was altered to include in the first year the works of English authors of the classical period: Addison, Pope, Johnson, Collins, Gray, and Goldsmith. For the second year, English Literature (optional in 1883-84, but compulsory thereafter) added lectures on Chaucer and Shakespeare, plus "a critical reading" of five of the Canterbury tales and four of Shakespeare's plays. Schurman thus brought to Dalhousie an emphasis on the close reading of texts as emphasized by his

literary mentor, Henry Morley, at University College, London. In this, he prepared the way for his good friend and fellow Gilchrist scholar, W. J. Alexander, who would assume the George Munro professorship at Dalhousie in 1884, thereby becoming the first professor in a Canadian college to devote his teaching strictly to English language and literature--with a strong emphasis on literature. Thus Dalhousie too came under the jealous influence of English literature, with a consequent deemphasis on the history of the language and literature, and a withering of the practical, general arts of rhetoric, especially those unrelated to literary analysis.

From 1853 onwards, the rhetoric and English studies curriculum in British North American colleges, therefore, developed two strong tendencies. First, the evolving curriculum reflected a wide range of studies strongly influenced by the respective religious and national heritage of the curricular leaders in each college, but within that context, all colleges moved toward an increasingly secular curricular focus. Secondly, the curriculum evolved in a progression from some form of classical curriculum, taken by all students, to a system of options that, in the 1850s introduced the history of English literature, but, by the 1880s, emphasized the critical reading of British authors. The impact of national and religious traditions was most marked in the Anglican colleges, which retained the historic Oxford curriculum through most of this transitional period. Both Trinity College

in Toronto and King's College in Windsor, Nova Scotia, kept the historic Latin-based course of studies until the end of the 1870s, but both suddenly switched, within just a few years, to a critical reading of British authors.

The King's and Trinity curriculum, controlled by the Anglican Church, was not the only curriculum in the service of religion in the decades surrounding confederation. Victoria College retained a distinctive Methodist orientation through this transitional period, emphasizing both oral and written rhetoric. In this it remained close to its religious teaching and preaching traditions, though the emphasis on practical rhetoric within the context of a liberal education was undoubtedly influenced by nineteenth-century American liberal education as well. Although Victoria College prided itself in its Canadian loyalty,¹⁹ it still had strong American ties within Methodism. S. S. Nelles, for instance, took his first year at Victoria, but completed his education at Wesleyan College in Connecticut. Nevertheless, Victoria too moved strongly toward English literature under Alfred Reynar, who introduced English literary history almost immediately upon being appointed in 1866, and progressed steadily toward reading and criticism of original texts as the years passed. Though Victoria's curriculum, like that of Trinity and

¹⁹When Strachan cited the American influence in British North American colleges as a danger to British interests, Ryerson wrote Strachan a series of public letters strongly defending the loyalty of British North America's Methodists (cf. Strachan 1827, 10, and Ryerson 1828, throughout).

King's, was determined in large measure by religious interests, unlike the curriculum of the Anglican colleges, Victoria's program tended toward the practical. The shift toward the close reading of literature, therefore, conflicted with or, at least, balanced this utilitarian tendency.

Utilitarianism also marked the curriculum of the Presbyterian Queen's College. In early years, basic English grammar and composition were necessary in a struggling institution. Both composition and elocution were taught by John Clark Murray, oratory being a strength of the Presbyterian Church through the centuries. Although the lecture format of Scottish universities had undercut oratory, the small classes at Queen's were undoubtedly conducive to elocution. After Murray's departure for McGill in 1872, the Scottish emphasis on the history of English literature, and later a reading of British texts, also followed at Queen's.

The three largest colleges in this study, University College in Toronto, McGill in Montreal, and Dalhousie in Halifax all had fairly comprehensive English programs by the 1870s, and all showed the standard progression from literary history toward the reading of texts, with rhetoric in the classics moving to composition in English. The progression in Dalhousie was, of course, condensed, since Dalhousie did not reopen as a college until 1863, following McCulloch's death twenty years earlier. Other minor features, however, also distinguished the three

programs from each other. Toronto had no elocution. Here again, Wilson followed the Scottish pattern that emphasized writing, but not speech. McGill offered both composition and elocution, with elocution fading in the 1870s. Principal Dawson's utilitarian approach to education affirmed the need for English rhetoric, and the commercially-oriented Montreal constituency would have supported that. Given the presence of an elocution professor in a local high school, the course was natural. However, as student enrolments increased, W. T. Leach's Scottish emphasis swung toward composition and literature--a tendency perhaps hastened by his becoming an Anglican divine. Then, with the arrival of Charles Moyse from University College in London, the thrust toward British literature became dominant at McGill.

Under James DeMille, Dalhousie kept elocution in a strong rhetoric program until DeMille's death in 1880. DeMille's rhetoric instruction included both the aesthetic and practical features, harking to earlier rhetoric programs in the classics. But a growing emphasis on literature also followed the standard Canadian pattern, based on Scottish and English precedent. DeMille's inclusion of the history of English and of English philology, though limited by the fact that English was taught only in the first year, was also consonant with what happened in the other colleges.

The Anglo-Canadian experience in rhetoric and English studies between 1853 and 1884 thus covers a wide range, especially in

the 1860s and 1870s. Conspicuous by its absence in the whole spectrum is the absence of English courses restricted solely to composition, as advocated by Alexander Bain. The absence of the Bain approach though can be explained by the growing emphasis on literature in every college in this study. The study of rhetoric, including both writing and speaking, was considered utilitarian, which explains, in part, the fading of elocution in Canada, which turned more and more toward a literary culture fostered by reading in the last quarter of the century. Composition was kept as a simple necessity, for with the rise of criticism in the reading of literary texts, the written essay became the chief form of evaluating student work. The noticeable rise in emphasis on the reading of literature toward the 1880s represented a decided shift toward idealism and away from utility. In the choice between rhetoric and poetics, therefore, poetics had gained a distinct advantage by 1884. The reasons for this ascendance of poetics remains the final concern of this study of rhetoric and English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges of the nineteenth century.

The curricular developments in Anglo-Canadian colleges from mid-century onwards, therefore, took place in an environment of growing secularization. Whole institutions, like the King's Colleges at Toronto and Fredericton were taken from Anglican control and placed under secular authorities while the study of divinity was banned from the course of studies. Professors of

rhetoric, virtually all clergymen and generalists in teaching before mid-century, became laymen, often specializing in certain subjects. The emphasis in education changed from transmitting Christian values--in the early nineteenth century, ultimate values--to educating critical minds, and perhaps even valuing the search for scientific truth beyond the development of students as individuals. This shift in educational values generally led to a shift in curricular values, including the traditional rhetorical curriculum. The de-emphasis on tradition quickly led to shifting rhetoric from the classical course to English in what initially appeared to be a fullscale move toward the utilitarian in rhetorical instruction.

However, this movement toward the utilitarian was deflected by a deep cultural sense of emptiness at the loss of traditional values embedded in the Christian tradition, now weakened by the secularization of society and by ensuing attacks given focus by Darwin's alternative to the necessity of a divinity as the ultimate source of life. The apparent rush toward a utilitarian education in rhetoric and English studies therefore became directed into a search for an alternative to the Christian tradition. The study of English literature became this alternative, an alternative to replace especially the system of moral values lost with the weakening of Christianity. The shift to the study of English literature as a means of providing the sought-for alternative was especially thorough in Canada, as reflected

in the fact that the curricula of all colleges in this study had strong literature courses by the end of the 1880s. The specifics of the shift to a literature emphasizing cultural ideals are traced in the next chapter.

**CHAPTER 5: SPECIALIZATION, IDEALISM AND
BRITISH LITERATURE IN CANADA: 1884 - 1900**

In Anglo-Canadian English studies, the arrival of William John Alexander at Dalhousie College in the fall of 1884 marked the end of the transition from the traditional unified curriculum common to all students, to a specialized curriculum based on student options. This specialization was taught by a new class of English studies professor, for the first time teaching English literature and language exclusively. By the end of the decade, five Anglo-Canadian colleges had professors teaching only English: J. W. Alexander, appointed at Dalhousie in 1884, but moving to Toronto in 1889; James Cappon, Queen's, 1888; Archibald MacMechan, Alexander's replacement at Dalhousie; Charles Moyse, McGill, appointed to a dual English-History position in 1878, but given strictly English duties early in the 1880s; and William Tweedie, a Mount Allison and London (M.A.) graduate, appointed at Mount Allison in 1887.

Specialization brought with it a new focus in English studies. The new narrowed courseload of English professors might have permitted them to teach a full spectrum of courses related to English language and literature, perhaps modeled on the classical approach to rhetoric and poetics, but now featuring the vernacular rather than Greek and Latin. Such a course of studies would have been similar in scope to that of Demille's English

offerings at Dalhousie in the 1870s, or Leach's at McGill at the time of Confederation. Because the new specialists had more time to devote to English, and often more expertise than their generalist predecessors, their courses might have developed each of the various aspects more thoroughly than was the case in programs of the 1860s and 1870s. The earlier Dalhousie English program, for instance, had been confined to a single year because DeMille was responsible for history classes as well as for English language and rhetoric. However, specialization did not lead to this broad approach to English studies. The drive toward an increased emphasis on English studies in nineteenth-century Canada, as in Britain just decades earlier, grew not primarily out of a concern for students' rhetorical facility but out of a concern for cultural ideals. In 1878, DeMille had acknowledged this Anglo-Canadian English studies emphasis in the introduction to his rhetoric text.

While. . . a knowledge of rhetoric is of great importance to the writer, it may be shown to possess a still higher value as a means of culture and educational discipline. By culture is meant the refining and humanizing influence of art or letters, through which one attains to a more delicate sensibility of taste, and a higher and purer stage of intellectual enjoyment. As a means of culture, literature is at once more

accessible, more effective, and more enduring than art.

(The Elements of Rhetoric iv)

The hierarchy of values that placed the culture of the mind above utilitarian concerns, as reflected in DeMille's attitude here, would be affirmed strongly in the following decades.

DeMille's comment was made within the context of a strong rhetorical concern; by the end of the century, the new specialists would, if not actively depreciate that rhetorical concern, so strongly affirm the importance of literary insight over rhetorical expertise that rhetoric would be largely reduced to a writing of the expository essay--and that often without focused instruction, but rather as a means of evaluating the students' thoughts about the literature they were reading. The purpose of the new literature course drove English studies to emphasize the ideals of contemporary British culture presented powerfully in the works of Tennyson, Browning, Ruskin and Macaulay, and especially by Matthew Arnold. In this new regime, formal composition instruction was relegated to an often minor part of the first year program. College-level instruction in public speaking as part of English rhetoric disappeared entirely in Canada's leading colleges.

Instead of providing a broad rhetoric and poetics curriculum, therefore, the new English specialty narrowed the curriculum to a strong, virtually exclusive emphasis on literature. Of the traditional rhetorical elements in reading, writing, and speak-

ing, English studies came to focus strongly on reading, with a markedly reduced but continuing emphasis on philology and the history of the language in order to assist the students in their reading. As mentioned above, the writing that was required often was simply an evaluation adjunct to this reading as well.

The impetus for this narrowing in Canada, as it had been in Britain, was a new emphasis on cultural ideals in literature to replace the waning cultural influence of traditional Christianity. Like Britain, Canada felt as a shock the surge of science, a surge that undermined presuppositions hitherto held sacred, without question. Two of the foremost defendants of traditional religion in the nation were pillars in the university system. The first was Daniel Wilson, Professor of History and English Literature and then President of University College in Toronto, and J. W. Dawson, a geologist with an international reputation and President of McGill College in Montreal. Neither could adequately present what quickly became an outmoded interpretation of scripture in order to meet the needs of the new generation of students committed to scientific logic in all of their studies, including the liberal arts.

As the influence of these men waned, partly because of their age, and partly because of the strength of the new views in biology and geology especially, a new Hegelian idealism deriving from Glasgow and centered especially in Queen's, but influential throughout the nation, combined with the new emphasis on British

literature to offer a rational philosophical integration of Christian values and literary ideals to a university culture led by the historic colleges of Anglo-Canada. The correspondence between this new literary-cultural orientation and the needs of its supporting late-Victorian society was so close that the new English curriculum swept over the traditional English studies concerns, providing, by century's end, a remarkably unified curriculum across the nation, including the new colleges being established in Canada West. This idealistic literary curriculum would maintain its remarkable influence over English studies in anglophone Canada for six decades into the twentieth century. Indeed, that late-Victorian curriculum forms the core, though comparatively much reduced from its predominance early in the century, of English studies in virtually all Anglo-Canadian universities even today.

The philosophical impetus for the idealistic curriculum originated in Britain, first in the rise of science, and then in the development of neo-Hegelianism combined with Matthew Arnold's approach to British literature as vital in the national culture. But social developments in Canada supported the rise of this new idealism central to the specialization that developed in Anglo-Canadian English studies. In the aftermath of Confederation, Canadian colleges expanded quickly as the economy grew. In addition, the women's education movement gained momentum, by the 1880s and 1890s leading to co-education in all major univer-

sities. This integration of women into the college population had an especially strong impact on the new English studies, for, as noted in the discussion of the same movement in Britain, educators were convinced that a special affinity for literature was associated with the female psyche. The influx of women into college classes, therefore, swelled the ranks of late-Victorian English lectures in Canada.

By the latter half of the nineteenth century, specialization modeled on German university studies had also become attractive to college educators in Canada. In 1877, James Loudon, the first native Canadian to be appointed as professor at University College in Toronto, proclaimed the advantages of the German system in a speech to the Canadian Institute. He focused on the division of labour that allowed specialized research. The University of Toronto had had limited specialization from 1853 onward. Daniel Wilson, for instance, had been hired to teach English literature and history. But Wilson had had no specific preparation for his position, having studied the general, classical program in his native Edinburgh. Loudon looked for research specialists in specific areas. Though the teacher was "not relieved from the duties of the lectureroom or the work of the laboratory,. . . his subject [lay] within narrow limits," so he was "not only enabled to teach but to devote a lifetime to his special subject" (qtd. in McKillop 1987, 86). In the 1882 annual university lecture at McGill, President Dawson reviewed the need

for a new focus in Canadian education, which he held should follow British and continental universities: "The essence of a University education consists in its being given not by general teachers but by specialists, combining general culture with eminence in particular departments" (11). Though poverty had forced compromise, Dawson stated that the situation at McGill had to change. He then quoted Daniel Wilson, who had recently pointed out that while students had been multiplying from dozens to hundreds the staff of teachers had remained unchanged. Wilson pointed out that comparisons with Britain and the continent reflected poorly on the Canadian situation:

In nearly all [British and continental institutions] it will be found that provision is made for a much greater division of subjects. Instead of one professor of classical literature, as in University College, it is usual to make separate professorships of the Greek and Latin languages and literature. Separate chairs of mathematics and natural philosophy take the place of what is here a single professorship. The same is the case with zoology and botany; and not only is history a chair distinct from that of rhetoric and English literature, with which it is here conjoined, but ancient history is constituted a separate chair from modern history; while in many cases the

latter is conjoined with political economy, or is made to embrace the important subjects of constitutional history and jurisprudence. (qtd. in Dawson 1882, 12)

The advance of specialization was, of course, related to the shift from an emphasis on classical languages and learning to an emphasis on contemporary learning and on the vernacular. German universities had given lectures in the vernacular for more than a century, and it was this that enabled their research to progress as quickly as it had in the nineteenth century.

The shift from Latin to English in lectures involved more than a shift in language, therefore, and more also than a shift in scientific concerns from received knowledge to newly discovered knowledge. It meant also a shift in both the medium and the content of the literature that conveyed to new generations the cultural values embodied in a literary canon. The demise of classical literary culture became inevitable following the demise of classical studies. As the emphasis on classical learning waned, the importance of vernacular languages grew. With the new acceptance of the vernacular, research in both the sciences and the humanities expanded. Further, the new study of a vernacular literature demanded "research" in that literature, which itself demanded a reading of original texts. The growth of specialization, of research, and of the use of the vernacular were there-

fore intertwined in the late nineteenth-century development of universities in western Europe and North America.

Full specialization in English studies was introduced in Canada in 1884, in the person of W. J. Alexander. Prior to 1884, English and rhetoric had been taught by professors who had been educated only in the classical tradition with a fixed curriculum, and who also taught other subjects as well as English. Alexander's predecessor at Dalhousie, James DeMille, had been educated at Acadia College, and at Brown, in the period before advancing specialization in the curriculum was common. Indeed, until the founding of Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore in 1876, an earned doctorate among professors was rare in English-speaking universities. The doctoral titles of men like Egerton Ryerson, Daniel Wilson and J. W. Dawson were all honorary. It might be remembered that Daniel Wilson's chief research interest was ethnology, not language or literature, though Wilson was Professor of English History and Literature at University College in Toronto.

Born in 1855 in Hamilton, Ontario, Alexander, the son of Scottish immigrants, graduated as the only student in his high school class, and, after a year of private study under the tutorship of his collegiate teachers, won a scholarship to University College in London, where he took the honours course in English language and literature--as well as advanced work in chemistry and physiology, and in classics and German philosophy (Wallace

and Woodhouse 2). This pattern of seeking the best tuition continued for the learned Alexander, as he explained in later years:

As no advanced instruction in English Literature proper . . . was to be obtained in any university, either in America or Europe, I determined to continue in private my more direct study of the subject, and to avail myself of university assistance in gaining a wider knowledge of other literatures, especially those of the classical languages--which I deemed the best preparation for the study of any literature--and also in gaining a better acquaintance with scientific Philology.

In accordance with this plan I entered the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, (in 1879) where . . . availing myself of what assistance that University offered in English (which was, as far as I was concerned, Anglo-Saxon) I followed courses in Comparative Philology, Latin and Greek. (qtd. in Wallace and Woodhouse 3)

Following his graduation from Johns Hopkins, with a graduating thesis in Greek philology,¹ Alexander went to the University of Berlin for a final year of finishing in Germanic philology. As a preparation to teach English, therefore, Alexander had learned to

¹"Participial Periphrases in Attic Prose" was published in the American Journal of Philology 4 (1883):291-308.

read and appreciate English literature from Henry Morley at University College in London at the time when Matthew Arnold, the greatest Victorian critic of culture was at the height of his influence. Alexander had studied Greek literature with John Hopkins' B. L. Gildersleeve, America's leading Greek scholar, and he had finished with a year of Germanic philology at Berlin, the academic centre of philology developed by the famous Brothers Grimm. J. G. Schurman, a fellow Canadian Gilchrist scholar at the University of London, and a life-long friend, wrote of Alexander, "I venture to assert that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find a man. . .who could make any pretension to the richness, variety, and extent of Mr. Alexander's culture, especially on the literary side" (qtd. in Wallace and Woodhouse 2). Significantly, Alexander's Ph.D. was not yet in English, for no such degree could be had.

James Cappon was appointed to Queen's College, the Presbyterian institution in Kingston, in 1888, when "even opulent Toronto had not yet a full-time professor in English" (qtd. in McNeill 73). Cappon was born in Dundee, in 1854, and educated at the University of Glasgow, where, in 1879, he gained his M.A. in philosophy under the supervision of Edward Caird, Britain's leading idealist philosopher. After four years of tutoring and examining in English and philosophy in Scotland, he went to Genoa, where he studied languages, taught English, and wrote a book on Victor Hugo. He returned to Glasgow after two years,

taking a post in a women's college and lecturing in the university extension system. Without good prospects at home, he was attracted to the department headship of the small colonial university, enrolling 400 students annually (Shortt 63). In a testimonial for Cappon, Edward Caird wrote, "In my class he was decidedly the first man of the year. I consider him one of the ablest men who have been educated in Glasgow within the last ten years; and I know no one who is more zealous to exercise and develop his power and extend his knowledge. His teaching would therefore. . . be no mere routine but a living influence" (qtd. in McNeill 73).

Cappon had studied under both John Nichol and Edward Caird, but he was drawn more to literature than philosophy. He dryly confided to the Philosophical Society, "The best thing you can do--after you have taken the medal in philosophy--is to try to turn your technical phrases into current English." His junior colleague in English, W. E. McNeill, remarked that Cappon believed that "through literature he could teach all the Philosophy it was useful to know" (McNeill 77). At Queen's, Cappon was chosen over such applicants as Archibald MacMechan and Charles G. D. Roberts. For the course he taught, combining English literature and philosophy, he stated that he had an admirable preparation, having studied under illustrious professors in each of these fields.

Archibald McKellar MacMechan, born to a Kitchener, Ontario minister's family in 1862, was, like both Alexander and Cappon, also of Presbyterian background (his father was Irish Presbyterian), and, like Alexander, seven years his senior, a product of Hamilton and a graduate of Johns Hopkins. As an undergraduate at University College in Toronto, he enrolled in Modern Languages in 1880. In Varsity, the student newspaper, MacMechan wrote a column entitled "Bohemian," which reflected his attitudes toward a literary lifestyle:

We hunted out German families in the city to board with, to improve our German; we spent our vacations in Quebec, to improve our French; we taught peanut vendors in the Italian Sunday School, to improve our Italian. We worried the authorities into bettering the courses. We cultivated literature on a little oatmeal; we published an anthology of our own immortal writings; we astonished the world with a new Protestantism. . . . We went to England as cattle-men, that we might stand in the Abbey in Poet's Corner and see with our own eyes those sacred places which had belonged to the geography of Fairy-Land. We read 'Sartor'. . . our greatest oath was, By Saint Thomas of Carlyle. (qtd. in Shortt 43)

Following college, MacMechan taught at Brockville and Galt before taking a doctorate in Modern Languages at Johns Hopkins, beginning in 1886. Graduating in 1889, he moved to Halifax to

take up the George Munro Chair in English Language and Literature, newly vacated by Alexander's move to Toronto. MacMechan's doctoral dissertation also was not in English but in German and Italian: "The Relation of Hans Sachs to the Decameron."

That the preparation for teaching English as a specialty at the end of the nineteenth century varied is reflected in the formal education of Alexander, Cappon and MacMechan. Significantly, the extensive linguistic training of none of the three translated into a broad language emphasis in any of their teaching. That each focused narrowly on literature was thus not a matter of their own backgrounds but rather a matter of their sense of what was most important in English studies--and what they considered important was obviously what their students and university constituencies considered important: the cultural ideals inherent in English literature. That they read the prevailing demands correctly is reflected in the fact that all three had long, successful careers.

Indeed, the hirings of Alexander, MacMechan and Cappon were institutional responses to a growing frustration in both secondary and post-secondary education, frustrations that had already begun in the 1870s, when English was split from the classics in the progressive high schools. The problems arose from a lack of textbooks, and, even more importantly, from a lack of teachers prepared to teach the new subject, since the teachers in the school system had studied only classics in their own college

years. Their knowledge of grammar was derived largely from Latin in any case. The study of literature developed slowly as well. When the Educational Journal began publishing in Toronto in 1887, the concern about English was so extensive that a monthly column was devoted exclusively to the subject:

The comparative neglect of the study of English, seen until recently in all the higher institutions of learning, and even now in some of them, and the suddenness with which special stress has been laid upon it in Ontario have combined to bring it about that teachers are required to teach subjects which they were not themselves taught in school, and concerning which they have no well defined views as to the proper modes of teaching.

The editorial commented that experience is gained not in one day, nor even in one generation. It noted that the uncertainty about what to teach in English classes was increased by the very inclusiveness of English as a subject. The problems were reflected in the lack of agreement in content between various exams throughout the province (168). The same volume of the Educational Journal included a comment that the extended effort to teach English was largely confined to secondary schools--the university lagged behind. The writer also complained that the teaching of literature resolved itself "largely into barren classifications and the figures of speech and other rhetorical devices." Aes-

thetic and philosophical criticism received "but scant attention" (236). The chair to which W. J. Alexander ascended in 1889 was a partial response of the City of Toronto to these complaints about weak English instruction, for that chair was endowed in perpetuity by the city in 1889 (Wilson 1889, 6). With the appointment of Alexander, the University of Toronto proclaimed itself a recognized leader in the teaching of English language and literature.

A further development strongly affecting the expansion of English at the University of Toronto first, and then at other Ontario universities, and, indirectly, honours programs throughout Canada, was an 1895 decision of the Ontario Department of Education to set the academic qualification for specialist standing in secondary schools as the holding of an honour degree. The specialist designation had first been established in 1885, when four specialists were required for a high school to be classified as a collegiate, which increased that school's provincial grant. The original specialties in 1885 had been classics, mathematics and physics, philosophy, and modern languages, which had included English. When the University of Toronto English honours course moved from modern languages to combine with history in 1895, English was accepted as a specialty.² The designa-

²The honour course in Modern Languages, with English as one of four options, of which the student was required to take two, continued to be offered in 1895, when the new honour course in English and History was established. For further details about

tion of specialist status provided for an extra stipend, as well as being a requirement for department heads, principals, and Department of Education inspectors (Harris, 1988 42). Owing to the strong influence of Ontario's system of education in the rest of Canada, especially in the West, the University of Toronto honours courses continued to play a strong role in the rest of the nation through the first half of the twentieth century. The result was a focusing of Anglo-Canadian English studies almost exclusively on a reading of British literary masterpieces as determined by W. J. Alexander's program--which, in turn, was heavily influenced by Matthew Arnold.

A further underlying prerequisite for the development of specialties, including English studies, was a growth in student numbers between 1870 and 1900. Even if the colleges before 1880 had wanted to specialize, the student numbers would not have permitted it. Reviewing the period between 1860 and 1880 across the nation, R. S. Harris points out that, "with the exception of McGill and Toronto the number of professors in arts remained in the three to six range, and at all institutions, including McGill and Toronto, the financial position remained precarious" (1988, 19). The total national enrolment stood at only 2,500, and only

the development of specialist status, see R. S. Harris, "The Development of the Specialist Certificate," Quiet Evolution: A Study of the Educational System of Ontario. (Toronto: UTP, 1967), 78-93. Harris's English Studies at Toronto: A History (Toronto: UTP, 1988), 40-41, provides a brief overview of the developments.

215 degrees were granted in 1880 from the twenty universities that had been founded from 1800 to 1880³. In the 1880s, however, Dalhousie and Queen's more than doubled their staffs, with enrolment at Dalhousie about 250 and Queen's slightly more by 1890. In 1891, McGill alone registered 900 students, and Toronto, 1500. Reflecting on the dramatic increase in college enrolments in the decade leading up to 1896, G. W. Ross, Ontario's Minister of Education, cited as reasons for this increase the expansion of settlement, the development of agriculture, improvements in transportation, the improvement of secondary schools (in 1896, Ontario had 23,000 secondary students), and the proximity of such institutions as Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Cornell and Princeton. Canadian authorities recognized that the only way to keep students from expatriating was to provide the needed facilities in Canada (Ross 1896, 5-6). The resulting enrolment increases provided the necessary conditions for the hiring of additional professors. These hirings, given the rising emphasis on Matthew Arnold's Wissenschaft within the university culture of the colonies as well as Britain, naturally led to the growth of university specialties, of which English was an important one.

Another reason for increased enrolments, especially in English, was the opening of university doors to female students.

³For a list of universities founded between 1789 and 1880, see R. S. Harris, A History of Higher Education in Canada 1663-1900. (Toronto: UTP, 1976), 13.

This development broke traditions deriving back through the Middle Ages to the early Christian church and the Pauline injunction for women to keep silence in Christian assemblies (I Cor. 14:34; I Tim. 2:11). Higher co-education was, of course, also a new phenomenon in English-language universities throughout the western world. As noted in Chapter 3, University College in London had opened degrees to women in 1878. In the U. S., Oberlin College had admitted women since 1833; most American colleges in the West were co-educational. Cornell was the first major eastern U. S. college to move to co-education, in 1872. In Canada, as elsewhere, the move had initial opposition. President Dawson addressed the problem repeatedly in his annual addresses to McGill University. In his 1880 address, he stated that the question of whether or not women should be educated had been all but resolved. The further question regarding the content and method of their education, however, still remained open. Economic considerations alone, Dawson said, suggested that women should be given the same education as men in co-educational settings. However, higher and broader grounds suggested a special education in separate colleges: first, the present professional requirements for men did not allow enough of the "higher ideal of aesthetic, intellectual and moral culture" that courses for women should include; secondly, "the ruder and stronger stimuli applied to young men" were not needed for women; thirdly, there were "practical inconveniences and dangers" attending co-

education, especially with a student body of "very different social grades"; fourthly, in the United States, where both separate and co-education were being tested, public opinion seemed to favor the separation of the sexes. (Dawson, 1880, 10-11). Dawson, therefore, firmly favored separate colleges for women.

In the annual address two years later, Dawson suggested that pressure for an expansion of women's education was growing, but that present funds could not cover the expense of giving women the same opportunities as men. Further, Dawson argued that his own experience in lecturing to women in extension classes showed that women were "more acute and receptive as to details and distinctions" than men, at least in the sciences: efficiency therefore indicated separate lectures. In 1884, a local benefactor finally offered support for separate classes for women. This was the state of affairs at McGill till the end of Dawson's principalship in 1892, though Dawson hoped for a full, separate college in the years to come.

At University College in Toronto, Daniel Wilson also favored separate colleges. In 1884 he wrote an open letter to the Ontario Minister of Education to outline his concerns. Wilson reminded the minister that women had a legal right to attend classes, and that a suit might be brought against the province if some young woman were barred from studying at the University. However, he suggested that legislation also called for "due order and discipline," which would certainly be disrupted by co-educational

tion. Few women in Toronto would wish to mingle with three or four hundred "fellow-students of the rougher sex," and older women, he argued, would not send their daughters to co-educational institutions. On the other hand, a Ladies' College would attract a large number of women. Further, as president, he also had assurances that parents would "hesitate to send their sons to a college where they were thrown into such intimate relations, as fellow-students, with strangers of the other sex." Wilson agreed with President Eliot of Harvard that poverty could be the only argument for co-education, since co-education required no separate classrooms. Therefore, as the "wealth and refinement" of the nation increased, co-education would lose favor even in those new communities of the western American states that now found it acceptable. Wilson objected to the views of the president of Oberlin College, who found marriage between students after graduation as normal, or, even worse, who accepted the fact that some students would actually leave school to get married. Wilson concluded his letter with a renewed call for separate facilities for co-education: "it will be a just cause of regret if the still unaccomplished object of the higher education of women is attempted to be carried out on a system of compromise and acknowledged inefficiency, from a reluctance to extend to it the same reasonable expenditure as has been ungrudgingly approved of in every other branch."

Given Wilson's resistance at University College, it is surprising that the generally conservative Trinity College in Toronto admitted women into classes in 1885. Perhaps the founding of a women's college at Oxford in 1875 emphasized the need for women's education. The provost of Trinity considered it important to provide influences and safeguards to obviate whatever was harmful, but he determined to "provide a common Christian home calculated to soften and ennoble the characters of the students." St. Hilda's College initially provided a separate residence and lectures for pass students, but the honours students were integrated, since the provost held that "the main disadvantages of co-education are unlikely to result in the case of higher lectures" (Trinity 56). However, within a few years increased numbers made even the initial separation impossible, so at Provost Body's resignation in 1894 all classes were integrated. At Dalhousie the matter of co-education failed to raise significant controversy, either before or after its inauguration in 1881-82 (Dalhousie Gazette, April 30, 1884, 143).

The advent of women onto Anglo-Canadian campuses, therefore, swelled the ranks of students in the last decade of the century, thereby providing sufficient numbers to support a specialized faculty. However, although the new, impressive enrolments provided the numbers to permit specialization, the content of those specialized courses was driven by ideology.

As suggested in the introduction to this chapter, the principal reason for the growth of English literature within the new specialty of English studies was the emphasis on English literature as presenting the ideals of a culture to a society whose religious ideals had been undermined in the previous decades. And, as noted in the discussion of the same phenomenon in Britain in the second half of the century, the philosophical idealism at the heart of Christianity--that is, the belief in ultimate reality as spiritual rather than material--was transferred from religion to culture. Northrop Frye recounts with humor the interrelatedness of Christianity and German idealism, which was so important to anglophone Canada in the decades surrounding the turn of the century:

Leacock has a story which I often turn to because the particular aspects of Canadian culture it reflects has never been more accurately caught. He tells us of the rivalry in an Ontario town between two preachers, one Anglican and the other Presbyterian. The latter taught ethics in the local college on weekdays--without salary--and preached on Sundays. He gave his students. . . three parts Hegel and two parts St. Paul, and on Sunday he reversed the dose and gave his parishioners three parts St. Paul and two parts Hegel. (qtd. in The Bush Garden 227)

English-speaking protestants, especially Methodists and Presbyterians, both highly influential in Canadian higher education, thought deeply about the truths of traditional Christianity besieged by the new rise in science. They thus looked with special interest to new philosophical systems that addressed their concerns.

A. B. McKillop states that "the historian of ideas in Canada quickly discovers how central the philosophy studied at Canadian universities was in helping to bring about the intellectual and spiritual accommodations made necessary in the Victorian era." He adds, "Much of that accommodation involved the interplay between certain strands of religion, science, and philosophy that found their way, as a kind of intellectual patchwork quilt, into the homes, the universities, and the churches of British North America in the nineteenth century" (1987, 96).

Central to this integration process was the thought of John Watson of Queen's University, who dominated Canadian philosophical inquiry between 1872 and 1922. McKillop's description of Watson's philosophy highlights the similarities between the concerns of Watson and Caird at Glasgow. Watson also attempted to dissolve the conflict between science and religion, to supply a higher reality than the material world, to emphasize noble thoughts without giving up intellectual rigor, and to package all this within an all-encompassing system based on reason. Watson's idealism, McKillop writes,

constituted a new conception of Design and Purpose operating in the universe, one that could encompass rather than capitulate to evolutionary science. It offered a critique of empiricism and put empiricists on the defensive by revealing the limitations of scientific enterprise without attacking science ad hominem. It cultivated a pious disposition, yet did not belittle intellectual inquiry. It showed the essential "rationality" of the universe and placed everything within the perspective of a new and modern interpretation of the Christian experience, even while defending the essentials of the faith as it conceived them. ("John Watson and the Idealist Legacy." McKillop 1979, 74)

Watson's was a system that put into teleological perspective the spiritual, intellectual and the moral ideals important to the late Victorian middle class, whether in Britain or in the colonies. And it provided the late nineteenth-century educated Christian with a metaphysical system almost perfectly tailored for the study of British literature. It easily encompassed the Christian orthodoxy of George Herbert and Alexander Pope, the morally active Nature of Wordsworth, the neo-platonism and "the everlasting universe of things" of Shelley, the "universal HERE" and the "everlasting NOW" of Carlyle, and the "culture" of Matthew

Arnold. Up to mid-century, the heart of the classical liberal arts curriculum had been the Christian religion. An easy transfer of ideal values from Christianity to literature now led to the new literature course as a replacement of the Christian philosophy and ethics and rhetoric courses that had been the capstone in many of the old, unified, classical programs. For the next seventy years, English literature remained the most common compulsory course in a curriculum that became ever more optional.

In the traditional classical program that, at its best, balanced rhetoric and poetics, and utility and philosophy, the cultural ideals of Christianity were wedded to the aesthetics of classical culture. This balance had been achieved at McGill, under Leach, and at Dalhousie, under DeMille--and we might include attempts at Queen's, under Murray, and at Victoria, under Nelles and the early Reynar. As the curriculum became specialized, however, philosophy became isolated from utility, and theory from practice. In some sense the goal of learning became a pursuit of truth as objectified in research rather than the education of the student. Of course, the student would also be educated by doing research, but the alteration of the balance toward the pursuit of truth and away from the ultimate interest and welfare of the student de-emphasized the significance of the practical features of education. In English, the growing emphasis on the importance of reading the text and the discovery of

philosophical truth and cultural values thus overshadowed the rhetorical or practical side of English studies. Though professors of English at the turn of the century acknowledged the need for instruction in composition, this concern was eclipsed by their interest in "the best that has been thought and said," judged from an Arnoldian poetic perspective.

The emphasis on the need for English studies to transmit the highest culture possible was reflected in the evolution of Victoria College's course under Alfred Reynar. Reynar formed a bridge between the generalist, rhetorical approach to English of the 1860s and 1870s and the specialist's approach of Alexander, Cappon and MacMechan. Alfred Reynar in 1891 was Dean of Arts, taught church history in the faculty of divinity, and carried the responsibility for Modern Languages, of which English and rhetoric were still units at Victoria. From his arrival in 1868 the literature courses in English had expanded steadily, but under his direction the program still included rhetoric and philology.

In 1890, Reynar still taught a broad course rather than a narrowly literary one. The examinations in pass English dealt with Anglo-Saxon history and culture, the Norman conquest and the Renaissance, in addition to a section on Shakespeare's Coriolanus. The first year pass course also included exams on rhetoric and on philology. The rhetoric exam, however, reflected a strong element of poetics in a conflation of literary analysis

and rhetorical figures. This focus on "the flowers of rhetoric" was, of course, traditional, but the late nineteenth century emphasized figures of speech more and more for critical poetics rather than for productive purposes in writing or speaking. Reynar's exam still included both approaches:

1. How is it that figurative language is more effective than the plain and ordinary mode of speaking? In illustration, use Antithesis, Epigram, and Interrogation.
2. Point out the difference between Metonymy and Synecdoche, and show the force of each of these figures.
4. What is the function of the Imagination? Distinguish from the Fancy. Show how the Imagination is related to Oratory and to Poetry.

The third question, too long to quote, presented a prose passage for analysis in the belletristic mode (criticism regarding figures, vocabulary, sentence and paragraph structure, simplicity and clarity, and "feeling and spirit"), while a fifth question presented a poetic passage for descriptive and metrical analysis. The honour examination included Chaucer, Milton and a section on prosody. The Victoria English program contained historical works as well as the traditional poetry, fiction and

drama, thereby indicating Reynar's interest in the history of culture generally, not just an aesthetic approach to literature.

Reynar's interests in English studies were reflected by his public speeches and writing as well as by his courses. The public writing exhibited the strong idealism of the period, an idealism that for Reynar tied English literature to deep Christian and classical traditions. In a baccalaureate sermon in 1889, he argued that godliness had historically brought success both to nations and individuals, but that opposition to God had led to failure. Reynar asserted the advantages of the classical traditions in both Britain and America, arguing that the Greek heritage in science, the Latin strength in administration, and the Christian heritage in religion provided the English culture with a "keener and stronger" moral sense than that of other nations ("Righteousness Exalteth a Nation"). In an unpublished address entitled "The Ancient Classics and the Modern Classics in Our Schools," Reynar argued again that nowhere was the biblical precept, "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" better taught than in the "best writings of the Anglo-Saxon race."

In another address to the Ontario chapter of the Modern Language Association, Reynar also explained his cultural-aesthetic theory, again emphasizing the ideal--in this speech, the means of apprehending it. His views of culture meshed with his reading of Matthew Arnold, whose definition of culture as the best thoughts of the best men he quoted. "Culture," added Reynar,

"is a law written in the heart and in the mind." One method of seeing this equation was through the sentiments, which were "the flags of the mind, not the perceptions and judgments, but the appetencies by which the mind goes out toward certain things and the aversion by which it turns from their opposites." Related to these sentiments, the study of literature was not to acquire knowledge (science was better for that), but to improve the culture of the imagination and the sentiments:

The imagination is simply that faculty by which we form true ideals, perfect images, faithful concepts of things--that faculty in fine by which we see things as they are in their eternal archetypes, and not merely as they may be imperfectly realized or discovered by experience. ("Literature and Culture" 125-131)

For Reynar, the highest form of literary interpretation was also idealistic, related to the human spirit rather than to reason. The best literature combined that spirit with cultural values. To the average Philistine, the importance of literature was "a mystery past finding out" ("Literature and Culture" 125). Methods of teaching literature were not logical--they could not be weighed and measured. Grammar and rhetoric taught literature superficially, scientifically, tending to suit examinations. In the best teaching of literature, the highest results came not from the "doing or saying of the teacher, but from his being;" the student felt "the vital warmth of the living soul or chill of

the soul that is dead whilst it still lives" ("Literature and Culture" 129-30). In Tennyson, "one of the greatest of Englishmen on the subjects that concern everyone," Reynar found a choice combination of literary spirit and ethical concern, and that union of real and ideal that captured the essence of the finest literature. In Memoriam especially reflected Tennyson's faith, rooted in the spirit, overcoming doubt, rising from reason.⁴ "It was of such seekers after God," Reynar comments, "that the Great Master said, 'Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.'" Especially in Tennyson's presentation of love, the secular was raised to the level of the sacred (for Reynar, the Christian faith):

The love that had once seemed human only and that had been associated with the 'sweet human hand and lips and eye' is now seen to be the expression or outgoing of the divine principle or passion rather that pervades nature and guides and rules the world. The human love, however, is not absorbed and lost in the higher divine love, but it is exalted, glorified and made immortal. This high experience of the poet is in keeping with the prayer of the promise of the Great Son of Man. . . 'If I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and

⁴The University of Victoria Archives include a manuscript entitled "On In Memoriam and the Religion of Tennyson," a complete stanza by stanza commentary on Tennyson's great long poem.

receive you unto myself, that where I am ye may be also' (John XIV,2). ("On In Memoriam" CXXIX)

The conflation of English literature with Christianity here was total. The ideals of one were the ideals of the other.

For Reynar, as noted above, the study of literature was also important in developing the imagination, which was the means of perceiving the ideal. In the context of this emphasis on the imagination and on the ideal, utilitarian matters such as grammar and rhetoric took a second place, necessary for a scientific age, but clearly within the sphere of the more philistine concerns of life. The same two-level perception that privileged literature and cultural ideals over the practical matters of composition and elocution within the general field of English studies would become standard in the last decades of the century.

Though J. W. Alexander was not a clergyman, his commitment to the ideals of the age were just as strong as was Reynar's. But Alexander approached the ideals from the secular perspective, through literature. This is not to say that Alexander had no interest in the traditional areas of rhetoric, or in philology, for he did; his education was simply too broad to ignore these aspects of a literary culture. However, the reality of the curriculum in which he was the only professor of language and literature at Dalhousie, and in which he had the assistance of but one assistant, David R. Keys, at University College, did not permit the development of a well-rounded English program at

either institution.⁵ Within the context of having to teach nearly three hundred students, specialization suggested narrowing the focus of English studies rather than keeping the focus broad and seeking some accommodation besides large lectures to deal with the problem. Further, in 1884, at Dalhousie, and again in 1889, at Toronto, Alexander was hired for his expertise and sensibility in literature, not for his expertise in rhetoric.⁶ Nevertheless, Alexander's concern for the utilitarian aspects of English studies was reflected in a request to the University College staffing committee in April 1891:

⁵Professor Harris (1988, 33) records the enrolments for the classes of Alexander and Keys at University College as follows (counting each hour of attendance for each student):

	<u>Pass</u>				<u>Honour</u>				<u>(TOTAL)</u>
	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	<u>I</u>	<u>II</u>	<u>III</u>	<u>IV</u>	
1890-91	193	102	48	47	65	61	39	30	585
1894-95	123	62	43	33	74	43	42	34	454
1898-99	105	65	67	54	77	36	27	49	480
1901-02	159	117	111	64	71	25	18	17	582
1904-05	102	83	79	38	90	59	34	45	530

⁶The full background to Alexander's hiring, especially at Toronto, is far more complicated than suggested above, of course. The creation of the Chair of English Language and Literature itself was the result of a dispute between the City of Toronto and the university. In addition, whether or not a Canadian should be hired was a factional issue within University College. And finally, whether the position should be filled by a philologist or a student of literature was not a closed issue until Alexander agreed to come from Dalhousie. Nevertheless, having made the choice, President Daniel Wilson concluded, "We have got the best man available and one that I have reason to believe will not discredit us" (qtd. in Harris 1988, 30).

Under the present system, by which the University takes no account, save through examinations, of the work done during the session, it is impossible to get students to do much in the actual writing of essays;. . .it is highly desirable that students should be required to write a certain number of essays each session, the proper examination and criticism of which would involve a large amount of time and arduous work not to be satisfactorily performed by a Fellow;. . . the addition of a lecturer who would take charge of this department is needful, if the University is to make provision for the proper study of composition. (qtd. in Harris 1988, 32)

The request was not granted. Late in the decade \$100 annually was allowed for "supplies and provision for reading essays." This was doubled in 1903 but reduced to \$150 in 1904 (Harris 1988, 32).

Alexander's request and the response revealed a number of issues relating to the relative importance of the various rhetorical arts at University College in the last decade of the century. First, it reflected virtually no concern, either by Alexander or by the university administration, for oratory, which was not offered as a course in any of the liberal arts programs. The fact that extra-curricular debating societies existed at the

university does not argue for the importance of oratory in the mind of university authorities, for the very fact that these societies were extra-curricular suggests that they were not important enough for the university to fund as part of the English program, or as a separate rhetoric or speech program.

Alexander's letter also undermines the traditional argument that matriculated students knew how to write, so the university had no need for formal composition instruction in addition to the regular writing that students did in their courses. It is true, of course, that the matriculation exams contained formal composition and grammar examinations, but these exams served primarily as screens to keep out students that could not cope with freshman level work: the composition and grammar exams did not themselves provide writing instruction. The inescapable conclusion, therefore, for the university's refusal to accede to Alexander's request is that the university itself, together with the constituency supporting the university, considered expertise in composition and oratory relatively unimportant in the total scope of the liberal arts program. The traditional rhetorical concerns central to a liberal education as conceived by Ryerson in 1842, or by McGill and Dalhousie just one generation earlier, were relegated not even to optional courses, but to unfunded, voluntary, extra-curricular clubs and, for those aspiring to be writ-

ers, to voluntary work in the college newspaper office⁷. The fact that Alexander raised the issue reflected his and others' awareness of the narrow focus of the University College English studies program--but it reflected also that in a forced choice between an immediately practical education and an education in culture, between rhetoric and poetics, the reading and analysis of literature was considered the more important. Alexander's request specifically for assistance in composition also suggests that the very concept of rhetoric as itself central to a liberal arts education, not simply as a means to a utilitarian end, was fading. For DeMille, the study of rhetoric was clearly a means of developing a refined, humanized, "delicate sensibility of taste, and a higher and purer . . . intellectual enjoyment." As more and more of this education in culture was taken from rhetoric as a study of productive communication, integrating the traditional cultural concerns of rhetoric into the study of literature, essentially a process of consumption, of taking in

⁷The specific rejection of composition at the university is reflected in the comments of W. H. Houston in 1887. In his "English" column, printed regularly in the first years of The English Journal, beginning in 1887, W. H. Houston stated that "the general object of our English training is to impart culture, and it is for this purpose the best subject in every stage of a student's course from infant class to post-graduate university." Houston, castigated the universities for their neglect of English, stating that though the study of English in the schools was defective, "the general practice of the teachers is better than the theory of the Provincial University." As a member of the University Senate, he had asked that the "study of English prose be made compulsory for rhetorical purposes," but his proposal was voted down. (The Educational Journal 1 [November 1887] 200-201)

rather than developing a personal artifact, rhetoric was sucked dry of its creative core. This process of reducing rhetoric to composition left the concern for students' writing but a shadow of what it had been just a decade or two earlier.

Although the University College English program of the 1890s did not reflect Alexander's total concerns, it did reflect his priorities. These priorities were shaped by his honours English program at University College, London: German philosophy, classical studies and honours English under Henry Morley. The classical studies Alexander considered important to his appreciation of aesthetics, a view if not derived directly from Matthew Arnold, at least supported by him. "Greece did not err," wrote Arnold in Culture and Anarchy, "in having the idea of beauty, harmony, and complete human perfection, so present and paramount" ("Sweetness and Light" 466). In Arnold, Alexander found that emphasis on perfection and on the ideal that was so important to late Victorians. For Arnold, culture helped one to "see things as they are, " by which he meant "to draw towards a knowledge of the universal order which seems to be intended and aimed at in the world. . .to learn, in short, the will of God" ("Sweetness and Light" 460). These ideals were also Alexander's ideals.

Alexander's views regarding the university course and the centrality of poetry for a liberal education were presented cogently in inaugural speeches, his 1889 inaugural address at University College largely repeating his Dalhousie inaugural in

1884. He began his 1889 speech by hoping that University College would one day have a chair devoted entirely to the English Language. In this he again voiced his awareness of the need for more than literature studies in the curriculum, but also his thinking in terms of specialization as prioritization if those total concerns could not be addressed. "In the scheme of that liberal culture which is the aim of college training," he said, "I think it will not be questioned that English Literature is the more essential and more important of the two." Having decided that literature should be privileged over other matters of English study, his approach was to teach literature well rather than to teach the whole range of English studies at a mediocre level. The fundamental benefit of the study of literature related to the human spirit and the health of society; namely, "that the student should escape from himself, his own narrow conceptions and surroundings, that he should sympathize with . . . men of very different character, in times and countries, perhaps, remote from his, with feelings and modes of thought even more remote" (1889, 10). The discipline of literature gave the "qualities of intellectual openness and flexibility," which, in turn, fostered "a tolerance and coolness of judgment especially characteristic of thorough culture" (1889, 11). Literature provided the "culture" of Matthew Arnold, a culture that preserved society from philistine anarchy.

The direct point of contact between the "culture" of literature and the mind of the reader was the style of each author.

Through style. . .we come in contact with that which is greatest in man, character,--that unity of tendency and impression which springs from all his moral and intellectual forces. . . . When style in that highest degree is present, we are not merely told how the writer felt, but his feelings are communicated to us; not how he saw, but we are enabled to see as he did; not what manner of man he was, but we are introduced into his very presence. In the sphere of studies, I know nothing comparable to this. (15)

Echoing Arnold's definition of culture as "the best that is known and thought in the world," Alexander asserted that the literature of genius opened to the reader "the best and most desirable we can conceive, the truest aristocracy of the human race in their happiest moods, with their wisest and deepest thoughts" (15). These wisest and deepest thoughts again had a practical result in ethical relationships: "The soul vibrating in sympathy with the great deeds and lofty character" finds no pleasure in anything that is ignoble or degrading" (1889, 23).

Of this highest form of literature, "literature which is literature first of all, not history, or science, or philosophy," there could be several varieties, but poetry was "the best and

highest representative." Quoting Arnold, Alexander stated that "The poet is in the fullest sense creative; the subjective factor reaches its maximum; and hence poetry is, in an especial degree, the subject of the student of literature" (17). Alexander held that the combination of style and emotion in poetry drew out the quintessential nature of mankind: it approached the absolute of religion. In both form and aim, poetry was "the highest species of literature. For the highest manifestations of human nature [were] emotional." Borrowing from Arnold again, he stated,

Emotion raises morality to religion. Nay more, the work of Christianity itself was to introduce the reign of emotion, to substitute for the tribunal of an unchanging code, the arbitrament of an inner and ever progressive emotional state. (1889, 17)⁸

For Alexander, the highest value in English studies, therefore, lay in the appreciation of noble human culture in literature. Translating this noble culture from print to life, Alexander, like Reynar, identified literature closely with religion. Fol-

⁸Compare with Arnold: "Some people, indeed, are for calling all high thought and feeling by the name of religion; according to that saying of Goethe: 'He who has art and science, has also religion.' But let us use words as mankind generally use them. We may call art and science touched by emotion religion. . . .

"'By the dispensation of Providence to mankind,' says Quintilian, goodness gives men most satisfaction.' That is morality. 'The path of the just is as the shining light which shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' That is morality touched with emotion, or religion" (Literature and Dogma: An Essay Towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible 16-17).

lowing Arnold though, Alexander moved toward replacing religion with literature, thereby investing especially British literature with those lofty cultural ideals that Christians had traditionally found in the Bible. In this, a new canon of British literature strove to replace the importance to Anglo-Canadian culture of the older biblical canon.

We must understand Alexander's priorities to understand his curriculum. Given the importance of the historical masterpieces in British literature, the works of highest value had to be separated from works of lesser value. Alexander thus categorized literature in a hierarchy. In some sense, all written thought was "literature," including the Elements of Euclid, the histories of Herodotus or Thucydides, or Darwin's On the Origin of Species. To become Arnold's cultured individual, one had to understand the development of history and the thoughts of one's contemporaries. In this sense, Alexander affirmed the need for the whole university curriculum, though he reserved the highest place for literature, both vernacular and classical. The study of composition, therefore, belonged in the curriculum, but at the level of the other utilitarian studies.

Given the prevailing attitude that college studies (higher education) should deal with matters of the spirit rather than matters of correct practice, Alexander's concern for rhetorical excellence in composition found expression in textbooks for the public school system. Alexander's views about the role of lit-

erature in education in schools paralleled, in large measure, his views expressed in his two important inaugurals, but in the school texts he gave more scope to composition. But here too culture was not forgotten. His approach to composition was to teach it within the context of developing the students' cultural sensibilities, for Alexander always subordinated the utilitarian to the cultural and the ideal. His major work in this area was a joint text with M. F. Libby, English Master in the Parkdale Collegiate Institute in Toronto. Following the lead of rhetoric in classical studies, Alexander's approach in Composition from Models: For Use in Schools and Colleges, was belletristic--based on the imitation of models. But here, too, composition was not divorced from the mental development of the individual student within the context of a liberal education. The major purpose of narrative writing in composition classes was to develop judgment and taste (19); in treating dialogue Alexander again stressed mental development: "The exercises wisely pursued will cultivate the imagination, broaden the mind by enabling it to take different point of view, and lead to appreciation of important phases of literature" (iii).

The emphasis on the development of the mind led ultimately to an emphasis on writing with the style that set apart the great artist from the rest of mankind. At its best, therefore, rhetoric moved toward poetics. The object of rhetoric was, ultimately, to enable the human character to express itself at its most

noble ideal. In general, Alexander and Libby agreed with the Romantic view that style could not be taught, but there were "certain tendencies in style which the immature writer ought to be warned against" (13). Further, good models could help any writer, even a genius, for "All literary skill" was "based on imitation" (7). The great geniuses themselves would, most of them, have improved their writing if they had had systematically studied a little more than most of them did the principles found in every good modern treatise on rhetoric (8). Genius, therefore, though innate, could be fostered and directed. Toward this end, the object of school composition instruction was not the creation of genius but the teaching of sound judgment, clear and correct diction, and proper arrangement.

Alexander's focus on composition in his collaboration with Libby in a school text might suggest that he was not comfortable in working on composition or that he needed help in focusing on school rather than college levels of writing. Both conclusions would be invalid, for Alexander's chief publications all his life were for English in the schools rather than for college readers. In writing Alexander's memorial for the University of Toronto Quarterly, both M. W. Wallace and A. S. P. Woodhouse stress Alexander's interest in school writing. Fully one-half of the forty-three entries in the checklist of Alexander's writings relate to school-level concerns, whether the text was an address to Ontario teachers or an introduction to one of the fourteen

collections of poems, short stories or models for composition that Alexander published. In all of these, however, his primary interest centred on the importance of literature as a means to culture, not in their use as models for the students' own composition alone. In his introduction to Select Poems, 1898, entitled, again, "The Study of Literature," Alexander reiterated the importance of presenting children with ideals rather than emphasizing the practical, which, though necessary, was too often seen as the sole purpose in studying literature. Literature used for the teaching of composition was "more practical though less important" than using it for literary study (13). In schools as well as in colleges, therefore, Alexander's interest lay in "the educational value of the artistic in literature," the purpose of which was to communicate "beauty and perfection of outward form," which itself pointed to "the spiritual significance underlying the arrangement of materials" (11). The entire introduction emphasized that if the individual focused on the underlying reality of everyday life, the utilitarian concerns would follow: "the ability of the individual to form correct judgments concerning the problems of every-day life depends almost entirely upon his ability to see the ideal within the real" (9). Emphasizing this focus on the ideal, M. W. Wallace, Alexander's student and later English professor and Principal of University College, wrote in Alexander's 1945 memorial that in preparing texts for use in Ontario high schools Alexander "did more than any other

single person to establish standards of taste and of the teaching of English in Ontario" (Wallace and Woodhouse 1).

Alexander's emphasis on the ideal led to changes in the University College English curriculum that he inherited. Sensitive reading of a text meant close attention to style, organization and content for the student to capture the essence of an author's thought. When he came to Toronto in 1889, Alexander inherited an English pass course that still contained a great deal of material about the history of British literature rather than an extensive reading of major works themselves. The honours course, however, included the reading of works from Chaucer to the Romantics. Both programs would undergo major changes under Alexander.⁹ As expected, the literary histories quickly disappeared, replaced by the critical reading of original works. In 1895, University College introduced a new honours program, including both History and English, with English as the senior partner. This program was developed in conjunction with historian George M. Wrong, appointed to the History Department in 1894. Alexander's two inaugurals had emphasized the importance of the students' appreciation of the historical context of literary culture. The honours content in English, which was also prescribed for the honours program in Modern Languages, was divided

⁹Professor Harris (1988) provides a full review of Alexander's work at University College, as well as his influence on the federated University of Toronto. Chapter 2 covers the period 1889-1906, and Chapter 3 carries to Alexander's retirement in 1926.

into the first two years and the last two. The freshman course included three components: Literature, the reading and analysis of three Shakespeare plays; Rhetoric, the analysis of selected essays; and Composition, the writing of four literary essays relating to literary works read in the course (Professor Harris notes that the latter requirement lasted for the next sixty-five years--Harris 1988, 39]). Significantly, rhetoric here meant analysis, not writing, which was theoretically isolated as a separate component, though Alexander's sensitive teaching would undoubtedly have related them. The second year included the four essays, the study of versification, and selected works of Chaucer, Shakespeare or Milton (Calendar for 1896-7, 108). The calendar described the third and fourth years as follows:

In the Third Year, beside additional work in the period prescribed in the General course, the study of Old English is begun. In the Fourth year this last mentioned work is continued, and a course on Historical Grammar is given. In literature the development of the English drama is the subject for Honor work. . . .The class work is devoted partly to a special examination of the prescribed selections, partly to an exemplification by lectures of the general characteristics of the various periods. (108)

Even with the expertise of D. R. Keys in language, therefore, the program was still heavily oriented to literature.

The 1896-97 calendar introduction to the pass program echoed the honours orientation, emphasizing the development of an appreciation for literature, the hallmark of Alexander's approach to English. The first year read two Shakespeare plays, and the second read selected Milton poems. Composition was included, based on Alexander's use of models. The usual four essays were required in each of the two first years of the program. (A special note cautioned the students to annotate the use of articles or books used in the preparation of essays. Almost a century has not changed the nature of the study or the students!) The cultural approach was then emphasized in the third and fourth years again, with each year focusing on the literature of a period rather than a miscellaneous selection from the range of British history.

This emphasis on history as the cultural context of the great writers was part of Alexander's emphasis on the ideal. Hence his collaboration with G. M. Wrong in establishing the English and History honours program. The historical background helped the reader understand the concerns of the writer, and the development of culture itself was an historical matter which encompassed all the writers of a nation. Alexander stated in his 1889 inaugural,

As one's knowledge and insight deepen, all books, all writers assume their proper places in the picture; great currents of thought, obscure streams of influence, the manifold relations of thinkers, the action and reaction of thought become manifest, and the whole adjusts itself in fitting perspective. (31)

This concept of wide perspective was constantly reiterated in Alexander's teaching and curriculum. Arnold's ideal of seeing things as they were, of judging everything from the perspective of an ideal abstracted from two millennia of literary culture and then related to the creative genius of one's own century, flowed through Alexander's commitment to literature. It grew out of the Anglo-Canadian consciousness of the period, and, in turn, fostered a further concern for the ideal. M. W. Wallace states that Alexander's assumption that "literature dealt with the highest realities went unquestioned" (Wallace and Woodhouse 5). This high ideal, related to the reading and criticism of literary texts, was thus transmitted to the next generation of scholars. Fostered also by the influence of the Victorian authors studied in English classes--critics like Ruskin, and poets like Tennyson and Browning, this influence permeated Canadian higher education for more than a half century.

Alexander's idealistically oriented college curriculum gained wide influence in Canadian universities, not only because it fit the prevailing philosophical predisposition of the late-

Victorian Anglo-Canadian culture. First, the Ontario Department of Education in 1895 set an honours degree for specialist standing in provincial secondary schools. This provided a financial incentive for the program. Secondly, Alexander's students carried Alexander's views into their own classrooms. Thirdly, as the first program to receive specialist status, the Toronto model influenced other English programs that were soon established (Harris 1988, 41). Finally, Toronto was by far the largest university in the nation, so Alexander's program educated more students than any other program. In 1891, Toronto's enrolment stood at 1,500. McGill was next with 900. Dalhousie and Queen's stood in the range of 250 students (Harris 1988, 19). Figures for honours enrolments in the English and History program show over one hundred students in 1902. This rose to a high of 193 honours enrolments in 1905 (Harris 1988, 287).

Just as Alexander changed the curriculum at University College to focus on high cultural ideals, so James Cappon made changes at Queen's when he arrived in the fall of 1888. Because John Watson, the idealist philosopher, also from the University of Glasgow, had already been at Queen's since 1872, an emphasis on idealism had preceded Cappon to Kingston. Cappon swiftly brought English under the influence of the new philosophy. The calendar for 1884-85, with English taught by the Rev. George Ferguson, treated English under the heading of "Rhetoric and Literature," with requirements for a Junior Class and a Senior Class, both compulsory. Ferguson's program focused on composi-

tion, on rhetorical analysis of poetry and prose, and on literary history.¹⁰ Weekly essays for the seniors reflected the strong practical flavor of the program. The second-hand nature of the literary study was reflected in the recommended book list, which contained the standard literature reviews rather than specifying original works:

Max Muller's Science of Language, Marsh's Lectures on the English Language, Maetzner's English Grammar, Craik's English Literature, Taine's English Literature, Gervinus' Commentaries on Shakespeare, Dowden's Shakespeare's Mind and Art, Hudson's Shakespeare's Life, Art, and Characters.

The honours program consisted of the pass course plus additional work in Anglo-Saxon, Chaucer and Spenser. It is not clear whether the weekly essays required in the senior class were restricted to literature, but, given the lack of emphasis on direct reading of the individual authors, and given the title of the calendar entry as "Rhetoric and English Literature," the

¹⁰ The 1884-85 Junior Class lecture entry in the Queen's calendar was the following:

- I. On Composition;
- II. Critical review of Works of various authors in Poetry and Prose Subject for examination--English Literature to the period of the Reformation.

The Senior Class lecture entry listed the following:

- I. On Prosody.
 - II. On the Literature of the 16th and 17th centuries.
- The Senior Class also required weekly essays.

essays probably covered a variety of topics and were assigned to develop the students' broad rhetorical skills.

To indicate a new direction, the calendar heading in 1889-90, the first year under Cappon's direction, was immediately changed to "English Language and Literature." The details of the English entry were much expanded. The course offerings, still divided into junior and senior, became significantly more literature oriented, with a specific component on Arnold's criticism.¹¹

¹¹The 1889-90 Queen's English offerings:

JUNIOR CLASS

The course will comprise:

1. A historical review of a period of English Literature
2. Lecture on style and composition in connection with the study of great prose writers.
3. A detailed study of the following works:
 Shakespeare's Julius Caesar
 Pope's Essay on Man
 Carlyle's Essay on Burns

SENIOR CLASS

The course will comprise:

1. A historical review of a period of English Literature; lectures on English Prosody.
2. Lectures on the growth and character of the English Language.
3. The study of Anglo-Saxon (Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader).
4. A detailed study of the following works:
 Chaucer's Clerke's Tale
 Milton's Paradise Lost, Book I
 Arnold's Function of Criticism (Essays in Criticism, First Series).

The honors course added readings in Wordsworth, Coleridge, Shelley, Keats, Carlyle, Browning, and Arnold, in the first year, and Tennyson, Scott, Thackeray, Hawthorne, Emerson, Carlyle, Browning, and Arnold, in the second year.

The 1889-90 calendar also included an entry to extra-mural students in both years of the pass and honors program, an entry

Further, Cappon's new course highlighted the altered emphasis on literature by tying composition to the study of prose literature as well, reflecting Cappon's view that reading good literature provided the readiest means of becoming proficient in the rhetorical arts. The calendar entry made it clear that the instructional mode for composition was the lecture. Presumably the practice of weekly assignments was modified to require less writing.

In the next decade, the syllabus grew more detailed, and the honours program was expanded to three years. The first year lecture course in composition continued, initially as a lecture course on style "in connection with the study of great prose writers" (1891-92). However, by 1900, the calendar entry, "Practical course in Rhetoric and Composition," was separated from the entry relating to analysis of style. This isolating of composition, especially the label "practical," possibly reflects that lecturing on the style of great authors simply did not prepare the students to write competently. Problems in composition might have arisen as a result of the workload as well. Though the calendar lists a tutor for Cappon's department from 1890 onwards, Cappon wrote to Principal Daniel Gordon in 1909,

that would remain in the following years, with the addition of a special tutor for extra-mural students in 1890-91. The reading list included both original literature and background readings as well as work in philology.

For many years all my classes (except two Honours Classes of about 70 each) were 100 or over. Having to teach such classes twice a day and keep their interest active all the time, not only ruined my individual and exercise work, but has had, I think a good deal to do with that peculiar nerve exhaustion from which I now suffer. (qtd. in Shortt 63)

With the number of students indicated, the pre-Cappon practice of weekly essays to develop students' rhetorical skills was surely abandoned.

Cappon's program at Queen's focused strongly on culture, with an emphasis on literature placed within a national and historical context. In this way Cappon attempted to convey the development of Victorian ideals in the national settings. The program thus contained the history of both the language and the literature of England--not to present facts but to convey an understanding of ideals. Given this focus on ideals relating to the spirit of British literature, composition would not have been stressed. Oral rhetoric, of course, was not mentioned.

As a student of Edward Caird in Glasgow, Cappon's literary philosophy was much more overtly metaphysical than was Alexander's. Though the idealist focus was similar to Alexander's, in Cappon that focus had a formal philosophical base. To Arnold, Cappon consciously added Hegel. "Human nature he conceived of in spiritual terms, suggesting that man possessed an intuitive

awareness of the World Spirit. This Spirit, in turn was a reservoir of absolute principles, including those which governed both aesthetics and ethics" (Shortt 59). But Cappon's scholarship was not a matter of professional interest only. Sympathetic to Hegel's concept of the "mission of the individual State and its relation to the World-soul" (1916, 100), Cappon looked upon the study of history as the study of the activity of the World-soul, which Cappon related to his study of world literature. "It is really literature," he maintained, "which binds men together in a spiritual world and gives such solidarity of moral consciousness to society as it has attained" (1917, 108). He found deeply harmful to modern life the utilitarian rejection of the value of the non-immediate. "You may extend the creed of Utilitarianism, as Mill did, into the highest regions of spirit theoretically," he explained, "but in its practical working it tends to give a preference to the lower forms of utility" (1917, 94). Hence he rejected the theories of those whose thoughts could not transcend the physical world, even though they espoused abstract forces, like Darwin's or Spencer's forces of evolution. Cappon likewise rejected the utilitarianism of Huxley and Mill, with whose philosophy he also related the work of Alexander Bain. All were tied to physical rather than spiritual perceptions of reality. Literature that captured metaphysical ideals could explain much more about humanity than could a mentality tied to the physical senses. Cappon's curriculum, therefore, gave as little philoso-

phical room as was practical to the arts of rhetoric, which he related to the necessary but decidedly secondary realm of the senses.

Similarly, Cappon rejected the scholar who studied only to know facts: "The modern specialist in Latin and Greek who has read Thucydides and Plutarch, Horace and Tacitus, Longinus and Quintilian, but does not complete his literary education by making himself acquainted, as he may easily do, with the thought of Carlyle and Emerson and the criticism of Sainte-Beuve and Arnold, should be a horror to the friends of classical study" he wrote (1904, 194). Like Alexander, Cappon thus insisted on studying literature within a full cultural context. From this position he denounced Ontario's 1904 education legislation that reduced Latin to an option in the training of Ontario public school teachers. Cappon held that, when done well, the old study of the classics "combined in a fine way the study of history, of antiquities, of poetry and literature, something of philosophy and something also which I might describe as a comparative study of civilization." Because each of these studies "threw an illuminating light on the other," the classical approach would be difficult to replace (1904, 194). The essential thrust of a liberal education, in which literature ranked among the highest studies, was to keep alive mankind's spiritual life "by giving it a true and beautiful form of expression" (1904, 194).

Given this emphasis on the ideal, Cappon even more than Alexander privileged literature over the practical study of rhetoric in its various forms. Whereas Alexander affirmed the need for composition, regretting the insufficient funding to teach it at Toronto, Cappon actively depreciated the teaching of composition and elocution. He stated that students could become good speakers and debaters, and even good writers, "without more than the A B C of a literary education" (1904, 195). However, given the need to teach composition, Cappon also agreed with Alexander that literary study was the readiest means to proficiency in writing.

Cappon's rejection of the strictly utilitarian approach to literacy led him to disparage both Alexander Bain's psychology and his influence on English studies. In a paper read to the Modern Language Association of Ontario in 1890, Cappon reviewed a recently published school text that emphasized categorization, an emphasis Cappon called "the point of view of the narrow and materialistic school of philosophy which Bain represents, a point of view utterly discarded by all great literary men, Ruskin, Arnold, Carlyle, Emerson" (1890, 9). "It seems to me that we begin at the wrong end if we thrust between the pupil and his text an artificial and incoherent system of categories, contiguities, concreteness, ideality, redemption of pain, and such like" (1890, 13). Rather than emphasizing categories, Cappon argued that "the main thing is . . . but to see how. . . style

reflects the temper, the character and the habitual points of view of the writer." When the pupil understood this relation between expression and thought, then and then only would he be able to "use the philosophical categories of criticism with profit and any degree of accuracy; . . . something more to him than external and mechanical formulas" (1890, 13).

Cappon applied his philosophical idealism far beyond his English classes. From the inception of the Queen's Quarterly journal in 1893, Cappon involved himself in both editorial and journalistic capacities. W. E. McNeill, a junior English department colleague and Cappon's biographer in Some Great Men of Queen's, calculated that altogether Cappon "dealt with one hundred and sixteen different subjects, some of them requiring an enormous amount of work" (77).¹² He held that "in all nations,

¹²W. E. McNeill writes,

The weightier articles were reprinted as pamphlets and mailed to the right people. He attacked political corruption in Canadian elections, boldly giving names, dates, places; he argued that the Government had extended Separate Schools beyond the limits of the constitution; he championed a Canadian navy. . .; he maintained that Canada and all the Dominions were in every way better off within the Empire than outside it. . . . He dealt elaborately with Great War problems in a series of articles and pamphlets. . . . "In a United States series he exposed with blushing examples the ills of the body politic, indifference to law, disregard of life, judicial corruption, municipal graft, business profiteering, newspaper sensationalism, contempt for ancient cultures, worship of what is big and new. . . .

In a series of education articles he wrote with passion to defend the classics and to resist the extension of science studies. He shot barbed arrows into

but especially in an intellectually immature country such as Canada, it was the duty of the man of letters to express detached opinions for the guidance of both politicians and the public" (Shortt 62). Like Alexander, Cappon was influenced by Matthew Arnold's concepts that great prose and poetry "combined perfection of form with elevated moral content." Culture was "the key not only to individual but also to social morality" (Shortt 59).

Cappon's scholarship was monumental. W. E. McNeill describes his notebooks as follows:

He took all humane learning as his field--Literature, History, Philosophy, Theology, Art--in all ages, in all countries. He had to know it all and reflect upon it all. He had complete command of Greek and Latin, of French, German and Italian, and a working knowledge of other tongues. (90)

His notebooks summarized the histories of Greece, Italy, Holland, Serbia, the Balkans, Germany, and "English political and literary history from 1800 to 1866. . . on the scale of seven pages to every year." His notes on Greek drama included detailed analyses, comparisons and reflections on each play. Other culture, too, was reviewed:

the head of a great department store, who had spoken slightly of the "dead languages." "One would like to know," Cappon wrote, "whether Mr. Eaton thinks it should be the aim of our school system to develop the best kind of citizenship or only to produce human chattels for conducting Friday bargain sales." (77-78)

The same toil is given to the drama of other countries--Britain, France, Belgium, Italy, Germany, Scandinavia, the United States. Here are notes on painters and pictures and music; on [twenty-seven] political philosophers. . .; on speculative philosophers. . .; on all the notable theologians. . . .Poetry has most space of all; no great poet is omitted from Homer to Yeats. . . . in some cases there are comments on every poem in a volume. . . .And so on. It would be difficult to think of any name in all humanistic history that does not appear in these notes. (McNeill 90-91)

This scholarship emphasized Cappon's concern for the life of the mind. In this concern, it was the knowledge and understanding of life that mattered most, not the practical aspects of communication. Hence, reading and analysis figured most prominently in Cappon's teaching, not writing or speech. His position was reflected in a notebook entry that consciously echoed the words of Jesus: "The scholar. . . can say without saintly pretensions, 'I am not of this world, even if I am occasionally in it'" (Qtd. in McNeill 89; cf. John 17). For Cappon, the scholar cultivated a mind that transcended the practical concerns of everyday life.

For both Alexander and Cappon, then, reading the literary texts themselves ranked highest as a function in English studies, with poetry the noblest of the literary genres. For both professors, cultural history and literature were intertwined. At

University College, this emphasis was conveyed especially in the combined English and History honours program; in Queen's it was conveyed in the historical emphasis of each course within the literature program. British literary authors, of course, outshone all other English language writers, though Cappon included Hawthorne and Emerson, as well as Whitman in later years. These transcendental American writers were especially congenial to Cappon's philosophical idealism. Language concerns, both philological and rhetorical, were, therefore, given secondary rank in both programs. Philological work helped students understand the historical aspects of the language, so it was an important part of cultural history. Composition was, of course, a practical necessity. The fact that composition was taught in lecture format, based on style analysis and models, and largely, if not exclusively, with literary topics, with an average of one essay required every two months at Toronto, suggests an emphasis on clarity of expression through correctness and proper arrangement, with style following from models rather than from extensive writing and personal reflection. Cappon's philosophy of composition was the same, though Cappon was less concerned about the practical than was Alexander.

This approach to rhetoric as utilitarian rather than developmental in the liberal arts tradition fit the larger intellectual environment in which English as a specialty fit into the late nineteenth-century curriculum. Though Alexander would have

liked to relate composition to literature as closely as possible, in fact, composition and literature became separate sub-specialties within English studies. The composition approach would not evoke the work of a Carlyle, a Wordsworth, Dickens or Tennyson in a writing student. This utilitarian approach to composition, at a conceptual level, of course, clashed with Alexander's emphasis on a meeting of souls when students read the great authors of British history. It also clashed with the ideals of Cappon. However, the growing emphasis on knowledge as specialized permitted this fragmentation of a traditionally unified study, even to the total exclusion of elocution or oratory in the curricula of both Toronto and Queen's.

Within the context of a rhetoric of objective knowledge, the emphasis was on the text conveying ideas, not on the transmission of ideas in oral form. Within this context, the privileging of written over oral rhetoric arose, as mentioned earlier, from the need for written essays as a means of evaluating students' ability in literary analysis in a formal lecture setting as well as from a hierarchical valorizing of literature, composition and oratory inherent in the idealist approach to English studies. In addition, however, the great difference in emphasis between composition and elocution reflected the high emphasis on print as a medium of communication at the end of the nineteenth century. Before mid-century, orality had been much more important in a low-literacy setting. A half-century later, the situation would

begin to change again, as technology would reassert the importance of orality in mass communication. At the end of the nineteenth century, however, elocution was considered extraneous to the formal curriculum, to be pursued only by students interested in the excitement of debating societies or drama clubs. The function of the classroom was to elevate the students' souls, not to further their professional rhetorical skills.

A final program with a strong idealistic influence on Anglo-Canadian English studies in the first half of the twentieth century was Archibald MacMechan's program at Dalhousie. The arrival of MacMechan from Johns Hopkins University with a Ph.D. in Modern Languages in 1889 did not mark as great a shift in English studies instruction as had the coming of Alexander to Toronto or Cappon to Queen's. At Dalhousie, J. G. Schurman and J. W. Alexander had already effected the transition to a literature-oriented curriculum from DeMille's broad rhetorical concerns that included reading, writing and speaking. It was left to MacMechan to augment Alexander's curriculum and to carry it forward into the next century. He taught as the Munro Professor of English Language and Literature from 1889 to 1931, dying in 1933. S. E. D. Shortt's study of MacMechan as a Romantic Idealist emphasizes that though the bulk of MacMechan's forty-year teaching career occurred in the twentieth century, MacMechan was one of Canada's "older intellectuals" who "formed their ideas on art and society in the relatively stable period before 1890"

(41). MacMechan was thus another late Victorian idealist who affirmed the basic unity of human intellectual endeavor, whether religious or philosophical. "In the face of relativism," writes Shortt, "MacMechan posited absolute values, while in contrast to liberal empiricism he proclaimed a Christian idealism. In the process, his writing became, by his own admission, a paradigm for Victorian concepts of morality and aesthetics" (41). Although his influence as a scholar and sensitive critic spread throughout the nation during his career at Dalhousie, MacMechan was not as expert in technical aesthetics as Alexander or as systematic in philosophy as Cappon. Perhaps his self-deprecating style also hid much of his mastery of both subjects.

A Scottish minister's son, MacMechan attributed his philosophical stance to George Paxton Young, Professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy at University College in the last decades of the nineteenth century. George Paxton Young had come to University College from Knox College, where his Hegelian idealism had led him to resign from the Presbyterian ministry, which, in 1868, demanded a conservative Christian orthodoxy that Young was unable to embrace. In University College, more than a decade later, Young's blend of idealism in religion and philosophy impressed the youthful MacMechan. Years later MacMechan wrote, "I have never heard his equal. . . . He took hold of us; he awoke us to life, the life of the mind":

The problem of the external world! Had any of us the faintest notion that there was such a problem, before our Chrysostom opened his lips of gold? This was a common Canadian sort of universe, which we all understood well enough for all practical purposes. Then came the awakening, the veil was taken from our eyes. This solid-seeming world was but the shadow of our dream, if indeed it had being at all, apart from ourselves. Everything we saw and touched, and heard and felt, the most humdrum effect of our activity, the commonest motion of foot or hand, were all parts of one unending miracle.

. . . . There was then a world within us, wherein this marvelous outer world to the remotest point of light in the heavens is embraced, comprehended, set in order. . . .

Young preached the great doctrines by which the pillars of the world stand firm. He leant chiefly towards those that insist on the dignity of man and the worth of the human soul. (1906-07, 141-143)

MacMechan described Young with such terms as "self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control." From reports of Dalhousie students, MacMechan's description of Young might have been a description of himself. Shortt states that at MacMechan's death a

boyhood friend "captured his character in a single phrase: 'He was indeed the model Christian gentleman'" (42).

For MacMechan, Christianity together with cultural and philosophical idealism were not simply conceptually sympathetic, they were all revealed in the world around him. Hence his life-long attraction to Carlyle, who emphasized personal experience and reflection rather than systematic philosophy. Perhaps because of his lack of concern about systematizing his beliefs, his orthodox Christianity rode easily on his shoulders. "The central theme of existence was man's struggle to transcend his fallen state, to create for himself a home in a hostile environment" (Shortt 49). His religious perception was affirmed in moments of intuition "when the soul seems lifted above and out of itself and discerns truths higher than the cold processes of reason ever show" (qtd. in Shortt 49). The intuition also affirmed his philosophy that a natural law existed, a law associated with love.

The expression of the affection between man and his God, his fellow beings, and his environment was the force, according to MacMechan, which energized the world. This conviction

. . . was the core of his philosophy. (Shortt 50)

MacMechan's Christian idealism provided the basis of his teaching, most of which focused on literature rather than the philological or rhetorical aspects of English studies, although

the Dalhousie curriculum demanded more writing than the curriculum of University College, Queen's, Victoria or McGill. Further, in the 1910 calendar, typical of the MacMechan curriculum, the writing also focused on material other than English literature. The first course required "ten narrative and descriptive themes based on personal experience, and work read in class" (1910, 56). The second composition course included lectures on the principles of narration, description, and exposition. The course required twenty expository themes based on the literature read in the class (1910, 57). In subsequent literature courses, eight expository themes per course were required.

Notwithstanding the large amount of writing required, the calendar describes the course in English as "mainly literary," pursued in an historical manner (56). MacMechan too valued belletristic work above other writing. For MacMechan, the distinction between literary writing and other writing related to a lack of imagination and harmony in non-literary writing. The best writing was truly creative. In Headwaters of Canadian Literature, used as a classroom text in his Canadian literature course after 1924, MacMechan borrowed DeQuincy's distinction between the "literature of knowledge" and the "literature of power."

Since the world began, it has been granted to some few scores or hundreds of men to put together words that live; that may justly be called literature, the litera-

ture of power. Of it, the two chief ingredients are imagination and harmony. The literature of power is creative; and, by universal consent, is held to be poetry in all its branches. (13-14)

The poets of a nation--Homer, Aeschylus, Virgil, Lucretius, Dante, Shakespeare, Milton, Goethe--were the "glories of the nations which brought them forth" (14). They were also the citizens in touch with the spirit of the nation, which, for MacMechan, was related to universal ideals inherent in all men, though cynicism suppressed this idealism in most. The idealism of a chosen few included an "affection" initially for one's fellows but also for all creation, and "an intuitive recognition of God immanent in creation and, by virtue of this [insight]. . . , well suited for a position of social leadership" (see Shortt, 53, 54).

MacMechan carried these beliefs into his approach to literary criticism, typical of which, and central to his interests as a Canadian, was his 1924 Headwaters of Canadian Literature. The central question for MacMechan's Headwaters was the question of the nature of the soul of the Canadian nation, the soul that is revealed in her literature. "On the surface though Canada be prosaic and commonplace, there is deep down in the nation's heart a capacity for the ideal" (16). For Canada, the nature of this soul in touch with the ideal was revealed in its appreciation of Nature:

Nature-worship is the 'note' of Canadian poetry, French as well as English. Poets of other nations find beauty, love, the soul their first concern; but our native bards seem to turn instinctively to the external world. . . .one and all they sing the praise of Nature. The Mighty Mother is the theme of Lozeau, bed-ridden in a city room, no less than of Roberts, the untiring ranger of woods and streams. (Headwaters 170-171)

The reference to Roberts here was to the early poetry, the poetry praised by Cappon, poetry that followed good models: Keats, Shelley, Tennyson. Reflecting critical concord with his fellow idealist, MacMechan quoted Cappon, who rejected both the style and the content of Roberts' later work in New York Nocturnes:

'He has the true singing quality.' But he 'needs a sterner literary conscience. . . . His work belongs too much to the region of artistic experiment. His constant transformation too, and the ethical homogeneity of his work take away something of the impression of sincerity and depth, which the poetry ought to give.'
(Headwaters 124-25)

The judgment here is based on both critics' ideal values, rooted in an objective law of love energizing the world.

For MacMechan, Archibald Lampman's poetry did not fail ethically. "Sincere, tender, unworldly, contemplative are the terms which describe his character; he lived in and for the

ideal" (Headwaters 115). Lampman's "The Frogs," for instance, perceived the spring piping from the ponds not as rising from grotesque creatures but as a modern echo from the pipes of Pan. Bliss Carman too brought his readers close to the heart of things. MacMechan explicitly placed Carman in the same tradition as Wordsworth and Arnold. "Low tide suggests the ebb of life, and love, and all good things. Over all these poems broods the deep but not unwelcome melancholy of youth," youth for MacMechan representing proximity to the ideal, before the cynicism of age set in. MacMechan suggested that in Carman's poems "the personal note. . .merged in deeper, fuller strains. These could be called "hymns to Cybele, Magna Mater" (Headwaters 130). This consciousness of the ever-present universal spirit of life served as the ultimate ethical and aesthetic standard for MacMechan.

As is obvious in his criticism, which derived at least its sublunar standards from English authors, MacMechan related the consciousness of Canada to the culture of Britain. He was an unabashed cultural colonial, though he affirmed the need for developing the Canadian spirit. MacMechan's student, G. G. Sedgewick, recalled, "Archie was proud of being and remaining a Victorian, and he was equipped with an armoury of definite reasons for his pride," not the least of which were Ruskin, Tennyson, and, above all, Carlyle, in whom he found an antidote to modern materialism. "To MacMechan, Carlyle's message, when stripped of Goethe, was simple Christianity," says Shortt (48).

The old world provided the artistic and ethical ideals needed for life, individually and corporately. Without excuse, twenty-two years after Confederation, MacMechan's 1889 inaugural at Dalhousie began as follows:

It will not seem strange, or need any preface or apology, if in a seat of learning in the English colony which has always cherished the deepest reverence for the homeland, the attempt be made, however unskillfully, to portray what has ever been that home-land's crowning glory--her matchless literature.

The colonialism at the end of the speech was even stronger:

As a band of students we have a plain duty. To cultivate [this literature] ourselves and encourage the study of it in others. As a people, as an English colony, we are the undisputed heirs to all that is best in the civilization of the homeland.

MacMechan's goal was to translate those values into the Canadian spirit:

Scholars hold that the poems of Homer were first sung in Asia Minor before they crossed the Aegean to become the glory of the land of Greece: and if we but reverence and study our language somewhat as the Greeks studied and revered theirs, the time may come when the fame of English letters shall leave the old con-

continent to be indissolubly linked with the name of a greater England on this side of the sea. (1889, 3)

Like Alexander and Cappon, therefore, MacMechan considered literature as the way to a higher human reality than that found in the physical world. For the English-speaking nations, the best literature for this was that of England, which, at its best, offered both an emotional and ethical experience that made it totally compatible with the historical ideals of Christianity. For MacMechan, the ideals of Christianity and English literature flowed into each other.

In curricular terms, however, MacMechan's focus in composition came closer to arousing this spirit of the ideal in his students than did the emphasis of Alexander and Cappon, for MacMechan asked his classes to write frequently, and to focus on the personal as well as on objective texts. Indeed, the 1900 calendar, typical for at least the following decade, stated that "practice precedes theory." Reports on students' private reading were also required. As at University College and Queen's, however, oral rhetoric had no place in the curriculum in this age of print. And MacMechan's pre-war curriculum was also largely restricted to British literature. Both the 1900 and the 1910 calendar included no non-British author, even though the 1910 calendar offered two courses in the nineteenth century. For all three of these founders of twentieth-century English studies in Anglo-Canadian universities, therefore, the ideological and

aesthetic purity of British literature so far surpassed the writings of other English-speaking nations, including their own, that Canadian or American authors were but infrequent intruders into a hallowed canon, at least up to 1914. (After 1924 MacMechan used his Headwaters of Canadian Literature as a text.)

In focusing on philosophical and aesthetic ideals through a specialized study of English literature, this first generation of English studies specialists brought English studies in Canadian anglophone colleges and universities into the twentieth century.

Alexander, Cappon, and MacMechan were all educated in a curriculum that, though modified by the presence of electives, emphasized classical learning. None of them took research degrees in English, yet all of them practiced as English specialists throughout their careers. By their collective emphasis they shaped a curriculum that, for the first six decades of this century, would privilege the ideal over the utilitarian, poetics over rhetoric, and British literature and traditions over the literature and traditions of all other nations, including those of their native land.

The legacy of this last generation of scholars in nineteenth-century English studies was "an England on this side of the sea." Their colonial attitudes, whether narrowly focused on ethics, like Reynar's and MacMechan's often were, or more aesthetically focused, like Alexander's and Cappon's, ensured that what they considered to be "the best that is known and thought

in the world" would have a strong English orientation, simply from the fact that the leading Victorian writers shaped into art the very concepts that this first generation of English studies specialists considered essential in a cultured life. Central in these concerns was the presence of an ideal, both ethical and aesthetic, that gave focus to both literature and life, an ideal that English literature dealt with in both poetry and prose. This ideal brought together secular and sacred, temporal and eternal, personal and catholic, in a new academic discipline that sought to transcend its own insularity by focusing on the universal. This ideal focus, however, left the practical concerns of the historic rhetorical curriculum, the mother of English studies, almost wholly restricted to expository writing instruction, largely because writing was necessary to convey the students' philosophical and aesthetic insights in literary interpretation. And in an age when the ideals of human society were formally conveyed in print form, the rhetoric of orality found no place at all in the Anglo-Canadian college curriculum.

CONCLUSION

The object of most historical study is more than ferreting out historical facts "just because they are there," like mountains to climb. Historical study helps place present situations within a perspective that helps us understand them. Given the historical perspective of this study, it is interesting that English studies in Anglo-Canadian colleges and universities have recently experienced two decades of major curricular change. These two decades of change have occurred a century after an earlier transitional period that also revolutionized the Anglo-Canadian English studies curriculum. After this earlier period of transition, the late 1880s and 1890s saw a stabilizing of the curriculum, that began with the arrival of W. J. Alexander at Dalhousie in 1884. The present changes have broadened the curriculum from its restrictive focus, forged in the 1880s. In that decade, a broad curriculum in both rhetoric and poetics, present at colleges like Dalhousie and McGill at the time of Confederation, narrowed to a tight emphasis on poetics, associated with cultural and philosophical ideals in British literature. Recent curricular developments have seen a return toward a historic balance between rhetoric and poetics. This balance sustained the classical Greek and Latin curriculum from Aristotle to Quintilian and the late medieval and renaissance curriculum that Canada inherited at the beginning of the nineteenth century. That bal-

anced curriculum had been translated from classical studies into the vernacular by the 1860s and 1870s.

This concluding chapter now reviews three central factors that led Anglo-Canadian colleges to abandon that balanced curriculum: a shift to the vernacular as opposed to an earlier centrality of the classics poetics and rhetoric, as well as language, together with a skewing of the rhetorical curriculum that accompanied the shift from Classics to English; a weakening of Anglo-Canada's historic protestant Christian faith, owing to the rise of science; and a consequent turning to British literature for both cultural and aesthetic ideals, to replace the ideals undermined by the loss of historic religious certainties. and a continuing colonial mentality. This conclusion adds a broad overview of curricular implications of a shift from an early emphasis on orality to a late-century emphasis on print in the Anglo-Canadian culture. This shift from orality to literacy relates to the curricular developments throughout the century, and thus transcends the narrow, historical categories established in the body of this study.

After reviewing nineteenth-century developments, this chapter turns briefly to changes in the twentieth century, noting the stability of the curriculum up to the 1960s, then outlining the expansion of the English studies curriculum after that. This review of both nineteenth- and twentieth-century developments forms the basis for final reflections on a choice facing contem-

porary Anglo-Canadian English departments: will they follow late nineteenth-century specialization into separating rhetoric from poetics, or will they follow the older, classical tradition in attempting to integrate the teaching of rhetoric and poetics?

The nature of English studies and rhetoric in the first century of Anglo-Canadian colleges and universities changed a great deal between the time the first colleges in the Maritimes were established and the end of the nineteenth century. The changes were not haphazard, nor did they result from the decisions of single individuals, though it might sometimes appear that strong individuals like Thomas McCulloch or Egerton Ryerson set curricula by themselves. Instead, the curriculum in each college reflected the cultural values of the supporting constituency of that college. The development of the rhetorical curriculum at King's College in Toronto illustrates strikingly the significance of community consensus in curricular development. Historic Strachan documents reflect clearly the then archdeacon's early personal interest in a practical rhetoric for King's College, including a strong reading and writing program, as well as a strong emphasis on public debate. Strachan's aim was to educate future legislative leaders. Strachan's educational philosophy, however, was rooted in Scottish traditions, not in Anglican conservatism. Hence, even though Strachan had a great deal of influence in Toronto, his curriculum was bypassed in favor of a classical program inherited from Oxford, demanded by the Tory

constituency that supported Toronto's King's College before 1850.

Different religious and national traditions thus led to different curricula in the colonies of British North America. An Oxford program similar to Toronto's had also been introduced into two other Anglican King's Colleges: at Windsor, Nova Scotia and at Fredericton, New Brunswick. At Pictou Academy, and later at Dalhousie College in Halifax, on the other hand, Thomas McCulloch introduced a more utilitarian curriculum, based on Scottish traditions, to educate those students barred from King's College by religious requirements. The Scots stressed competence in the vernacular as well as in Latin and Greek. At Victoria College in Cobourg, Upper Canada, a third tradition, based on Methodist interests in educating a strong Christian ministry, often largely itinerant, emphasized the English language even more than did the Scots. The fact that Egerton Ryerson, a strong Methodist leader and the first Victoria College president, had himself been an itinerant minister gave Ryerson a strong sense of Methodist needs. Therefore, though Ryerson took credit for the English and rhetoric focus in the early Victoria curriculum, the Victoria curriculum was a product of Methodist community values and not a function of Ryerson's independent vision and judgment alone.

The importance of the community in the focus of rhetoric and English studies in Anglo-Canadian universities continued through the second half of the century. At mid-century, the Anglican powers in Toronto and Fredericton came under ever stronger pres-

sure to release control of the King's Colleges to the elected representatives of their respective colonies. These two Anglican institutions were thus forced to give up not only the religious requirements of their colleges but also their Oxford-oriented rhetorical curricula. In Toronto, where the Reform Party controlled the Legislative Assembly, the result was an almost immediate introduction of English studies in addition to classics, a curricular shift that led to the appointment of Daniel Wilson to teach English history and literature at Toronto in 1853. Wilson brought Scottish rather than Anglican traditions to the reformed University of Toronto, thus lending the institution a practical inclination that lasted for three decades. This practical emphasis fitted well the interests of the non-Tory Reformed Party involved in both economic and legislative leadership in pre-Confederation Toronto. Economic interests also influenced the development of programs that included practice in rhetoric in Fredericton, Montreal and Halifax. At Fredericton, the economic interests, especially of the lumber industry, made up of a large Scottish community, supported a shift from Latin to English led by Marshall D'Avray, who taught both English and French. The emphasis on utility in a growing economy also led to a stress on the vernacular in Montreal, a leading centre of trade. At McGill College, Principal J. W. Dawson and English and Rhetoric (and Logic and Philosophy) Professor W. T. Leach built a comprehensive program of rhetoric and poetics in English, including both speech

and writing, as well as studies in the history and literature of the English language. In the Maritimes, the seaport of Halifax, with its mixture of Irish, English, Scots and United Empire Loyalists, built a vibrant seagoing economy as well. Here again the economic interests of the region were reflected in a comprehensive curriculum in English rhetoric and literature molded by James DeMille between 1864 and 1880.

On the other hand, the strong Anglican conservatism of constituencies controlling King's College at Windsor and the new Trinity College in Toronto kept the curricula of these two institutions firmly classical in the Oxford tradition until the decade of the 1880s. Here strong religious concerns overshadowed economic concerns, partly because Anglicans tended to see themselves as Upper Class (with studies in the vernacular associated with the lower classes), and partly because Anglican practice in England stressed a classical education within the traditions of the Anglican church, based on the lead of Oxford and Cambridge. Neither King's nor Trinity had any formal courses in English literature or language till more than a decade after Confederation.

Regardless of the specific religious or economic base of each individual college, however, the whole system of higher education in Canada through the nineteenth century was strongly Christian. A crisis in faith, therefore, growing in Europe since the late eighteenth century, but brought to a head by German

higher criticism and then focused sharply by Darwin after mid-century, affected not only British education, but also all Anglo-Canadian colleges, especially in the English curriculum. The Christian foundations of liberal education shaken by the 1870s, leaders in education, especially Anglo-Canadian protestants, cast about for an alternative foundation for their ethical systems. They followed Britain in finding an important alternative source for noble ideals embodied in the historic literary masterpieces of the British nation.

The result for rhetoric and English studies in all colleges was a sharp shift away from a curriculum highlighting the practical arts and theory of rhetoric in the vernacular to a strongly idealistic curriculum following Matthew Arnold's emphasis on "the best that is known and thought in the world." Higher literature, said W. J. Alexander in his 1884 inaugural address at Dalhousie College, "brings us into contact with men, the choice and master spirits of all ages. Here is a society ever open to us, the best and most desirable we can conceive. . ." (13). This search for the ideal in English literature was supported by the influence of a strong neo-Hegelian philosophy, advanced most ably by John Watson, a philosopher at Queen's, but easily incorporated into a literary criticism emphasizing philosophical and cultural ideals.. This neo-Hegelianism integrated a divine principle with a rational, philosophical system encompassing both reason and religion. This idealism was implicit in the criticism of Arnold,

championed by J. W. Alexander, first at Dalhousie and then at University College in Toronto. Idealism was also emphasized at Queen's by James Cappon, a student of Glasgow's neo-Hegelian philosopher Edward Caird. The same idealism permeated the teaching of Archibald MacMechan of Dalhousie, of Alfred Reynar at Victoria, and Charles Moyse at McGill. But this idealism also devalued the practical, associating it with the philistinism that Arnold condemned. The study of poetics as a cultural ideal was thus highly privileged over the utilitarian bent to which rhetoric had been reduced.

The Anglo-Canadian curriculum in rhetoric and English studies at the end of the century, therefore, became strongly idealistic, based on traditional British values as espoused in English literature and supported by a strong belletristic emphasis on Anglo-Canadian rhetoric in the preceding decades.¹ English studies thus emphasized, to the virtual exclusion of all other literature, a canon of British authors derived from the critical stance of Matthew Arnold. All English studies programs, includ-

¹Nan Johnson reviews this aesthetic predisposition in nineteenth-century Anglo-Canadian culture in the December 1988 issue of College English. Comparing Canadian concerns to American, she writes,

The distinctiveness of nineteenth-century Anglo-Canadian rhetoric courses lies in a marked regard for classical theory and models, an emphatic dependence on British epistemological and belletristic texts as sources for "modern" theory, and a general pedagogical philosophy that stressed the causal relationship between the study of rhetoric and the appreciation and preservation of English culture (of which Anglo-Canada was a part). (862)

ing those with a balance between rhetoric and poetics, such as those at McGill and Dalhousie, were transformed into curricula featuring the literature of the mother country. Works of North American authors, both Canadian and American, were largely ignored in official syllabi. In the 1880s and 1890s, instruction in rhetoric turned largely into composition as an adjunct to the study of English literature. Rhetoric was therefore largely subverted into the writing of the expository essay within the context of literary criticism. So closely did this new curriculum agree with the contemporary social and intellectual interests of the Anglo-Canadian education establishment that the English studies focus developed in the decade following Alexander's arrival in Dalhousie in 1884 spread throughout the Canadian college and university system, and retained its essential characteristics until the sixth decade of the twentieth century.²

²Ramsay Cook's award-winning historical study, The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada (Toronto, 1985), reviews a response to the Canadian crisis in faith that parallels what occurred in English studies. Cook argues that by the end of the Victoria age "the foundations of religious orthodoxy had been shaken" (25). For liberal protestantism, the response was the secularization of the church: "to salvage Christianity by transforming it into an essentially social religion" (4). Echoing Matthew Arnold, Principal Grant of Queen's told Sir Sandford Fleming in 1886, "The work of the Church in our day. . . is to reconcile itself to all that is best in modern thought" (qtd. in Cook, 185). James L. Hughes wrote in the Methodist Magazine and Review in 1899 that

men are beginning to understand the revelations of Christ in regard to the greatest ideal--community--and to believe that Christian principles are for everyday use; they are in fact the fundamental principles of all social evolution. The new theology and the new education are in perfect harmony in teaching that the great-

The curricular shifts of the nineteenth and early twentieth century were paralleled by a dramatic rise in literacy in the British North American colonies, and in their later Confederation. Although the shift from orality to writing in western culture generally took place over millennia, on a national scale, the same shift took place in Canada in the nineteenth century. Rhetoric was a study originally developed for an oral culture; literature and literary criticism were adapted for a print culture. The rhetorically-oriented curricula at the various colleges in the first half of the century were suited primarily to the early colonial situation, which saw an often illiterate or semi-literate public dependent on gaining information through public oratory. Nineteenth-century historian J. G. Bourinot noted in 1881 that in the first quarter of the century "not above one-fourth of the entire population could read, and not above one-tenth of them could write even imperfectly" (1881, 29). The low level of literacy was compounded by the fact that, even for those colonists who could read and write, there was little for

est work a man has to do is not the mere saving of his own soul, but the fullest development of his soul or selfhood in order that he may do his best work for God in accomplishing the highest destiny of mankind as a unity. (qtd. in Cook, 195)

The turn to English literature in Anglo-Canadian university curricula was thus part of a general secularization of the liberal protestant church, which was strongly influenced by the philosophical idealism of its leadership. This leadership, of course, came from students educated in Anglo-Canadian liberal arts colleges and in divinity programs attached to those colleges.

them to read, especially if they lived in rural areas. S. F. Wise argues that in pre-industrial Canada the clergy were most often the source of both information and the interpretation of that information. In defining public philosophy and public morality, "the conservative clergy had little competition. . . . Legislative debates were not reported at this time. . . . The day of the journalist-politician had scarcely dawned. The popular press did not exist" (Wise 83). Bourinot makes the same point, noting that especially itinerant Church of England clergymen exercised considerable intellectual as well as religious influence in early British North America (1881, 17-18). The early colonial culture was thus a predominantly oral culture for all but the elite in society.

The literacy situation began to change as the various colonies implemented school programs in the 1830s and onward. Egerton Ryerson's 1842 inaugural speech at Victoria College addressed both the old and the new, the world of orality and that of print. The speech reflected his own experience as a Methodist clergyman. In his first year as an itinerant Methodist preacher in 1825, Ryerson wrote his mother that he had twenty-four teaching and preaching appointments in four weeks (1883, 43). The following year his preaching increased to up to thirty-five sermons in four weeks (1883, 47). His diaries indicate that he often preached three sermons on a Sunday. His public religious duties were, therefore, highly oral, often among illiterates. He continually

lamented the educational poverty of his charges. However, in the second year of his ministry, he was commissioned by the Methodist convention to respond in print to charges by the Rev. John Strachan that the American connections of Canadian Methodists rendered members of this denomination a threat to the security of the British crown (Ryerson 1883, 49). To refute Strachan, Ryerson wrote a series of letters that brought him public prominence. Following that success, in 1829 Ryerson was appointed the founding editor of the Christian Guardian, a post he held for three years. Being editor of one of Upper Canada's first newspapers with a circulation of more than a thousand,³ Ryerson achieved further public notice.

Ryerson's comments in the 1842 inauguration address reflected his experience in both oratory and writing. First he discussed oral communication, which he termed rhetoric:

Rhetoric is, as Quintilian has expressed it, scientia bene decendi--the art of speaking well. Speech is the great instrument of intercourse between man and man; and he who can speak well, both in public and in private, on all subjects in which he may be concerned, possesses a power more enviable and formidable than that of the sword; he possesses an empire over mind.

(18)

³J. G. Hodgins, editor of Ryerson's autobiography, found the Christian Guardian "regarded as the leading newspaper of Upper Canada" (Ryerson 1883, 93).

Ryerson then turned to address writing:

Closely allied to Rhetoric, and forming indeed a branch of it, is Belles-Lettres--the art of writing well--of writing with propriety, beauty, and force. In an age of printing and writing--in all its varieties--to write well is of the last importance. The power which an eloquent orator exerts over an assembly, an able writer exerts over a country. The "pen of the ready writer" has frequently proved an instrument of more potent power, than the sword of the soldier, or the sceptre of the monarch. The "heavens are his sounding board," and a nation, if not the world, his audience; and his productions will be listened to with edification and delight, by thousands and millions whom the human voice could never reach. (19)

Ryerson's views on both oratory and writing arose from his own experience, so they were naturally highly utilitarian, strongly centred on persuasion.

By 1860, however, Ryerson's strongly utilitarian views were already becoming outdated as liberal education in Upper Canada took hold. Daniel Wilson had come to University College in 1853 specifically to teach English literature, and even Nelles at Victoria College had introduced the subject by this time. This curricular focus at both institutions reflected rapid advances in literacy in the population of Upper Canada from 1830 onwards,

and the consequent demands for material to read and, at college, for instruction on what to read and how to read it. The increase in literacy and in public writing is reflected in the colonial newspaper industry. In 1833, Montreal's Daily Advertiser became British North America's first daily newspaper. By 1873 Canada had 47 dailies, and by century's end, 112 (Creery). Though only 10% of the population could write in 1824, by 1850 half of Upper Canada's children attended school; by 1871, the number had risen to over 86% (Ian Davey 223).

This shift from literacy for the elite alone to mass literacy, and from orality to print, had numerous implications for Anglo-Canadian society, implications that had a necessary impact on the Anglo-Canadian college curriculum. The most obvious, of course, was a growth in college enrolments after mid-century, without which a focus on literature, which came with the introduction of curricular options, would have been economically impossible. But the hidden implications were perhaps more important. Orality requires conventionalization (Olson 261), and it emphasizes tradition (Cook-Gumperz 90-92). The unified, classical curriculum emphasizing oral rhetoric derived from a society that emphasized tradition, with the purpose of a liberal arts course before mid-century being to transmit the given classical and religious traditions of a culture going back to the middle ages. This rhetoric relating to early nineteenth-century orality, therefore, not only derived from an oral culture, but,

structurally, it also fostered an oral culture and the traditions consonant with it. One of the primary concerns in the founding of the early colleges was the preparation of clergymen, whose primary function was preaching to the masses and ministering to individuals within an oral setting. The college curriculum existed to transmit a given culture to students, who, in turn, were to transmit the same culture to congregations.

The growth of print literacy, however, and the concomitant increase in writing and reading shifted the focus from the communication in a mass setting to communication on an individual basis.⁴ David Olson argues that the transition from utterance to text involves increasing objective explicitness, with written language increasingly able to convey meaning in the absence of external, physical stimuli that necessarily accompany orality. Olson goes back to the German reformation to illustrate the difference between the social significance of utterance and text. Martin Luther argued that "scripture is sui ipsius interpre-scripture is its own interpreter. . . . For Luther. . . the meaning of Scripture depended, not upon the dogmas of the church, but upon a deeper reading of the text." The meaning of the text lay not in the tradition of the Catholic church, a largely oral culture, but in the text itself, in the printed medium (258-9). Luther's emphasis on the individual priesthood of all believers,

⁴See Marshall McLuhan's The Gutenberg Galaxy (1962) and Understanding Media (1964).

that is, the personal responsibility of the individual for his own salvation, coincided with this emphasis on the text. Olson argues that, during the reformation, the growing emphasis on the text was vital in the development of an increased emphasis on the individual.

In the history of western culture, then, this emphasis on the individual proceeded from the reformation (Protestantism continually emphasizing this individualism by its progressive fragmentation) through individual research stressed in the specialized curriculum (Matthew Arnold's Wissenschaft), which then came to include the study of English literature itself. In Canada, W. J. Alexander, at Toronto, emphasized this focus on the individual in his literature lectures. In his school reader for 1898 he stated, "It is one thing to have the pupil understand the bald statement of thought; it is an infinitely more important thing to have him feel its inspiration" (1897, 28). This emphasis on feeling individualized the readings for each student. Alexander recognized that the classroom must also allow for these individual differences. He went so far as to state that there were men "of considerable literary aptitude," to whom Wordsworth, for instance, was "a sealed book." One critic was "blind to the excellence of Pope, another to that of Spenser." Even a man of "Matthew Arnold's pre-eminent literary insight" failed to understand Shelley (1889, 29). If educated critics showed individual aptitudes, how much more would students. Because of

individual differences in students, Alexander argued that Shakespearean study was important in the classroom because Shakespeare more than any other author appealed to a wide variety of intellects. Some aspect of Shakespeare appealed to every student. Cappon's and MacMechan's stress on cultural ideals to be gained by each student from literature mirrored Alexander's concern for the individual's appreciation of literature.

Not only does literature, or print, appeal to the individual, but writing and the print medium gives impetus to producing new knowledge. Whereas orality functions optimally with conventionalization, as Olson points out, writing makes explicit what orality leaves implicit. In objectifying the previously implicit, print evolved in concert with the thrust of Baconian science that emphasized not traditional knowledge, derived from the classics and from the church, but new knowledge, derived from the physical world. Writing thus helped objectify both what was implicit in culture and implicit in the physical world. David Olson notes that the British essayists used writing "for the purpose of formulating original theoretical knowledge". John Locke's An Essay Concerning Human Understanding set psychology on a new track by repeatedly "examining an assertion to determine all of its implications" (Olson 267). Locke began his essay by thinking he could write what he knew on a sheet of paper in an evening. However, "By the time he had exhausted the possibilities of both the subject and the new technology, the essay had

taken twenty years and two volumes" (267). Olson then points out that Locke's new methods allowed "the deduction of counterintuitive models of reality" (267). As Kenneth Burke points out, especially in Rhetoric of Religion, language itself has an internal organization, a "hierarchical principle" that leads thought on in a dialectical fashion. Writing allows much more reflection about conceptual relationships than does oral discourse, a fact that itself suggests the creative principles associated with writing.

The shift from orality to literacy, then, brought with it increased individualization, as well as increased tendencies to derive and objectify knowledge and to derive it from abstract systems inherent in the nature of language and linguistic symbol systems rather than from personal beliefs or given religious traditions. This shift from subjectivity toward objectivity appeared overtly in Anglo-Canadian literary developments in the nineteenth century. Early in the century, the discourse of Thomas McCulloch, for instance, was laden with both social and personal values. At the end of the century, on the other hand, the discourse of W. J. Alexander had a strong objectivity. A comparison of two inaugural addresses illustrates the difference. At the occasion of opening a new building for Pictou Academy in 1819, Thomas McCulloch ended his address by placing the students' individual duty into the context of religion; in that setting,

McCulloch's rhetorical appeal was based on ethos as well as logos:

There is also a higher tribunal at which your character must soon be weighed; and there the heart purified by the wisdom from above, and full of mercy and good fruits, alone is approved. It must, therefore, be your daily study, to blend religious improvement with literary acquisitions. (24)

McCulloch also appealed to his students on the basis of ethos and pathos:

The approbation of your best friends, the honour of this seminary, your reputation, your prospects in life, are at stake. What an honorable field for activity is here presented! Should these motives, arousing exertion, conduct you to excellence, how noble the result! (24)

Using all three of Aristotle's rhetorical appeals then, McCulloch addressed his audience personally, urging an individual commitment to common ideals.

By contrast, Alexander's appeal in his 1884 inaugural was almost all logical, even when it stressed the moral aspect of literary study.

From the study of literature, then, in its most elementary form, as a simple presentation of ideas, hence from the study of all literature, we note two great

results:--first, openness of mind, that is, a readiness to admit ideas, however strange, and to comprehend and accept whatever truth they contain; secondly flexibility of mind, the capacity to seize a point of view not our own, to understand other men and other times--what, in short, we may call intellectual sympathy. (11)

Both of these inaugurals reflected strongly-held values of the authors. Alexander's two admonitions, however, were presented as logical deductions deriving from the study of literature; they were not presented as rooted in Alexander himself or in his audience. The difference between the source of the appeal in these two discourses reflects the process of objectification that had taken place in the course of the nineteenth century.

A comparison between the criticism of Reynar and Alexander shows the same shift toward treating the text as an object: Reynar's hortatory commentary, though not as strong as McCulloch's, still reflected his roots in the earlier decades of the century, roots reaching into the religious culture, where the direct transmission of morality was more important than the aesthetic analysis of the objective text. In the "Preface" to the notes on Tennyson's In Memoriam, Reynar wrote, "In Tennyson's In Memoriam we have the record of the thought and feelings of one of the greatest of Englishmen on the subjects that concern everyone. And we may well sit at his feet to learn of him." The commentary on Stanza LXVII conflated the values of Reynar and

Tennyson: "Tennyson realizes that his true vocation as a poet is not merely that of giving voice to a fruitless sorrow, but rather of holding up noble ideals and giving men the heart to struggle toward their realization." In Stanza XCIV, Reynar's commentary quoted Alfred Gatty, who also projected his religious position into the poem: "this fitness for apprehending any communications from the next world, well describes the condition requisite for intercourse with God Himself." Reynar's appeal, therefore, like McCulloch's, was personal; it invited emotional commitment as well as intellectual assent.

In contrast, Alexander's analysis of Browning's "Sordello," also dealt with man's relationship to the divine, but Alexander focused on Browning and the poem, inserting his own values only obliquely:

Of Sordello's thoughts we learn nothing more: he dies at this point; but the fact. . .that the badge was found trodden beneath his feet, indicates that he chose what we feel to be the better part,--that he resolved to sacrifice his own ambition to the well-being of mankind.

The difficulties raised in the final debate have not, however, been answered; accordingly Browning, in person, steps in to give his solution. There is need, we have seen, of a Love powerful enough to bind down the soul to a course of action commensurate with the

conditions of the present universe. This love must be for an object completely external to, and beyond, ourselves. . . . The object must, further, be capable of drawing out the soul completely and infinitely; that is,--must be beyond and above us, never to be attained or understood; must, in short, be absolute and infinite, in other words--God. (Browning 1889, 176)

In this passage, the love is presented logically, as a necessary construct in a system, with a description to clarify love's fit in the total design. When Alexander introduced the concept of the divine, he placed the need in Browning, not in himself or in his audience. Though Reynar, like Alexander, therefore dealt with an objective text, Reynar's personal appeal in criticism reflected his education in traditional rhetoric, in contrast to Alexander's more logical, objective approach.

In reviewing Canada's intellectual development in the nineteenth century, historian J. G. Bourinot noted the changes in public oral presentation as well. Writing for the Royal Society in 1893, he stated that the poems, histories, and literary essays of the second half of the century proved the steady intellectual growth of the nation, a growth reflected as well in the pulpits and the legislative halls of the nation. In the latter, however, he found that "a keen practical debating style has taken the place of the more rhetorical and studied oratory of old times" (1893, 45). Before 1840, "Political partisanship ran extremely

high. . . and grosser personalities than have ever characterized newspapers in this country sullied the editorial columns of leading exponents of public opinion" (1893, 16). The emotional involvement of the speakers, however, carried force, for Bourinot noted that "at no subsequent period of the political history of Canada were there more fervid, earnest orators than appeared in the days when the battle for responsible government was at its height" (1893, 11). Not only the academic culture, therefore, but the culture of public politics moved from high subjectivity toward an objective style during the course of the century.

The shift from subjectivity to objectivity that accompanied the transition from orality to print brought with it a split between poetics and rhetoric, with a privileging of poetics. When classical rhetoric, developed in an oral setting, shifted from Classics to English, rhetoric lost not only its oral component, but also its theoretical foundation. A careful reading of DeMille at Dalhousie, for instance, reveals how much his theory of rhetoric derived from his classical education. DeMille was more interested in educating an intellectually rounded graduate than a successful specialist. Because of his deep respect for rhetorical theory, DeMille spent seven years writing his rhetoric text. When J. G. Schurman and then W. J. Alexander succeeded DeMille at Dalhousie, the classical values of DeMille's rhetoric disappeared, though Alexander was himself as deeply acquainted with the classics as DeMille. But Alexander's course was dif-

ferent from DeMille's: Alexander's English curriculum was specialized; it related to print literature written for a literate society; it was not derived from an oral tradition, as was DeMille's. Reviewing the history of English rhetoric, Andrea Lunsford suggests the shift from classical rhetoric to the vernacular in eighteenth-century Scotland brought the same loss of its theoretical foundation as it moved from "an active production of public discourse" to "the aesthetic appreciation of literature" (1986, 110). As Hugh Blair translated classical rhetoric into his enormously successful lectures in Edinburgh, he transferred rhetoric out of the classical curriculum and gave it a separate university course taught in the vernacular. Focused primarily on style, Blair stripped from rhetoric its theoretical foundations in classical literature relating to a full range of discourse. When Blair's Edinburgh chair, under Aytoun, became the model for studies in English literature in Scotland, the narrowed rhetoric was institutionalized, first in Britain and then in Canada.

The arrival of Alexander as a specialist in Dalhousie, therefore, brought with it a strong shift from rhetoric toward poetics, with the idealism of English studies in subsequent years shifting especially aesthetic concerns from rhetoric to poetics, leaving rhetoric as little but a shell associated with composition, in which instruction, if offered at all, was restricted to the first year in most colleges and universities.

And the nature of both rhetoric, reduced largely to composition, and poetics, in the form of literary criticism, became strongly objective. The centre of concern in both was the nature and content of the text rather than the implications in the text for the reader or the writer.

A brief review of curricular developments in Anglo-Canadian English studies up to 1960 confirms the continuation of the late nineteenth-century idealistic curriculum: the centrality of British literature associated with this idealism, the narrowing of rhetoric to composition, reduced largely to exposition and taught as an adjunct of literature, and the nature of criticism as strongly objective. This curriculum especially valued the moral and aesthetic content of British literature. It was thus a curriculum that emphasized the reading and appreciation of belletristic writing. This curriculum devalued the historical productive arts of rhetoric, emphasizing the literary essay as a vehicle of communicating insights related to the reading of literature. Even the study of schemes and tropes, so central to traditional rhetoric, was transferred from the production of writing to the analysis of poetry. The study of oratory, which necessarily emphasized the appeals of ethos and pathos as well as logos, withered away, kept alive outside the core of liberal arts programs, as homiletics in divinity courses, and as dramatic elocution in theatre departments.

By the last decade of the nineteenth century, the direction of this new course in English studies was set. In 1890, the University of Toronto calendar listed for English lectures three Shakespeare plays in the freshman year, to which were added six essayists as models for rhetoric and composition focusing on prose style. The second year offered a history of the English language, a course that by 1893 had changed to a study of Walter Scott's poetry and prose, thereby indicating a shift from language to literature. The third year studied the English classical period (Dryden to Cowper), and the fourth year focused on the Romantics and Victorians. The honors program added Anglo-Saxon and filled in with additional English authors (Chaucer, Sidney, Bacon, Milton, etc.). The 1890s English program at the University of Toronto was, therefore, very literary and very British. The English offerings at McGill were similar, with English composition given one lecture-hour per week in the freshman year, and Alexander Bain's Rhetoric (perhaps the most prominent English language text on rhetoric and composition in the English-speaking world) listed with Chaucer as part of the literary option in the third year. The remainder of the course focused on British authors from the pre-Elizabethan period to the nineteenth century. The exam for the third-year study of Bain's text, however, reflected how the literary interests of the curriculum had changed the historic focus of rhetoric, for the questions included nothing on invention and arrangement, or even

on Bain's four modes of discourse. The exam focused rather on literary forms and the criticism and analysis of style.⁵ The same idealistic emphasis dominated the Dalhousie curriculum. The 1900-01 Dalhousie calendar stated explicitly, "The course in English is mainly literary." Indeed, the seven courses offered all focused on historical periods in British literature, with composition as part of the freshman literature course. A review of other college and university calendars in anglophone Canada, from the Maritimes to Winnipeg, shows a similar curriculum.

Though the English curricula of universities in Canada had expanded by the middle of the twentieth century, poetics and literature remained much more important than language or the rhetorical arts. The 1950-51 University of Toronto calendar still required the four essays that were part of the 1900 curriculum in each year of the English program. The calendar entry listed no formal rhetoric instruction. "Composition" was described only as the writing of at least four original compositions during the session" (157). The authors studied were chiefly British.⁶

⁵The first two questions related to style and diction; the third to figures of speech; the fourth, to the relationship between verse and pathos; the fifth, to meter; the sixth, to the divisions of historical writing; and the seventh, to the purposes of dramatic writing (1890-91 McGill Calendar, 120-21).

⁶Of 116 authors and works cited in the 1950-51 Toronto calendar for the general program, nine were American; except for Ibsen, Sophocles, and the Book of Job, the others were all British. The honors program added seventeen more courses, only one of which was non-British, a course on North American literature.

Calendars of other colleges reflected the same interests. Dalhousie, for instance, also tied composition to literature in the first year, and included only a single combined Canadian and American literature course as part of a program of twenty-one courses in 1949-50. The 1949-50 calendar for the University of British Columbia, by then the third largest university in the nation, showed an identical focus on literature, chiefly British.⁷

The Dalhousie, British Columbia and Toronto programs also included for honors students a separate course on literary criticism and poetics as well as a senior level writing course.⁸

⁷The third and fourth years offered twenty-one courses (excluding seminars); eleven of these were on British literature. Two courses (offered in alternate years) were on North American literature; one other course included American and British authors together. The remainder included courses on poetics, creative writing, European literature, theatre, Anglo-Saxon, and the history of the English language.

Besides the composition and literature courses of the first year, a second-year advanced composition course was given for practical programs such as Agriculture, Commerce, Pharmacy, etc. In this connection, it should be noted that in 1949 the first year course in B. C. was a senior matriculation year. This may account for the inclusion of "Elementary forms and principles of composition" in the English 100,101 entry, since the first year was viewed as high school completion. This status for the composition course would have suggested a more utilitarian course than would normally have been taught in the liberal arts program at a university, though the second year professional writing course indicates a stronger practical focus in British Columbia than at most other leading college programs in anglophone Canada.

⁸R. S. Harris points out that the University of Toronto split its original combined English and History honors program in 1936. By 1945, English courses in the new honors English program, English Language and Literature, were structured as follows:

First Year: Essays [the writing of four essays],

The nature of the writing course, though not specified in Dalhousie and Toronto, may have focused on creative writing in fiction and especially poetry. In his own, unique, fashion, Earle Birney had inaugurated such a course --"devoted to practice in imaginative writing"-- at the University of British Columbia (1949-50 calendar, 23). This was in keeping with the emphasis on literature and aesthetics within Canadian English departments. This focus on "imaginative writing" as the proper sphere of advanced writing instruction in a humanities program, indeed, the whole focus on literature and poetics typified the strongly aesthetic nature of English studies at mid-century. In his description of this curricular approach in America between 1900 and 1920, in what he calls that "Rhetoric of Liberal Culture,"-- in which "creative writing" also played a part (1987,44), James Berlin analyzes the epistemology of this movement. Berlin argues that this rhetorical approach was grounded in philosophical idealism, the pursuit of which would keep an individual "in touch with the permanent and the true." The aim of education in this

American-Can Lit, Shakespeare;
 Second Year: Essays, Chaucer, O.E., Renaissance, 1660-1780;
 Third Year: Essays, Chaucer, Spenser & Milton, Drama to 1642, Bibliography, Novel;
 Fourth Year: Essays, Romantic, Victorian, 19th Century Thought, History of Lit. Crit., 2 of Middle English/ Creative Writing/ Mod. Poetry and Drama/ Mod. Novel

Harris notes that the sequence of English courses in the honors program given above remained largely intact from 1945 to 1960 (85).

mode was to encourage a wise passivity and self-realization. The proponents of this approach in America were "Anglophiles who favored class distinctions and aspired to the status of an educated aristocracy of leadership and privilege, a right that was claimed on the basis of their spiritual vision." Proponents of this position called upon Matthew Arnold's concern for "the best that has been thought and said" in an attempt to "address and resolve moral and social problems by virtue of their sensitivity to the aesthetic" (1987, 45). Berlin notes, as well, that "proponents of the rhetoric of liberal culture discouraged writing instruction even as they continued to provide it to students in freshman literature courses that required writing about literature" (1987, 46). Berlin's comments reflect the ambivalence toward what many in Canada deemed the practically necessary but philosophically improper inclusion of composition in university-level liberal arts courses.⁹

In the first six decades of the present century, the renunciation of a rounded English studies program, which would have included rhetorical theory and practice as well as a strong focus on national literature and other world literature in the English language, also reflected the philosophically idealistic nature of the curriculum. The relationship of this curricular

⁹James Berlin's Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900 to 1985 lists a plurality of approaches to rhetoric in American colleges between 1900 and 1960. Against this plurality, the homogeneity of the Anglo-Canadian curriculum in the same period stands out strikingly.

focus on idealism was reflected in the 1952 presidential address of A. S. P. Woodhouse to the Royal Society of Canada. Woodhouse, at the time the head of Toronto's English department and one of Canada's foremost literary critics, spoke on "The Nature and Function of the Humanities." He listed six categories as included in the humanities: the linguistic, the literary, the aesthetic, the philosophical, the historical, and the practical. This last category, however, he restricted to literary writing, which he described as "near the frontier of the humanities" (7), questioning "whether, or at least to what extent, we shall push forward the boundaries [of the humanities] to include the new discipline" (7). The Woodhouse analysis, therefore, did not even consider as part of a humanist curriculum the study of rhetoric, that is, the study of human communication in both theory and practice, central to the Anglo-Canadian liberal arts curriculum before 1880, and almost universally central to higher education in the classical curriculum. In an either-or argument, Woodhouse stated, "I do not think that a study of the media of mass communications should be allowed to replace Shakespeare or Plato, as if one's life must necessarily be led on one side of the microphone or on the other" (12). In supplying English for professional faculties, Woodhouse also rejected a professionally utilitarian course:

the function of English in a professional school is not simply to afford training in writing. It offers a

principal (perhaps the only) introduction to the humanities, and it should cultivate a taste for reading as a form of intelligent recreation. In other words it has its contribution to make to the life of the student, not as an engineer, dentist (or whatever it may be), but as a civilized human being. And this is the primary concern of English at the university level (qtd. in Harris 1988, 126).

In the attitude expressed here, Woodhouse represented the strong idealist mentality that rejected all but the most limited of rhetorical arts in the English programs of the Anglo-Canadian college curriculum from 1890 into the 1960s. R. S. Harris' review of English studies at Toronto includes an informal office portrait of A. S. P. Woodhouse, the head of the University College English Department from 1944 to 1964. Behind Woodhouse in this portrait stand four pictures--of Matthew Arnold, W. J. Alexander, G. M. Wrong (Canadian Historian), and Samuel Johnson. Woodhouse called these four his "mentors" (Harris 1988, 112). The four portraits together might epitomize the historical and philosophical orientation not of Woodhouse alone, but of English studies in Canada up to 1960: concerned with an ideal culture, colonial, historical, classical and conservative.

The orientation of Woodhouse stands in sharp contrast to that of Egerton Ryerson, a century earlier. As the first

Victoria College president, Ryerson, placed not poetics but rhetoric at the centre of the liberal arts curriculum:

Knowledge itself cannot properly be said to be power, without the appropriate power to communicate it. Thucydides reports Pericles to have remarked--'One who forms a judgment on any point, but cannot explain himself clearly to the people, might as well have never thought on the subject.' Not to be able to communicate our knowledge, is but little better than to be without knowledge. (Ryerson 1842 18)

Ryerson's orientation was highly utilitarian. Indeed, as discussed in Chapter 4, Ryerson argued against English literature in the college classroom, his argument being that literature belonged in the grammar school.

Just as the Ryerson position was too narrow for the nineteenth century, the Woodhouse position, the mid-twentieth-century culmination of sixty years of studies focusing on idealism, especially English, proved too narrow after 1960. The cultures in which university curricula are rooted do not remain constant, so those curricula shift at time passes.

As mentioned earlier, the extent of change that began in English studies curricula in the 1960s paralleled curricular change a century earlier--though the lack of historical perspective in most English departments undoubtedly obscures this important information. True, the backbone of the English

curriculum after 1960 remained a series of courses in the development of British literature, but the literatures of English-speaking cultures outside the United Kingdom gradually began to appear in university calendars. As a harbinger of changes in attention to native letters, Canadian Literature, edited by George Woodcock, and later by W. H. New, began publication from the University of British Columbia in 1959. American literature, which had historically had only a limited following in Canadian universities, also gained in strength, and works of authors in the British Commonwealth began appearing in courses. Literary theory gained ground, as did the study of language, both in linguistics and later in rhetoric and composition. However, the changes of the 1960s and 1970s seldom went so far as including speech classes, which remained largely restricted to drama departments. On the other hand, a variety of "Communications" programs often grouped together such interests as semantic theory, media studies, modern dance, drama and music, or some of these, sometimes within English departments but often in separate, new departments.

Reflecting a new consciousness, the University of Toronto in 1964-65 established a new Calendar and Curriculum committee to review both the general and honors programs. It reduced the compulsory courses in the honors program to Romantic Poetry and Prose" and "Victorian Poetry and Prose." "Canadian Literature" was added as a new course. In the late 1960s, a course in

linguistics, taught by the recently established Centre for Linguistic Studies, was added in the first honors year, and a history of literary criticism was expanded to increase twentieth-century work as well as practical criticism (Harris 1988, 154). Much more important though, in 1969, the historic honors program itself was abolished as part of a wholesale curricular restructuring among the colleges making up the University of Toronto. Toronto's New Program, beginning in 1969, offered either a three- or four-year B.A., made no single course compulsory, and, in addition to the basic courses in British literature, offered a variety of new courses, among them "Canadian Poetry," "Canadian Fiction," "Contemporary Canadian Criticism," "The Contemporary Press," and "Film: Aesthetics, Theory and Practice" (Harris 1988, 158). A shift toward Canadian literature and toward a balance between utility and idealism was clearly under way.

In a further innovation, Toronto established a Writing Laboratory at Innis College in September 1964. Within the next two decades, every University of Toronto college would follow this lead. The intent of the Writing Laboratory was "never to provide what is often called remedial English," writes Professor Harris (1988, 161), but to help students "with any problem related to writing, though particularly with the essays or reports that are required in almost all undergraduate courses" (161). The focus was clearly not "creative writing." The

appearance of the writing laboratories, therefore, also marked a distinct shift toward practical rhetoric in English studies at Toronto. The work was organized by a series of personal interviews, lasting from one half hour to an hour with an experienced instructor. Attendance remained voluntary, but the success of the program soon brought students from beyond Innis College, accommodated as possible by committed Innis faculty.

Further changes loosening the historic English studies concentration on British literature at Toronto in the last two decades have included decentralizing the work of English faculty. In the early 1960s, Herbert Marshall McLuhan, a member of St. Michael's Department of English, became Director of the Centre for Culture and Technology, and Lawrence K. Shook, also from English at St. Michael's, became the Director of the Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies. In the later 1970s, the individual colleges also began to mount courses relating to English, among them courses such as Canadian Literature and Language, at University College; Canadian Studies, at Erindale; Literary Studies, at Victoria; and Writing and Rhetoric, at Innis (Harris 1988, 179). Further, in the 1980s the undergraduate curriculum of the University introduced a first-year course called "Effective Writing." Such a first-year composition course had been consciously rejected for a whole century. Though "Effective Writing" is not a compulsory course, even for students scoring poorly on the English Proficiency Test, Professor Harris

writes that it has proven popular with both students and staff, including senior professors. Professor Harris attributes the need for the new "American-type rhetoric course" to a decline during the 1970s in the standard of writing by Ontario secondary graduates, a phenomenon he traces back to the abolition of province-wide matriculation exams in 1967 (1988, 181). However, the popularity of the writing laboratories as early as 1964, as well as the call for writing laboratories by the Department of University Extension in 1967 and by the University Women's Club in 1972 (Harris 1988, 162), suggests that the need for such a course existed earlier already. It was recognized by the community, though not addressed by the university at the time.

Indeed, the need for rhetoric instruction has always been present in college studies. Rhetoric was the centre of the classical college program, and, even as composition, it remained important until it was shunted aside by the idealism of the 1880s. The loss of detailed attention to rhetoric, even in the 1880s, was not a matter of need, it was a matter of ideology. As this ideology began to weaken after almost a century, instruction in rhetoric once more gained strength in Anglo-Canadian English studies. The beginning of a shift in ideology was first seen in the inclusion of non-British literature in the curriculum, beginning in the 1950s. Since cultural ideals could also be found in native Canadian literature, a curricular shift in this area was acceptable to leaders like Woodhouse, for it expanded on

the scope of literature studies. But such a small shift was needed to begin to modify the idealistic strait-jacket of the first half of the century; at least a small break was needed before an increase in rhetoric, philology, recent literary criticism, and a wide variety of world literature in English was possible.

Wide-ranging curricular developments in rhetoric and English studies were not restricted to Toronto in the 1960s and 1970s. In 1959-60, McGill's calendar still showed a strong British and literary emphasis in the first year. Students were exempted from composition when they had "succeeded in demonstrating . . . competence." "Elementary English Composition" was offered only on a non-credit basis. The thirty-four courses in 1959-60 included one course in American Literature, one in creative writing, one each in Canadian prose literature and Canadian poetry, and "Studies in Literature since 1900." The emphasis was thus strongly traditional. By 1969-70, the McGill English 100 course had returned to the traditional English literature/composition split, with the course offered at the senior level as well for B.A. candidates who had missed the course in the first year. Modern North American Fiction was added, with Canadian and American Literature offered at both the 200 and 300 level. Creative Writing remained, but significant additions were courses in English language history and English linguistics, as well as African Literature. Courses also included Modern Yiddish Prose

and Yiddish Narrative, provided for the Montreal Jewish community, as well as two courses on film. The 1960s saw the course offerings increase from thirty-four to seventy-two (36 half courses and 36 full-year courses).

The 1979-80 McGill calendar showed continued changes from a decade earlier. The English Department now offered three options: Literature, Drama, and Film and Communication. In addition, English 100 had become a composition course, whose main purpose was "to develop or improve students' ability to write and to organize and express ideas." The course extended over a full year, but it was not compulsory. Other full-year courses included advanced composition, and studies in communication. The whole program in the 1979-80 calendar listed the equivalent of 108.5 full-year courses. The rhetorical courses had thus come with increased choice in literature and language offerings, and therefore increased specialization. Nevertheless, the philosophy guiding departmental development had clearly shifted toward a balance between British and non-British literature, and between poetics and rhetoric.

This pattern of development in English studies in other universities in Canada held true. The 1960s saw the beginnings of change, followed in the 1970s by substantial expansion of offerings in English literature from around the world, by expansion of language and linguistics, composition and rhetorical theory, and by new courses in communication theory as well as in

literary theory. The 1979-80 calendar of York University, for instance, listed courses in literary criticism for each level of a four-year program, with the criticism including both linguistics and rhetoric.¹⁰ The expansion of the liberal into the fine arts generally was also reflected in the 1979-80 York calendar, with programs in creative writing, dance, film, and theatre.

At the University of British Columbia, English Department offerings in 1980-81 also contained rhetorical courses and critical components. In addition to a first-year course including a traditional mix of composition and literature, the offerings included 300-level courses entitled "Practical Writing," "English Composition," "History and Theory of Rhetoric," "History of the English Language," "Stylistic Variation," "Dialectal Variation," "Literary Semantics," "The Structure of Modern English," "Practical Criticism," "History of Criticism," and "Modern Critical Theories."

The return of a rhetorical balance to traditionally poetics-related courses after 1960 reflected an obvious shift in cultural values, but the curricular shifts were also related to a dramatic rise in enrolments, beginning in the 1960s. As early as 1956 the

¹⁰101 - The Practical Criticism of Poetry; 201 - Literary Interpretation and Analysis (linguistic and structural analysis); 301 - Style and Stylistics (the classical rhetorical framework, English structure, specific English stylists since 1660);

417 - History and Principles of Literary Criticism.

University of Toronto had agreed to double its full-time enrolment by 1970. This would have brought 24,000 students to the St. George campus. However, by 1970 the enrolment stood at 26,000, and further increased by more than four thousand by 1975 (Harris 1988, 146-7). Increased student enrolments, of course, meant increased faculty. In 1963-64 the full-time teaching complement at Toronto was fifty-seven; in 1974-75 the staff numbered 148 (R. S. Harris 1988, 148). This increase in numbers was a national phenomenon. In 1962-63 the total national undergraduate full-time enrolment stood at 132,700. In 1981 - 82 this number had climbed to 354,503 (Cameron). Both increased students and faculty were necessary for diversification of the curriculum.

Though growth in student enrolments allowed more faculty members than earlier to teach their own specialties, the deep cultural reasons for the expansion of English studies in the 1960s and 1970s went further than mere numbers. James Berlin's review of rhetorical instruction in the twentieth century in American colleges is instructive for much that happened in Canadian colleges, though the history and development of English studies in Canada was significantly different from that of the United States. As noted earlier, Berlin holds that the teaching of rhetoric through literature was a rhetoric based on philosophical idealism (Berlin 1988, 44). This view, of course, corresponds with the data presented in Chapters 3 and 5 of the

present study. Berlin points out, further, that the literary criticism approach to composition often came in tandem with the offering of creative writing courses for those few gifted students capable of creating works of art. This corresponds to Canadian developments in the 1950s, when creative writing was added to numerous English programs, beginning with Earle Birney's course at the University of British Columbia in 1949. An adjunct of this model as extrapolated by Berlin, however, was also a remedial course for those students who could not cope in the regular first-year course (Berlin 1988, 91). This remedial model was also followed at McGill in the late 1950s--and in Toronto, with its addition of the writing labs, beginning in 1964. It was probably also the model followed by many institutions that offered remedial English in extension programs that were not considered a part of the regular English curriculum.

English programs in the 1980s thus offer a curriculum vastly expanded from those twenty years ago, especially in literary theory, in non-British literature in English, and in composition, language and history. The thrust of Anglo-Canadian universities is still strongly literary, and many attitudes deriving from the pre-1960 curriculum still remain. Far too many student essays are still judged primarily on correctness, and many composition classes treat writing the student essay only as a means to an end, not as part of a liberal education in its own right. But many now also accept the classical conviction that the study of

rhetoric is, indeed, a liberal study. Quintilian, whose educational system strove to educate not only a good orator, but, even more, a good person, urged his students to "write as much as possible and with utmost care, not to become expert writers only, or even expert orators, but, as basic to both, expert thinkers." To this he added,

For as deep ploughing makes the soil more fertile for the production and support of crops, so, if we improve our minds by something more than mere superficial study, we shall produce a richer growth of knowledge and shall retain it with greater accuracy. (Institutio Oratoria X, iii, 2-3)

In 1962, Albert Kitzhaber, having studied almost one hundred syllabuses of American freshman writing programs, presented much the same view:

composition. . . is not just a practical skill, not a mere bag of tricks, but instead an important way to order experience, to discover ideas and render them more precise, and to give them effective utterance. It is intimately related to thought itself. Considered in this light, composition is a liberal study, lying at the heart of any rounded scheme of education. (Kitzhaber 1962, 441).

Many who assigned the traditional essay within the context of English literature classes might have agreed with Kitzhaber,

arguing that the writing of essays in literature classes, as required in Anglo-Canadian universities, was at least in part designed to help students learn to clarify their thoughts and to learn coherent expression. This argument was partially correct. But the philosophy of requiring essays in a literature class, in the past has often focused more on the content of the writing as a reflection of the student's literary interpretation of the text than on the student learning to write. Prior to the 1960s (and in many situations even today), the approach to essays in literature classes was closely related to the interpretation of literature through a focus on the text as literary object exclusively. That approach to writing had its epistemological roots in Baconian science, which assumed that the nature of reality was transparent and wholly conveyed to the human mind by physical perception. David Hume, building on the ideas of Francis Bacon and John Locke, argued, "If any idea, no matter how abstract, cannot be reduced to its original impression, the idea should be dismissed" (Hume, 16-17). The philosophy of Bacon, Locke and Hume led to a positivistic epistemology, which initiated and then drove scientific thought as known in the nineteenth and earlier twentieth century. This has also been the epistemology supporting "current-traditional rhetoric," which stresses clear arrangement and superficial correctness. That approach to writing, especially when related to a reading of literature based

on a close, exclusive reading of the text, treats writing as merely a conduit of pre-existent truth.¹¹

That approach to writing derived from Locke's view that rhetoric distorted reality, so the best writing was that which distorted reality the least. That concept of writing fit the idealistic curriculum, which tolerated the teaching of a composition rooted in positivism because that rhetoric was useful in conveying in an untarnished manner "objective, ideal reality" from the mind of the critic to the mind of the audience. The teaching of a broader rhetoric than the strictly utilitarian "conduit" rhetoric could not be countenanced, since only belletristic writing, primarily British, could be trusted to contain or develop ideal concepts suitable for the youth of a nation as conservative ideologically as Anglo-Canadian universities demanded. Teaching the personal essay, for instance, would not feature "the best that is thought and known."¹² The introduction of the "creative writing" course in the 1950s, a break from the earlier curriculum, did not contradict the attitude slighting the personal essay in composition instruction. The "creative writing" course generally

¹¹James Berlin's two-volume history of rhetoric in the United States discusses the inter-relationship of epistemology and rhetoric in American colleges. See Berlin 1984 and 1987.

¹²This slighting of the personal approach in teaching composition still exists in Canada. At the March 1988 CCCC convention in St. Louis, Chris Bullock stated that his study of rhetoric texts had found no Canadian "expressionist-based" texts for college-level writing instruction.

attracted selected students serious about ideal literature, primarily poetry. Such students could be trusted to aspire to "the best that is thought and known," who were, therefore, committed to the ideals of the current literary culture before they entered the course. Creative writing focused on the belletristic tradition, not on the utilitarian or even on the liberal arts tradition that emphasized the student's personal development. It is probably also significant that the first professor of such a creative writing course was Earle Birney, who had proved his critical taste not only by study in London but also by writing a dissertation on Chaucer. "Creative Writing" belonged, very distinctly, in the poetics rather than in the rhetoric tradition, as the two were interpreted by English departments in the 1950s.

Though many attitudes deriving from the idealist epistemology remain even today, the curricular change in the 1960s and 1970s reflected a major shift in attitude by Anglo-Canadian leaders in English studies. However, even though the present curriculum had broadened to once more emphasize rhetoric, as it was emphasized in the earlier nineteenth century, the ideology driving McCulloch's and Ryerson's, or DeMille's, curriculum, differed from that driving contemporary thought. Hence, English studies today cannot simply return to a bygone curriculum.

For McCulloch, Strachan and Ryerson, and for Leach and DeMille, the existence of God and the centrality of the Christian religion in all of life, and therefore in education as well, was uncontroversial. Then, at the end of the nineteenth century, the earlier divine absolutes shifted to moral and literary traditions expressed in "the best that is known and thought in the world," but the absolutes still existed and carried Alexander's curriculum into the twentieth century.

Both the poetics and rhetoric associated with an epistemology based on absolutes emphasized language as a mirror or conduit of reality. Given the existence of a positivist physical reality as absolute, even while holding to ideals also considered eternal in some sense, late-Victorian and early twentieth-century student critics were to learn to "appreciate" literature intuitively, on the basis of innate genius, the role of the professor being to develop this innate capacity. As early as Alexander this was made clear:

Though the capacity for the highest literary appreciation is not common, in most men a measure of innate capability is dormant. To rouse this dormant capability, to guide it aright when roused, to teach the proper spirit in which to approach the masterpieces of literature, and to keep the mind in contact with them--this should form a main part of every course in literature. . . (1884, 13-14)

The role of the literature professor was effectively to lead the mind of the student to meet the mind of the literary genius embodied in the literature. This was to be a meeting of minds in communication with the absolutes embodied in the literature.

Significantly, Alexander's discussion of appreciating literature was subsumed under the discussion of style, for arrangement and style were the rhetorical concerns of the rhetoric relating to the poetics of the absolute. "Through style, then, we come in contact with that which is greatest in man," said Alexander in 1884 (12). Berlin traces this emphasis on style into the twentieth century, finding that current-traditional rhetoric has emphasized product rather than process, and arrangement and style rather than invention. Berlin further associates the current-traditional rhetoric with an epistemology related to the scientific method, which seeks knowledge in the external, physical world (1988, 27). As noted above, shifts in western epistemology, however, are now changing the way we think about language, and how we use language to think. As language has become ever more important in our culture, English studies have focused their attention more and more on language and communication, as the cursory review of calendars above has shown.

In this dissertation, I have presented a history of English studies in anglophone Canada in order to provide some perspective about our own origins. In medieval universities, rhetoric stood

at the centre of the curriculum, a tradition inherited by English Canada's first institutions. Although the classical tradition included a full rhetorical theory, unfortunately the centrality of rhetoric in most of these early institutions was undermined by the fact that because rhetoric was taught in Greek and Latin, it was not a vital force in the minds of students. Then, in most colleges, specialization soon led to a fragmentation of subjects. In the subsequent transfer of rhetoric from Classics to English, the theoretical foundations of classical rhetoric were stripped from the study, leaving only a utilitarian focus on elocution and composition, and eventually composition alone. Though English literature and language came together with rhetoric in the vernacular, both spoken and written, briefly in the 1860s and 1870s, especially at McGill and Dalhousie, by the 1880s rhetoric faded to first-year composition, which became an adjunct to history of literature classes. Courses in speech or elocution disappeared entirely. The underlying impetus for the specialization was rooted in a Baconian epistemology that placed reality in the realm of the physical senses, in a shift from an oral to a print culture, and then in a growing importance of the German university model that emphasized ever more discreet subject areas, especially as university teaching turned from small lectures and recitations on the history of culture to ever larger lectures and ever more detailed research into man's

existence as an objective physical, mental, and social being, in English studies searching for ultimate ideals.

English studies remained largely focused on courses in the history of British literature until the 1960s, when a revival in language, communication and rhetoric, as well as a widening concern for literary theory led to an expanded scope of English studies. This new interest in language and communication derives from an underlying epistemology grounded in a belief that the creation of knowledge itself is intimately related to the human use of language. To paraphrase Kenneth Burke, knowledge is a product of language related to man as a symbolizing animal.¹³ The growth in the scope of English studies in recent year is, therefore, not a product so much of English departments themselves determining to expand their studies, but of cultural forces rooted in language now perceived as epistemic, driving English departments to pursue emerging fields of knowledge.

English studies in the Canadian university setting are now in the process of expanding from traditional programs strongly committed to poetic traditions, emphasizing contemplative, abstract thought, to programs that include expanding rhetorical

¹³Burke's Quote:

For rhetoric as such is not rooted in any past condition of human society. It is rooted in an essential function of language itself, a function that is wholly realistic, and is continually born anew; the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols. (1950, 43)

components (including language), emphasizing practical written applications and theories of language and communication. Programs in speech will, undoubtedly, follow. Given these developments, English departments throughout Canada are now being forced to reconsider their institutional philosophies, which, until just two decades ago, stressed literature over language, reading over writing and speech, and theory over practice. In this current review, Canadian institutions have the advantage of observing how American colleges and universities have met this problem, for rhetoric has always been more important in America than Canada, and for twenty years now American institutions have been grappling with the transition from programs privileging poetics to programs including both poetics and rhetoric.

The American experience suggests that two main options are available: integration or specialization into separate departments. In a 1982 article, Maxine Hairston follows Richard Young in arguing that a Kuhnian-type paradigm shift has recently taken place in writing instruction, leading to a new consciousness of the importance of theory as well as practice in rhetoric. In that article, Hairston conceives of the new rhetoric as part of English studies in American universities and colleges. In the introduction to a 1983 series of twelve essays in Composition and Literature: Bridging the Gap, Winifred Bryan Horner agrees with Hairston's 1982 position, hoping that, in joining forces, both rhetoric and poetics will "find the strength

and the resources to forge new directions for the discipline" (8). In the same volume, others like Wayne Booth, J. Hillis Miller, David Bleich, Frederick Crews, and Edward P. J. Corbett argue for cooperation between literature and composition. Like Hairston, Miller alludes to the shift in modern consciousness that finds common interests between reading and writing. Quoting Paul de Man, he states

the "nearly imperceptible line" between a semiotician and grammarian of poetry like Michael Riffaterre and a theoretician of rhetoric like de Man may "be inextricably intertwined with the 'waning' of modernity." That is to say, it may be closely associated with the social and ideological situation within which the teaching of writing takes place today. If this is the case, anything that can be done to effect a rapprochement between literary theory and the teaching of writing would be all to the good. The theorists of literature would do well to face the practical implications for the teaching of writing as well as of the teaching of reading of their theories, and the teachers of writing would do well to be as clear as possible about the theoretical assumptions of what they do. (Horner 41)

Arguments for combining both reading and writing in the same departments, therefore abound. It seems only natural, as J.

Hillis Miller argues, for teachers of reading to know the theory of the composition that produces the writing that is read, and, just as natural that teachers of writing should know the theory of reading, for every text that is written is meant to be read. Indeed, reading is an inextricable part of the very process of writing, for a reader that fails to comprehend the nature of patterns of continuity and development in his or her own writing has great difficulty in initially writing and then revising a work in progress. Further, it is important for writers to read the best that has been written, which relates to Arnold's "the best that has been known and thought in the world." And, finally, it would be eminently reasonable to follow Cicero's advice, recalled in the introduction to this study; namely, to have the same set of professors teach us to read as well as to write. Nevertheless, as this dissertation has shown, our present university system is not built on the concept that language is epistemic. On the contrary, most of the present professorate, both within English departments and without, are more familiar with the concept that knowledge is best gained through specialization. Further, this chapter has argued that specialization is a natural heir of print literacy, which has a strong analytical thrust, and which is still much more powerful in the university setting than is a literacy of orality so strongly fostered by the electronic media and by ever greater ease in travel.

Therefore, although contemporary rhetoric and language theory suggests that studies should be integrated, arguments for the specialization still basic to our whole university system suggest that rhetoric and composition, as well as speech, should be taught in their own departments. Unfortunately, the separation option is driven not only by those arguing specialization on the basis of historical theories related to epistemology, but also by those arguing administrative and political convenience. Again, the situation in the U. S. is instructive for Canada. Though Maxine Hairston in 1982 appeared to favor the development of composition expertise within English departments, by 1985 the reality of the academic setting in which those teaching literature refused to recognize the importance of composition had forced her to question her earlier position. In her 1985 Chair's address to the Conference on Composition and Communication, she therefore argued for separation, based on the argument of specialization (though the introduction--and the emotion--in the address indicated the impetus for separation was provided by political conflict). Confining her comments to composition, she argued that composition must establish itself by producing research that will foster the growth of the discipline, by extending connections to disciplines outside the field of rhetoric, and by making connections with business, industry, technology, and the government (279-80).

Hairston's call for a separation between rhetoric and poetics is thus based on the political reality of English departments still committed to an essentially Baconian epistemology--as well as to the political reality that senior positions are those in literature. However, both conditions that now privilege literature over rhetoric are changing, and English studies in the university would do well to look to the future in making present policies. There is a potential danger that the present emphasis on utility in society at large might, in the coming decades, swing English studies so far toward rhetoric that poetics would suffer. At the moment that possibility may seem remote, but the rapid growth of courses like those at McGill mentioned above are symptomatic of possibilities that exist across the nation. The McGill experience is paralleled to some extent by the two-year college curriculum in British Columbia. When I began teaching at a two-year college in British Columbia in 1971, courses in rhetoric were virtually unknown in the academic area of the B. C. community college system. Within one decade, almost half the academically-oriented English courses at the college where I teach are in composition. If one considers the community college English taught in non-academic courses (business, health technologies, industry), literature courses are but a quarter of the English offerings. The situation at other colleges in this province is similar. The demand for a narrowly utilitarian approach to English is growing rapidly. If we

examine the almost total realignment of English instruction in Anglo-Canadian colleges exactly one century ago, in the decade following the arrival at Dalhousie of W. J. Alexander, we should not dismiss lightly the possibility of rapid shifts in curricular focus at the end of this century. The danger exists that these curricular changes might take English studies into another narrow focus, this time at the utilitarian end of the English studies spectrum. The broad study of both poetics and rhetoric in English could then be threatened again. An understanding of the development of English studies in our country, however, should help us to plan the path of inevitable change, in order to provide as comprehensive and balanced a program of English studies as possible in an age more and more dependent on language, of which English departments must be dedicated custodians.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Where works cited have been used in microfiche form, the number of the Canadian Institute for Historical Reproductions (CIHM) is given at the end of the citation.

Acton, H. B. "Idealism." The Encyclopedia of Philosophy. New York: MacMillan, 1967.

Agnew, Christopher Mack. "The Failure of the Imperial Idea in Canada." Diss. U of Delaware, 1980.

Alexander, W. J. ed. Select Poems, 1898. Toronto: Copp, 1897.

---. The Study of Literature. Inaugural Address Delivered at the Convocation of Dalhousie University, Halifax, N. S., Oct. 28th, 1884. Halifax, 1884.

---. The Study of Literature. Inaugural Lecture Delivered in the Convocation Hall, October 12th, 1889. Toronto, 1889.
CIHM NO. 01350.

---. An Introduction to the Poetry of Robert Browning. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1889.

Alexander, W. J., and M. F. Libby. Composition from Models for Use in Schools and Colleges. Toronto: Copp, Clark, 1894.

Alexander, W. J. ed. The University of Toronto and Its Colleges, 1827 - 1906. Toronto, 1906.

Altick, Richard. The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public 1800-1900. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1957.

Anderson, R. D. Education and Opportunity in Victoria Scotland.

New York: Oxford UP, 1983.

Aristotle. Rhetoric. Tr. W. Rhys Roberts. New York: The Modern Library, 1984.

Arnold, Matthew. "The Function of Criticism at the Present Time." Essays in Criticism. 1865. Reprinted in William E. Buckler, ed. Prose of the Victorian Period. Boston: Riverside, 1958.

---. Higher Schools and Universities in Germany. 2nd. ed. London: Macmillan, 1874.

---. Literature and Dogma: And Essay Towards a Better Apprehension of the Bible. 1873. London: John Murray, 1909.

---. "Literature and Science." Discourses in America. 1885. Reprinted in William E. Buckler, ed. Prose of the Victorian Period. Boston: Riverside, 1958.

---. "The Study of Poetry." 1880. Reprinted in Essays in Criticism, Second Series. 1888. Reprinted again in William E. Buckler, ed. Prose of the Victorian Period. Boston: Riverside, 1958.

---. "Sweetness and Light." Culture and Anarchy. 1869. Reprinted in William E. Buckler, ed. Prose of the Victorian Period. Boston: Riverside, 1958.

Aytoun, W. E. "The Scottish Universities." Blackwoods Magazine 82 (1858): 74-93.

Bailey, A. G., ed. The University of New Brunswick Memorial Volume. Fredericton: The University, 1950.

Bain, Alexander. English Composition and Rhetoric: A Manual. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1866.

---. "On Teaching English." The Fortnightly Review 31 (1869): 200-214.

---. On Teaching English: With Detailed Examples, and an Enquiry into the Definition of Poetry. London: Longmans, Green, 1887.

Ben-David, Joseph, and Awraham Zloczower. "Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies." European Journal of Sociology 3 (1962): 45-84.

Berlin, James. Rhetoric and Reality: Writing Instruction in American Colleges, 1900-1985. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1987.

---. Writing Instruction in Nineteenth-Century American Colleges. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1984.

Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." Philosophy and Rhetoric 1 (1968): 1 - 14.

Blair, Hugh. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres. Ed., Harold F. Harding. 2 Vols. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1965.

Booth, Wayne C. Modern Dogma and the Rhetoric of Assent. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1974.

Bourinot, John George. Our Intellectual Strength and Weakness: A Short Historical and Critical Review of Literature, Art and Education. Montreal: Foster, Brown, 1893. Royal Society of Canada Series, No. 1.

---. The Intellectual Life of the Canadian People. Toronto, 1881.

Brent, Doug. "Toward a Rhetoric of Reading." Ph. D. dissertation in process. University of British Columbia, 1988.

Broadus, E. K. "The Weakness in English of Large Numbers of Graduates and Undergraduates." NCCU Proceedings (1927): 79-97.

Bruffee, Kenneth. "Social Construction, Language, and the Authority of Knowledge: A Bibliographical Essay." College English 48 (1986): 773-790.

Bullock, Chris. "Canadian Identity and Canadian Composition Textbooks: A Selective Examination of a Problematic Relationship." CCCC Convention. St. Louis, 18 March, 1988.

Burke, Kenneth. A Grammar of Motives. 1945. Berkley: U California P, 1969.

---. A Rhetoric of Motives. 1950. Berkley: U California P, 1969.

---. Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method. Berkley: University of California Press, 1966.

---. The Rhetoric of Religion: Studies in Logology. 1961. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.

- Burwash, Nathanael. The History of Victoria College. Toronto, 1927.
- Calvin, Delano D. Queen's University at Kingston, 1841 - 1941. Kingston: Queen's University, 1941.
- Cameron, Christina. "University." The Canadian Encyclopedia. 3 vols. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985.
- Campbell, George. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Ed., Lloyd F. Bitzer. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1963.
- Cappon, James. "Current Events." Queen's Quarterly 25 (1917): 91-123.
- . "Democracy and Monarchy in the Modern State." Queen's Quarterly 24 (1916): 296-311.
- . "Edward Caird: A Reminiscence." Queen's Quarterly 16 (1909): 267-282.
- . "Is Ontario to Abandon Classical Education?" Queen's Quarterly 12 (1904): 190-206.
- . "Subjects and Methods in the Teaching of English." Canadian Educational Monthly 12 (1890): 8-14.
- Carlyle, Thomas. Sartor Resartus. 1838. Reprinted in William E. Buckler, ed. Prose of the Victorian Period. Cambridge: Riverside, 1958.
- Cicero. De Oratore. Trans. E. W. Sutton and H. Rackam. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library, 1942.
- Collard, Edgar Andrew. "Leach, William Turnbull." Dictionary of Canadian Biography. 1982.

Connors, Robert. "Composition Studies and Science." College English 45 (1983): 773-790.

---. "Mechanical Correctness as a Focus in Composition Instruction," College Composition and Communication 36 (February 1985): 61-72.

---. "The Rhetoric of Explanation." Written Communication I (1984): 189 - 210.

---. "The Rise and Fall of the Modes of Discourse." College Composition and Communication 35 (1981): 444 - 454.

Cook, Ramsay. The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1986.

Cook-Gumperz, Jenny, and John J. Gumperz. "From Oral to Written Culture: The Transition to Literacy." Variation in Writing Ed. Marcia Farr Whitehead. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 89-109.

Corbett, Edward P. J. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. New York: Oxford UP, 1965.

Creery, "Newspapers." Canadian Encyclopedia. 3 vols. Edmonton: Hurtig, 1985.

"Valedictory." The Dalhousie Gazette 30 Apr., 1884.

"Dallusiensia." Dalhousie College Gazette 5 Jan., 1871: 30.

"Daniel Wilson." A Cyclopedia of Canadian Biography. Toronto, 1888.

- Davey, Ian E. "The Rhythm of Work and School." Egerton Ryerson and His Times. Ed. Neil McDonald and Alf Chaiton. Toronto: MacMillan, 1978.
- Davie, George Elder. The Democratic Intellect: Scotland and Her Universities in the Nineteenth Century. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1961.
- Davies, Robertson. "A Return to Rhetoric." Queen's Quarterly 87 (1980): 183 - 197.
- D'Avray, Marshall. "University, 10th February 1863." University of New Brunswick Archives.
- . "University, 7th March, 1864." University of New Brunswick Archives.
- Dawson, J. W. On the Course of Collegiate Education, Adapted to the Circumstances of British America. The Inaugural Discourse of the Principal of McGill College, Montreal. Montreal: H. Ramsay, 1855. CIHM NO. 22525.
- . The Recent History of McGill University. Montreal, 1883.
- . Thirty Eight Years at McGill. Montreal: Gazette, 1893.
- DeMille, James. The Elements of Rhetoric. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1878.
- . "Professor DeMill's Address." Dalhousie Gazette 23 Nov. 1878: 1-7; 7 Dec. 1878:13-17.
- . A Strange Manuscript Found in A Copper Cylinder. 1888. Toronto: New Canadian Library, 1969.

- Eagleton, Terence. Literary Theory: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell, 1983.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. Selections from Ralph Waldo Emerson. Ed. Stephen E. Whicher. Boston: Riverside-Houghton Mifflin, 1957.
- Faber, Geoffrey. Jowett: A Portrait with a Background. London: Faber and Faber, 1957.
- Falconer, Sir Robert. "English Influence on the Higher Education of Canada." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. (1928): 33-48.
- . "A Hundred Years in the Humanities and Social Sciences." Queen's University, A Centenary Volume, 1841-1941. Toronto, 1941. 31-46.
- . "The Tradition of Liberal Education in Canada." Canadian Historical Review 8 (1927): 99-118.
- . "Scottish Influence in the Higher Education of Canada." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. Sec. II (1927): 7 - 20.
- Flexner, Abraham. Universities: American, English, German. New York: Oxford, 1930.
- Fraser, Brian J. "The Christianization of Our Civilization: Presbyterian Reformers and Their Defence of a Protestant Canada, 1875-1914." Diss. York U, 1982.
- Frye, H. N. The Bush Garden: Essays on the Canadian Imagination. Anansi, 1971.

- . The Critical Path: An Essay in the Social Context of Literary Criticism. Bloomington, 1973.
- . The Educated Imagination. The Massey Lectures, Second Series. Toronto: CBC Enterprises, 1963.
- . "The Study of English in Canada." Dalhousie Review 38 (1958): 1 - 7.

General Report of the Commissioners Under the Universities (Scotland) Act, 1858. With an Appendix Containing Ordinances, Minutes, Reports on Special Subjects, and Other Documents. Edinburgh: Murray and Gibb for Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1863.

Genung, John Franklin. The Practical Elements of Rhetoric. Amherst: J. E. Williams, 1885.

- . Outlines of Rhetoric. New York: Ginn, 1883.

Grant, Alexander. The Story of the University of Edinburgh. 2 vols. London: Longman's, 1884.

Grant, William L. and Frederick Hamilton. Principal Grant. Toronto: Morang, 1904.

Grierson, Herbert J. C. Rhetoric and English Composition. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1945.

Guthrie, Warren. "The Development of Rhetorical Theory in America 1630-1850." Speech Monographs 15 (1948): 61-71.

Hairston, Maxine. "Breaking Our Bonds and Reaffirming Our Connections." College Composition and Communication 36 (1985): 272-282.

- . "The Winds of Change: Thomas Kuhn and the Revolution in the Teaching of Writing." College Composition and Communication 33 (1982): 76 - 88.
- Halloran, S. Michael. "Rhetoric in the American College Curriculum: The Decline of Public Discourse," Pre/Text 3 (1982): 245 - 270.
- Hamilton, W.B. "Marshall D'Avray: Precursor of Modern Education." Profiles of Canadian Educators. Toronto: D. C. Heath, 1974.
- . "d'Avray, Joseph Marshal de Brett Mare'chal, 2nd Baron." The Canadian Encyclopedia. 3 vols. Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1985.
- . "Thomas McCulloch: Advocate of Non-sectarian Education," Profiles of Canadian Educators. Toronto: D. C. Heath, 1974.
- Harris, Reginald V. Charles Inglis: Missionary, Loyalist, Bishop (1734-1816). Toronto: General Board of Religious Education, 1937.
- Harris, Robin S. A History of Higher Education in Canada, 1663-1960. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1976.
- . An Index to the Material Bearing on Higher Education Contained in J. G. Hodgins' Documentary History. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1966.
- . English Studies at Toronto: A History. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1988.

- . "The Place of English Studies in a University Program of General Education: A Study Based on the Practices of the English-Speaking Universities and College of Canada in 1951-52." Diss. U. of Michigan, 1953.
- . Quiet Evolution: A Study of the Educational System of Ontario. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1967.
- Harrison, G. B. "Department of English." Queen's Quarterly 51 (1944): 378-89.
- . Profession of English. New York: Harcourt, 1962.
- Harvey, D. C. "Educational Activities in Cape Breton, 1758 - 1850." Public Archives of Nova Scotia: MG 1, Box 784, Folder 6/One, [n.d.].
- . "The Intellectual Wakening of Nova Scotia." The Dalhousie Review 13 (1933): 1-22.
- . An Introduction to the History of Dalhousie University. Halifax: McCurdy Printing, 1938.
- Hodgins, J. George, ed. Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada. 28 Vols. Toronto, 1894-1912.
- . The Establishment of Schools and Colleges in Ontario, 1792 - 1910. L. K. Cameron, 1910.
- . Historical and Other Papers and Documents: Education System of Ontario. 1792 - 1853. 3 vols. Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1911.
- . Sketch of Education in Upper and Lower Canada. Toronto: 1864.

- Horner, Winifred Bryan. Literature and Composition: Bridging the Gap. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- Houghton, Walter E. The Victorian Frame of Mind. New Haven: Yale UP, 1957.
- Howell, Wilber S. Eighteenth Century British Logic and Rhetoric. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1971.
- . Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1956.
- Hume David. "An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding." [1758] Essays Moral, Political, and Literary. Vol. ii. London: Longmans, Green, 1912.
- Ideas and Beliefs of the Victorians: An Historic Revaluation of the Victorian Age. London: Sylvan Press, 1949. [Broadcast on the B.B.C. "Third Programme"]
- Illsley, William Allen. "Studies in the History of the Teaching of English in Scotland." Diss. St. Andrews U., 1966.
- Jacob, E. The Experience, Prospects and Purposes of King's College, Fredericton; Oration Delivered at the Encaenia. Fredericton: The College, 1851.
- Johnson, Nan. "Instruction in Rhetoric: The Present State of the Art." Proceedings of the Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric. Ed. John Stephen Martin and Christine Mason Sutherland. Calgary: Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric, 1986.
- . "Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the Canadian Academy: An Historical Analysis." College English 50 (1988): 861-873.

Kant, Immanuel. Kritik der Reinen Vernunft. 1781, 1787.

Hamburg: Felix Meiner, 1956.

Kingsford, William. "In Memoriam." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. Sec. II (1893): 55-65.

Kirkconnell, W. "The Humanities." Canadian Education Today. Ed., J. Katz. Toronto, 1956; 200-210.

Kitzhaber, Albert Raymond. "New Perspectives on Teaching Composition." College English 23 (1962): 440-44.

---. "Rhetoric in American Colleges, 1850-1900." Diss. U of Washington, 1953.

Klinck, Carl F. General Editor. The Literary History of Canada: Canadian Literature in English. 2nd Ed. 3 vols. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1976.

Jardine, George. Outlines of a Philosophical Education. 2nd ed. 1825.

Jones, Sir Henry, and John Henry Muirhead. The Life and Philosophy of Edward Caird. Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson, 1921.

Langton, H. H. Sir Daniel Wilson: A Memoir. Toronto: Thomas Nelson, 1929.

Lanham, Richard. Literacy and the Survival of Humanism. New Haven: Yale UP, 1984.

Learned, W. S., and K. C. M. Sills. Education in the Maritime Provinces of Canada. New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1922.

Locke, John. An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. 1690.
London: Ward, Lock and Co. n.d.

Logan, John Daniel. Aesthetic Criticism in Canada: Its Aims, Methods and Status. Being a Short Propadeutic to the Appreciation of the Fine Arts and the Writing of Criticism, on Literature, Paining and Dramatic and Musical Performances. McClelland, Goodchild and Stewart, 1917.

Lunsford, Andrea. "Alexander Bain's Contributions to Discourse Theory." College English 44 (1982): 291-300.

---. "Cognitive Studies and Teaching Writing." Perspectives on Research and Scholarship in Composition. Eds. Ben W. McClelland and Timothy R. Donovan. New York: MLA, 1985.

---. "The Past--And Future--of Rhetorical Instruction." Proceedings of the Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric. Ed. John Stephen Martin and Christine Mason Sutherland. Calgary: The Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric, 1986.

---. "Rhetoric: A Key to Survival." English Quarterly 17 (1984): 3-16.

McCulloch, Thomas. The Stepsure Letters. [1821-23]. Intr. Northrup Frye. Toronto: New Canadian Library, 1960.

---. A Lecture Delivered at the Opening of the Building Erected for the Accommodation of the Class of the Pictou Academical Institution. Halifax: A. H. Holland for the trustees of the Pictou Academical Institution, 1819.

- . The Nature and Uses of a Liberal Education Illustrated, Being a Lecture Delivered at the Opening of the Building, Erected for the Accommodation of the Class of the Pictou Academical Institution. Halifax: A. H. Holland, 1819.
- McCulloch, William. The Life of Thomas McCulloch. Truro: privately printed, 1920.
- McDonald, N. and Alf Chaiton, eds. Egerton Ryerson and His Times. Toronto: MacMillan, 1978.
- McDougall, Robert L. "A Study of Canadian Periodical Literature of the Nineteenth Century." Diss. University of Toronto, 1950.
- McKillop, A. B. Contours of Canadian Thought. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1987.
- . A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1979.
- . "John Watson and the Idealist Legacy." Canadian Literature 83 (1979): 72-89.
- MacLennan, H. ed. McGill: The Story of a University. Toronto: Nelson, 1961.
- McMaster, R. D. "The Department of English." Folio 30 (1982): 5-12.

- MacMechan, Archibald. Concerning the Oldest English Literature. Inaugral Address Delivered at the Convocation of Dalhousie University, Halifax, N. S., Sept.26th, 1889. Halifax, 1889. CIHM NO. 27175.
- . "DeMille, the Man and the Writer." Canadian Magazine 27 (1906): 404-416.
- . "George Paxton Young. An Acknowledgment of Debt." University of Toronto Monthly 7 (1906-07): 110-115, 138-143.
- . Headwaters of Canadian Literature. 1924 New Canadian Library, 1974.
- MacMillan, C. McGill and its Story, 1821 - 1921. London: John Lane, 1921.
- McLuhan, Herbert Marshall. The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1962.
- . Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- McMullin, Stanley Edward. Thomas McCulloch: The Evolution of a Liberal Mind. Diss. Dalhousie U, 1975.
- McMurtry, Jo. English Language and Literature: The Creation of an Academic Discipline. Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1985.
- McNab, G. G. The Development of Higher Education in Ontario. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1925.
- McNaught, Kenneth. The Pelican History of Canada. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1982.

McNeill, W. E. "James Cappon." Some Great Men of Queen's.

Ed., R. C. Wallace. Toronto: Ryerson, 1941. 71-93.

Marling, Alexander. The Canadian Educational Directory and Year Book for 1876. Toronto: Hunter Rose, 1876.

Masters, D. C. The Rise of Toronto: 1850-1890. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1947.

Meikle, H. W. "The Chair of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in the University of Edinburgh." University of Edinburgh Journal 13

(1943): 89-103.

Moorman, J. R. H. A History of the Church in England. New York: Morehouse-Barlow, 1967.

Murphy, James J., ed. The Rhetorical Tradition and Modern Writing. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1982.

---. A Synoptic History of Classical Rhetoric. Ed. James J. Murphy. Davis: Hermagoras, 1983.

Murray, Lindley. English Grammar, Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners. With An Appendix, Containing Rules and Observations, for Assisting the More Advanced Students to Write With Perspicuity and Accuracy. 5th Edition Improved. York: Longman and Rees, 1799.

Natanson, Maurice. "The Limits of Rhetoric." Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings. Ed. Richard L. Johannesen. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Neatby, Hilda. So Little for the Mind. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Co., 1953.

Nelles, S. S. Journal: "Book of Random Thoughts. 1846-49," Personal Papers, Box 3, File 29, United Church Archives, Toronto.

---. Journal: "Book of Random Thoughts on Speech, Public or Private Conversation," Personal Papers, Box 3, File 30, United Church Archives, Toronto.

Newman, John Henry. The Idea of a University. 1852. Reprinted in William E. Buckler, ed. Prose of the Victorian Period. Boston: Riverside, 1958.

Olson, David R. "From Utterance to Text: The Bias of Language in Speech and Writing." Harvard Educational Review 47 (1977): 257-281.

Pacey, D. "The Humanist Tradition." The University of New Brunswick Memorial Volume. Ed. A. G. Bailey. Fredericton, 1950. 57-68.

Palmer, D. J. The Rise of English Studies: An Account of the Study of English Language and Literature from its Origins to the Making of the Oxford English School. London: Oxford UP, 1965.

Parker, William Riley. "Where Do English Departments Come From?" College English 28 (1967): 339-351.

Paulsen, Friederich. The German Universities and University Study. Trans. Frank Tilly and William W. Elwang. New York: Scribner's, 1906.

- Perelman, Chaim, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. 1958. Tr. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1969.
- Phillips, Charles E. The Development of Education in Canada. Toronto: W. J. Gage, 1957.
- Plato. Gorgias. Trans. W. C. Helmbold. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1981.
- Porter, John. The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1965.
- Potter, Stephen. The Muse in Chains: A Study in Education. London: Jonathan Cape, 1937.
- Prentice, A. The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-nineteenth century Upper Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977.
- Purdy, J. D. "John Strachan and Education in Canada, 1800-1851." Diss. U of Toronto, 1962.
- . "John Strachan's Educational Policies, 1815-1841." Ontario History 64 (1972): 45-64.
- Quackenbos, G. P. Advanced Course of Composition and Rhetoric. A Series of Practical Lessons on the Origin, History, and Peculiarities of the English Language, Punctuation, Taste, the Pleasure of the Imagination, Figures, Style and its Essential Properties, Criticism, and the Various Departments of Prose and Poetical Composition; Illustrated With Copious Exercises. Adapted to Self-Instruction, and the Use of

- Schools and Colleges. New York: D. Appleton, 1876.
- Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria. Trans. H. E. Butler. 4 vols.
Loeb Classical Library, 1922.
- Reid, Ronald F. "The Boylston Professorship of Rhetoric and
Oratory, 1806 - 1904: A Case Study in Changing Concepts
and Pedagogy." Quarterly Journal of Speech 45 (1959):
239-257.
- Reynar, Alfred H. "The Ancient Classics and the Modern Classics
in Our Schools." Unpublished manuscript. Reynar File.
Victoria U. Archives, Toronto.
- . "Literature and Culture." The Canadian Educational Monthly
40 (1889): 125-131.
- . "On In Memoriam and the Religion of Tennyson."
Reynar File. Victoria U. Archives, Toronto.
- . "Righteousness Exalteth a Nation." The Cobourg World
23 May 1889: [n.p.]. Reynar File. Victoria U. Archives,
Toronto.
- Richter, Melvin. The Politics of Conscience: T. H. Green and His
Age. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard U P, 1964.
- Ross, George W. The Universities of Canada: Their History and
Organization, with an Outline of British and American
University Systems. Toronto: Warwick and Rutter, 1896. CIHM
NO. 12965.

Ryerson, A. E. Inaugural Address on the Nature and Advantages of an English and Liberal Education. Toronto, 1842. CIHM NO. 21866.

---. Letters from the Reverend Egerton Ryerson to the Hon. and Reverend Doctor Strachan. Kingston, 1828. CIHM NO. 36177.

---. The Story of My Life. Ed. J. G. Hodgins. Toronto, 1883. CIHM NO. 12799.

---. University Question: The Rev. Dr. Ryerson's Defence of the Wesleyan Petitions to the Legislature, and of Denominational Colleges as Part of our System of Public Instruction, In Reply to Dr. Wilson and Mr. Langton, Before a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly. Quebec, 1860. CIHM NO. 22837.

Sanderson, Michael, ed. The Universities in the Nineteenth Century. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Scadding, Henry. Toronto of Old: Collections and Recollections Illustrative of the Early Settlement and Social Life of the Capital of Ontario. Toronto: Willing and Williamson, 1878.

Scholes, Robert. Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Sedgewick, G. G. "A. M." Dalhousie Review. 13 (1934): 451-8.

---. "The Unity of the Humanities." Dalhousie Review. 8 (1928): 357-367.

Segal, Judy. "English Department, University of Waterloo." Inkshed 2 (March 1988): 2.

- Sherman, Sarah W. "Inventing an Elephant: History as Composition." Only Connect: Uniting Reading and Writing. Upper Montclair: Boynton/Cook, 1986.
- Shortt, S. E. D. The Search for an Ideal: Six Canadian Intellectuals and Their Convictions in an Age of Transition. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1976.
- Simons, Herbert W. "Toward a New Rhetoric." Contemporary Theories of Rhetoric: Selected Readings. Ed. Richard L. Johannesen. New York: Harper and Row, 1971, 50 - 63.
- Sissons, Charles B. Egerton Ryerson: His Life and Letters. 2 vols. Toronto: Clark Irwin, 1937-1949.
- . A History of Victoria College. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1952.
- . Church and State in Canadian Education. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1959.
- Smith, Adam. Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres Student Notes, University of Glasgow, 1762 - 63. New York: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Solly, Henry S. The Life of Henry Morley, LL.D. London: Edward Arnold, 1898.
- Spragge, George W. "The Cornwall School Under John Strachan." Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records. 34 (1942): 63-85.
- . The John Strachan Letter Book: 1812 - 1834. Toronto: Ontario Historical Society, 1946.

- Stevenson, O. J. "The Study of Literature." Diss. U of Toronto, 1904.
- Stewart, Donald C. "Some Facts Worth Knowing About the Origins of Freshman Composition." CEA Critic 44 (1982): 2-11.
- Stone, Lawrence, ed. "The Size and Composition of the Oxford Student Body 1580-1909." The University in Society. Vol. I: Oxford and Cambridge from the 14th to the Early 19th Century. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1974.
- Strachan, John. An Appeal to the Friends of Religion and Literature, on Behalf of the University of Upper Canada. London, 1827.
- . A Letter to the Rev. Thomas Chalmers, D.D. Professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh, On the Life and Character of the Right Reverend Dr. Hobart, Bishop of New-York, North America. New York: Swords, Stanford, 1832. CIHM NO. 21387.
- . Sermon on the Death of the Honorable Richard Cartwright: With a Short Account of His Life. Preached at Kingston, on the 3rd of September, 1815. Montreal: W. Gray, 1816. CIHM NO. 21024.
- Taylor, Anne. "McCulloch to de Mille: Scottish Influence on the Teaching of Composition and Rhetoric in Nineteenth-Century Canada." Proceedings of the Canadian Society for the History of Rhetoric. Ed. John Stephen Martin and Christine Mason Sutherland. Calgary: The Canadian

- Society for the History of Rhetoric, 1986.
- Thomas, Clara. Ryerson of Upper Canada. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1969.
- Trinity: 1852-1952. Toronto: Trinity College, 1952. [Special Centennial Edition of the Trinity Review]
- Veysey, Laurence R. The Emergence of the American University. Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1965.
- Vroom, F. W. King's College: A Chronicle: 1789 - 1939. Halifax: Imperial, 1941.
- Wallace, W. Stewart. A History of the University of Toronto. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1927.
- Wallace, M. W. and Woodhouse, A. S. P. "In Memoriam: William John Alexander." University of Toronto Quarterly 14 (1945): 1-33.
- Walker, Lawrence. "English teachers' beliefs about teaching writing." The English Quarterly 15 (1982-83): 55-62.
- . "'More a Torment Than a Benefit': English Grammar in Nova Scotia Schools in the Nineteenth Century." Unpublished Manuscript, University of Lethbridge, 1984.
- Whately, Richard. Elements of Rhetoric. 1828. Ed. Douglas Ehninger. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1963.
- Wilson, Daniel. Address Before the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly, Appointed to Inquire into the Management of the University of Toronto, in Opening the Defence on Behalf of University College. Toronto, 1860.

CIHM NO. 42330.

- Wise, S. F. "Sermon Literature and Canadian Intellectual History." Pre-Industrial Canada 1760--1848. Readings in Canadian Literature. Vol. 2. Eds. Michael S. Cross and Gregory S. Kealy. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.
- Woodhouse, A. S. P. "The Humanities - Sixty Years." Queen's Quarterly 60 (1953): 538-50.
- . "The Nature and Function of the Humanities." Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada. 1954. Section 2, 1-17.
- Young, Richard E. "Paradigms and Problems: Needed Research in Rhetorical Invention." Research on Composing: Points of Departure. Eds. Charles R. Cooper and Lee Odell. Urbana: NCTE, 1978.

STATUTES, CALENDARS CONSULTED

Dalhousie University, Halifax (Dalhousie College, Dalhousie College and University). 1864-85, 1890-91, 1900-01, 1906-06, 1910-11, 1913-1914, 1916-1917, 1919-20, 1927-28, 1931-34, 1941-42, 1949-50, 1960-61, 1972-73, 1979-80, 1983-84.

King's College, Windsor. See University of King's College.

McGill University, Montreal (McGill College, McGill College and University, University of McGill College). 1853-55, 1860-62, 1849-50, 1878-81, 1889-91, 1898-99, 1899-1901, 1959-60, 1969-70, 1979-80.

Queen's University and College. 1862-72, 1879-80, 1883-86, 1888-92, 1900-01, 1910-11, 1920-24, 1929-30, 1949-50, 1979-80.

Trinity University, Toronto (Trinity College, Toronto). 1853-62 1871, 1876, 1885, 1896, 1902-03.

University of British Columbia. 1949-50, 1980-81.

University of King's College (King's College, Windsor). 1855, 1860, 1870, 1880-81, 1890-91, 1900-01, 1910, 1920, 1930-31, 1940-41, 1950-51, 1970-71.

---. The Statutes, Rules and Ordinances of the University of King's College at Windsor in the Province of Nova Scotia.
Halifax: John House, [1803].

University of New Brunswick. 1887-88, 1892-93, 1897-98, 1903-05,

---. Statutes, Rules and Ordinances of the University of King's College in Fredericton, in the Province of New-Brunswick.
Fredericton: John Simpson, 1830.

University of Toronto (King's College, University College). 1845,

STATUTES, CALENDARS CONSULTED

Dalhousie University, Halifax (Dalhousie College, Dalhousie College and University). 1864-85, 1890-91, 1900-01, 1906-06, 1910-11, 1913-1914, 1916-1917, 1919-20, 1927-28, 1931-34, 1941-42, 1949-50, 1960-61, 1972-73, 1979-80, 1983-84.

King's College, Windsor. See University of King's College.

McGill University, Montreal (McGill College, McGill College and University, University of McGill College). 1853-55, 1860-62, 1849-50, 1878-81, 1889-91, 1898-99, 1899-1901, 1959-60, 1969-70, 1979-80.

Queen's University and College. 1862-72, 1879-80, 1883-86, 1888-92, 1900-01, 1910-11, 1920-24, 1929-30, 1949-50, 1979-80.

Trinity University, Toronto (Trinity College, Toronto). 1853-62 1871, 1876, 1885, 1896, 1902-03.

University of British Columbia. 1949-50, 1980-81.

University of King's College (King's College, Windsor). 1855, 1860, 1870, 1880-81, 1890-91, 1900-01, 1910, 1920, 1930-31, 1940-41, 1950-51, 1970-71.

---. The Statutes, Rules and Ordinances of the University of King's College at Windsor in the Province of Nova Scotia.
Halifax: John House, [1803].

University of New Brunswick. 1887-88, 1892-93, 1897-98, 1903-05,

---. Statutes, Rules and Ordinances of the University of King's College in Fredericton, in the Province of New-Brunswick.
Fredericton: John Simpson, 1830.

University of Toronto (King's College, University College). 1845,