

nature," it is a safe inference that the speaking and singing voice is no exception to the rule.

3. Filled with this Dogberrian creed, Mr. Parker affirms that "That dreadful compound of a whine and a groan, which very many teachers can hear if they listen, is the direct product of a long, painstaking and painful drill." Out of charity towards our American cousins, we can but hope that this is an exaggeration. We have sometimes heard in Canadian schools primary readers pronouncing unfamiliar words in a dreary monotone; but never, in thirty years' experience, have we known of a single teacher fatuously "drilling" in the production of that "dreadful compound." We recognize the "dreadful" sound; we have a dim remembrance of our own primary efforts; but—*pace* Parker—the sound is due to Nature's prompting, not to the teachers' "drill." The teacher is to blame only if he lets Nature have her way—if he fails to correct her "strange eruptions" and to bring out of her crude compound of whine and groan, the sweet cadences of musical expression. We say that the singing tone is "natural" to the child who is wrestling with unfamiliar words. What is the task that is set before him in oral reading, and what his preparation for it? He has learned to talk, they tell us. He has indeed learned *by imitation* to express his few simple ideas, but his vocal organs are as yet but slightly under the control of the will. Besides, in spite of Mr. Parker's contrary opinion, reading is not talking. It is a much more difficult thing to do. Good readers are far rarer than good speakers. Even cultured men who have acquired, of course, the power of rapid word-recognition and a fair control over the organs of speech, find it an exceedingly difficult matter to read aloud any passage with which

they are totally unacquainted. For two distinct mental operations are necessarily involved—that of taking in the thought, and that of giving it out. These two processes are not mutually helpful; on the contrary, they may be said to be inconsistent; part of the mental energy at our disposal is cancelled (if the term may pass) in the subordinate process of taking in the sense, and there is hence less mental power left for the main process of giving out the thought. How great then must be the difficulty for a beginner in reading! For with him, taking in the thought through word-recognition must be the predominant process; while the aim of giving out the thought is but feebly present in his consciousness. What, for him, is this process of taking in the thought? He has to connect (in the alphabet method) the form of a letter with its name, its name with its proper sound, the printed word with the spoken word, the spoken word with the idea, the idea with other ideas similarly acquired. Is it any wonder that these complex operations tax his mental capabilities to the utmost, and leave but little power of attention for the reproduction of the thought so laboriously acquired? He has had very little voice-culture, he has but feeble control over the vocal organs; in pronouncing a hard-won word, he "pitches" his voice in a certain key; "Nature" tells him it is easier to retain that pitch while grappling with the next word; he has acquired no power to "anticipate" the sound of this "next" word while uttering the preceding one; he obeys Nature in economizing his fully taxed powers—in a word, "Nature" suggests singing and he follows "Nature."

4. Still "harping" on the shining Dogberrian principle, Mr. Parker further declares (1) that "if the thought is in the mind, the emphasis