

an artificial passing back and forth from one subject to another. For example, in studying the Revolutionary war, it is necessary, in certain connections, to consider the valley of Lake Champlain. Now, in studying the valley in relation to the movements of the English the student is not correlating geography with history. The valley is simply a valley, and the student is transforming that valley into history. At another time, and for a different purpose, he may transform the same valley into geology or poetry.

Correlation, in its truer sense, is then the organic life of the subject in its construction by the student in the process of realizing some life purpose. What the teacher needs to do is to forget all about his correlation and concentration, bring himself into the vital energy of his subject, and gather into the movement whatever the life of the subject requires. This is what every real university student does. And no teacher in a college or high school has ever troubled himself to find a central subject about which to organize other subjects. The method appears only in elementary work—a strong hint that the student is himself the agent that forms and transforms the world into subjects applying to his own life.

The language problem is one which often presses itself upon the teacher who is more than a mere *gradus*-grinder. "What is it all for, anyhow?" the pupil blurts out while floundering amid the particles and resquidpedals of his Latin, Greek, French and German, and "What is really the gain?" echoes the true teacher. Is the mental gymnastic derived from the thorough study of one language better or worse for a boy's mind than that secured from the study of four? Should the ordinary pass examination demand more than Latin or Greek, French or German? The examination is a necessity, says everybody, from the Minister of Education or his co-equals the Superintendents, to the teacher who thinks on his feet. But the examination may be made the servant and not the master, and that is what we are all striving to secure. Were the teachers to take up this feature of the question at their conferences there would be a greater gain in it than in mere objection-raising, which is in itself pernicious, leading too often to a change for the sake of a change. We are of the opinion that a thorough drill in Latin and French will do as much for a boy's mind, will secure the exercise of the mental activities that the study of four languages will, and at the same time will bring about in him a speedier love for the inner life of the exercise. The routine of the average boy's life is a life of drudge, as he staggers along for a portion of each day under his load of mixed declensions and conjugations, and grammar irregularities. Is the load a necessary one? Can it not be lightened without educational loss? The answer has been anticipated by many of our university colleges, but we must go a step further and have the question discussed on a philosophical basis, and there must be no spirit of antagonism in the investigations. Child study is running to seed for want of a strong healthy question such as this. As a mind strengthener will the study of Latin and French do for a boy what the study of four languages will do, outside of the utilitarian game in the acquiring of the modern languages?

The phase of the question which at once presents itself in such an investigation is the neglect to which the study of English is subjected. The man who studies Latin or Greek thoroughly will eventually tumble into a composition style, if he is thrown the way of writing much. But is this the way to make a nation of readers?