

aright—we fully agree with him: "The process of learning to read consists of two parts: *word-recognition* and *expressive reading*." If we might venture to suggest a change to cover what we suppose this remarkably odd sentence means, we would say, The process of *learning* to read consists merely in *word-recognition*; but, what we call *good reading* demands expressive utterance. To say that "the process of learning to read consists of *expressive reading*" can hardly be what the writer intended. Well, what is *word-recognition*? Is the mental operation at all different in kind from the knowing of an old friend's face? Not a whit. Now, how many of us, easily as we recognize the lineaments of those with whom we daily come in contact, would undertake to describe minutely the colour of their eyes, or the shape of their noses, and give the number of wrinkles that furrow their brows? As a *tout ensemble* we know the face unmistakably, and that is enough. What more do we want in the matter of words so far as *reading* is concerned? The oftener we see the words the better we *know* them, and this brings us face to face with a very self-evident proposition, viz.: The *more* we read, the *better* we read; or, in other phrase, facility of word-recognition is the result of extensive practice in reading. It is wholly immaterial to the pupil who has been taught to speak distinctly, or even if he has not, whether the elements of a given word are formed by protruding his tongue, biting his lips, shewing his teeth, or by any other "self-consistent method." All this time the teacher has been the model—the child the imitator. But with facility in the recognition of words, comes, almost invariably, a *pleasure in reading*, and, simultaneously with the pleasure, taste. We may rest fully assured that the latter can never exist where the former is wanting,

although it does occasionally happen that the reverse is true. The mention of *taste* leads us once more to the part played by the teacher. If he is really a good reader, at least a few of his pupils will do him credit. That they will all be proficient is, from the nature of things, more than any one has a right to expect. We have, in fact, no more reason upon our side in demanding that all one's pupils should reach a high standard in this branch than in spelling, in writing, or arithmetic. Dame Nature has too often had the start of the schoolmaster, and does not fail to maintain her ground. If the teacher has "No music in his soul" he will be totally oblivious to the thousand and one inaccuracies of careless readers, even though he were "steeped to the eyes" (this would include his ears) in the phonic or any other method.

It has already been remarked that the good reader is one who can most closely imitate speech, but this involves a good deal more than may at first sight appear. As in the case of actors, most of whom are fitted to play only in certain *rôles*, readers who are regarded as excellent in rendering some kinds of composition, may be but medium, or very poor, in others. We should bear in mind, however, that the teacher is a general purpose man—one who should be able to do fairly well in all styles ranging from "Old Mother Hubbard" to Massillon "On the Death of the Wicked," and such being the case he ought to be leniently dealt with even if he fail, by many degrees, to reach the standard of a Neilson, a Vandenhoff, or a Bell.

The teacher who wishes to make himself a good reader for school purposes, must not be limited in his choice of books. Text-books and an occasional work on education, occupy only a small portion of the ground, whilst treatises on *how* to teach read-