

method at present that involves so enormous an outlay of time, energy, and money, with so correspondingly small a result. To neglect the teaching of literature for the teaching of composition, or to assert that the second is the more important, is like showing a hungry man how to work his jaws instead of giving him something to eat. In order to support this with evidence, let us take the experience of a specialist who investigated the question by reading many hundred sophomore compositions in two of our leading colleges, where the natural capacity and previous training of the students were fairly equal. In one college every freshman wrote themes steadily through the year, with an accompaniment of sound instruction in rhetorical principles; in the other college every freshman studied Shakespeare, with absolutely no training in rhetoric and with no practice in composition. A comparison of these themes written in their sophomore year by these students showed that technically the two were fully on a par. That is weighty and most significant testimony.

If the teachers of English in secondary schools were people of real culture themselves, who both knew and loved literature, who tried to make it attractive to their pupils, and who were given a sufficient time-allotment to read a number of standard books with their classes, the composition question would largely take care of itself. Mere training in theme-writing can never take the place of the acquisition of ideas, and the boy who thinks interesting thoughts will usually write not only more attractively, but more correctly, than the one who has worked treadmill fashion in sentence and paragraph architecture. The difference in the teacher's happiness, vitality, and consequent effectiveness is too obvious to mention.

Books Received and Reviewed.

[All Exchanges and Books for Review should be sent direct to the Editor of the *Educational Record*, Quebec, P. Q.]

The article in the June number of the *Atlantic Monthly*, of special interest, is one on "The Politician and the Public School," by L. H. Jones, Superintendent of Schools, Cleveland, Ohio. Mr. Jones, in his able discussion of the relation, which seems to be too close in the United States, between politics and teaching, brings to light many strange