

not had the advantage of this special training cannot do good work in teaching literature. It does say that he could do good work with much greater ease and confidence if he had the special training. Very often the best service a teacher can render a class is to read the selection properly. I recall a young lady who once came to me at the close of a space, saying she always had thought the poem under consideration "horrid", but she had changed her mind and could now see that it was "really beautiful" and hereafter would read it with great delight. If the teacher is able not only to interpret the author's mood, but also to instruct his pupils how to do the same thing, he has performed for them an invaluable service in their study of literature. I am convinced that even purely imitative work on the part of the student may be of considerable value. Many teachers have not had special training, and are burdened with other work also. It is worth while to be able to show the student *how*, even if one cannot definitely explain *why*; for he may thus almost unconsciously come to observe the more important laws of oral expression. How much better, however, if the student is put in possession of these laws so that he knows both what he is to do and why he is to do it. Then he is able to read. And if he can read there is for him no method of literary instruction equal to oral reading.

In the first place oral reading is an exceptional means of creating interest in the subject. It is true that interest itself is not strictly a part of instruction, but it conditions instruction and is essential to good results. A teacher who finds himself before three dozen restless boys of the junior form, and is supposed to interest them in a subject which may not naturally appeal to them very strongly, will welcome any worthy means of fixing attention. My experience is that the boys are all anxious to read. The great difficulty is that the classes are so large that their ambition to read well cannot be more fully gratified.

Further, the oral reading of the text is the best aid to the author's meaning. Probably I shall be accused of placing the cart before the horse. If oral reading is the expression of the author's mood, then it is evident that the student cannot express what he does not already know. This is true, and we all so teach. Nevertheless I shall have to bear the consequence of taking a seemingly illogical position. In many experiences effect becomes cause. The explanation lies in the facts that the student, as he looks at the sentences and the paragraph, does more or less fully grasp the meaning. His knowledge may be correct, even if it is far from being complete. The oral expression of what he sees in the text enables him to see more. We are accustomed to speak of shades of meaning. By using his knowledge the student increases his knowledge, so that after all he is only observing an ordinary law of the learning process. That to read is to understand applies to the