

outfit of the investigator in phonetics must be a knowledge of sounds, and above all a capacity for distinguishing between sounds. To be of any value, this knowledge must be exact, otherwise the results will be vitiated, as has happened more than once with men eminent in the science. What better foundation can we lay for the knowledge of a future generation of phoneticians than an early familiarity on the part of our students with accurate distinctions of sound, some elementary instruction as to how sounds are formed, and, above all, an awakening of the mind and an arousing of the curiosity in this direction, a mastery of the sounds of some other language than their own, and a comparison instituted between the foreign sounds and those of their own language. This is apart from the question of present usefulness as regards the language being learned, but there is an incidental advantage which regards the learner's own language, to which I should be disposed to attach considerable importance. A knowledge of grammar and of grammatical principles in general enables our young people to correct many a gross error, many a bad habit of speech acquired in childhood under unfavourable circumstances—the "I would of went," "Them is my books," "I seen him," etc., etc. In a similar way the mastery of a series of foreign sounds, and a comparison of them with those of English, will enable the learner to detect and rectify of himself, the *oo* in "stoodent," "Toosday," the defective vowel in "mawdle," "cowledge," the redundant or lapsed *h*, the nasal twang—things which every Canadian teacher has to fight against, and which must be fought against, so long as it is unlawful in these things for everyone to do what is right in his own eyes. My own opinion is that it would be impossible for a young person to master practically the sound-series

and intonation of French and German, without developing in the process a *Sprachgefühl*, a phonetic conscience, the promptings of which would modify and refine the learner's own diction, if he has been unfortunate enough in youth to contract vices of utterance.

I have now said a part of what may urged in favour of ear culture. You have observed that little has been said with reference to the eye. This is upon the assumption that the eye-method exclusive needs no advocacy at present. If at some future time it is despised and needs an advocate, I shall be happy to prepare a paper in its defence, for I hold that the one method is complementary to the other, and that neither can stand alone. Having said so much, you will expect me to offer some practical suggestions as to the means of bringing about what is urged to be so desirable.

We may lay down first, as a fixed principle, that culture in discriminating sounds must be conjoined with exercise of the vocal organs in forming them. The ear and the voice are inseparable. A child born deaf is dumb, and a child born dumb is practically deaf. A child in learning to utter sounds correctly is at the same time learning to hear correctly, and *vice versa*. Try to utter a certain foreign sound and fail to do so, and you find not only that the vocal organs refuse to utter it exactly for you, but also that the ear has been more or less wrong in its conception of the sound. The two processes serve as a check upon each other.

Secondly: As children learning to speak, we form our first articulate sounds by a process of imitation pure and simple, and this same faculty of imitating plays a prominent part in the learning of sounds, and will be of use more or less whatever be the age of the learner. I say "more or less"