

give a false colouring to what is present to the sense or mind. Also in making his own experience the measure by which he judges others, he necessarily takes for granted that the statements and reports of his seniors of experiences that lie beyond his, are of the same truthful character as his own. Hence he accepts of them without any questioning until, as he grows older, he establishes by unpleasant experiences their untruthfulness. When he reaches this conclusion a new condition of things breaks in upon him, and he gradually commences to doubt almost everything that has not been tested by himself. This process has its beginning in the period of infancy, is intensified in childhood, and reaches its worst form in youth. In view of the natural consequences of the abuse of this characteristic of infant-nature, it should be a fixed principle of both parents and teachers never under any circumstances to deceive a child.

(e) During this period each organ of the body is in the most plastic state.

Coupled with this there is intense physical activity and absolute singleness of aim. All the physical and mental power of the child is present in every separate course of action in which he engages. Hence the readiness with which his activities can be transformed into habits. The importance of this characteristic of infant nature cannot be overestimated. It is capable of being used for evil as well as for good. This is illustrated in the formation of what are known as loafing habits, including the awkward use of feet and hands and other organs of the body. But it is especially illustrated in the formation of habits of disobedience to parents and others having rightful authority, and of disrespect of law and of the just claims of superiors in age and in experience. Habits of this kind are largely formed during the period of infancy. Hence at this time neither parent nor teacher should fail to give proper attention to this element of the child's nature.

FRENCH IN THE CLASS-ROOM.

BY W. H. FRASER, B.A., UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

PROFESSOR GOODWIN, of Harvard, the celebrated Greek scholar, is credited with the remark that he would just as soon teach a dead student as a dead language. The observation is witty, and contains at the same time a theory of linguistic instruction. Now, Greek and Latin are the two dead languages most generally studied by scholars of the present day. Did the learned professor mean to say that his own task of teaching one of these languages is to be compared with the indisputably ungrateful and hopeless

one of instructing an extinct student? His words appear at first sight to express an extreme paradox. What he doubtless meant was that unless the method of a teacher is such as to make of a language to the learner a living reality, the expectation of result will be as utterly and dismally groundless as his clever saying implies, and that, indeed, whether the object be to inculcate one of the so-called dead languages, or one of the most actively growing idioms of our day. The words perhaps imply another truth: that it is probably more