defects, and a bad example is therefore set for the children.

Do not for one moment suppose that I propose to produce, a certain set quality, the same pitch in each child—that all voices might be alike. This is far from the purpose of any true teacher of reading, even if they suppose it could be accomplished. True development means the unfolding of the individuality in the child's voice as in other things. Faults are taken by some to be the marks of the individual, but they are not. It is to correct faults arising from the neglect of the study of voice production that is to be urged—that the individuality, unfettered, may more perfectly be educated.

With voice building, correct pronunciation, exercises for articulation and the meaning of new words should be taught. It is one of the great missions of reading that that the English language is spoken the same everywhere, to see that dialects, provincialisms and incorect pronunciations are abolished. It cannot be urged too strongly that teachers correct first of all the vocal sounds. When there is good authority do not change the accent from that which is already in use. Do not urge program to be pronounced prog rum, detail, ditail, neither, nyther, either, eyther, when the vowel sounds, which all authority agrees upon, are incorrectly given. For example, correct the use of short a for Italian ä in such words as aunt, caif, hall, laugh and others, the use of long oo for ū in June, Tuesday, lurid, dew, knew, etc; short a for intermediate a, as in ask, dance, grass, glare, etc; coalescent e misplaced by coalescent u in bird, girl, mercy, verse, prefer, etc; short ŏ given like broad a, as in coffee, office, dog and others. To correct these vowel sounds is difficult after they have once become habit, but are easily corrected in the child. In presenting this matter to a number of teachers once I was informed that a leading educator advised that these vowel sounds be not corrected, as the children would be laughed at in the home circle. Such advice made little defence, for it is opposed to all progress for every step in advance will be met with laughter from some, but it is the one who takes the step that makes the progress. Galileo, Confucius, Columbus, Luther, Newton—were these all not laughed at?

After the vowel sounds have been given the needed attention, the consonants should be thoroughly drilled, and last the misplacing of emphasis.

Our third root—the development of expression in the body—must also be cared for. If our children were allowed to use their bodies, and urged to do so as when at home or on the play ground our school system would not be criticized as killing the emotional nature. Gesture is a part of reading and cannot be separated from it without losing one of the roots from which life is sustained. There is a great prejudice against gesture because it is believed to be unnatural. There is also an erroneous idea current that gesture is something to be tacked on, for we hear such expressions as, "I can't put the gesture in" and such gestures usually seem put in. Gesture should be the spontaneous outgrowth of the thought. At first children should be allowed to use as much gesture as they wish and when they have developed the mind until it controlls the emotions the gesture will be less frequent and mean more.

There are two reasons why so little oral reading is done at home—one lies in the fact that our lack of education in this branch makes it little pleasure to our friends or ourselves; the second reason being that good sight reading requires much practice. You may say that this practice might have been obtained, in part at least, in the school room and therefore this failure lies also at the school door. There is no one thing that can be more productive of development in the home circle than reading aloud. Much thought is aroused and many ideas brought to light which would not otherwise have been obtained. The controversy and discussion of points are also productive of good. Home oral reading can be practiced by all and should be brought forth from the obscure place it has occupied. Instead of selfishly sitting down to your book allow those around you to enjoy it also. There are few indeed, who are skilled sight readers, in fact I remember only one who had made an art of it. This was Mr. Moon, a former elocution teacher, but now a noted lawyer in Philadelphia. A newspaper in his hands became fascinating. This proficiency, he told me, was gained by a hard summers labor of twelve hours each day, reading aloud Macaulay's essays—perhaps the most difficult English to read aloud.

A literary taste can often be aroused in those to whom it seems dormant, by reading to them. An incident was told me by a friend which illustrates this point. In this friend's family was a member who could not be interested in any literarture, and Mr. Harrah determined to develops the taste. He therefore read stories to her, and would leave them at the most interesting point, hoping that she would pick them up during the day. Some time elapsed before this much was accomplished, but as soon as she could be induced to read herself the taste for literature progressed.

The great charm in Mr. Moon's reading was that he read as he talked—catching the entire line in a glance and looking off the text the greater part of the time. This reading by many would be considered out of place—too dramatic, would be said. It is often stated that he or she is a good plain reader. What idea is conveyed by a plain reader. Simply that the words are articulated in the older the author placed them, without any thought as to the ideas to be advanced. To make myself more plain—if we were relating an incident to a few friends, we would, by tone and gesture reproduce the scene, people and our deductions. This would be nothing out of the way or unnatural. The author desires to convey as vividly and forcibly his thoughts as we do ours—so why read them otherwise—why make one rule for yourself and another for others?

If more of this reading were done at home, and a more thorough knowledge given in school, there would be found a greater appreciation of good reading. Fuss, fury and artificiality generally impress people more than nature in a reader. It has been truly said that where there is one good judge of reading there are many good judges of music and where there is one good reader there are many good musicians. Because there is such a general misunderstanding of the art of reading, and many teachers of it who misunderstand it, also, I am sorry to say, intellectual people, accept elocution and reading with a sneer.

But the most preceptible sneer comes from the dramatic profession. The average actor rails at elocution and reading—elocutionists, according to the New York *Mirror*, the actor calls fossils, fools or frauds, and himself he calls "an artist." "An Artist," Alfred Ayres exclaims, "Heaven help me! Well his art is the fakir's art, not the actor's art!" So long as actors of the present say servus for service, deef for deaf, private for private, figor for figure, misplace emphasis in the most outrageous manner, we certainly must agree with the above that the rudiments of the art are not mastered. These mistakes, shocking as they may seem, are not myths, but actual realities taken from the critic's paper. These blunders are made by the highest as well as the lowest. To be sure actors, are now becoming more careful that these errors have been published, and the dictionary is consulted sometimes. Reading is the foundation upon which the actor should build his artistic superstructure. Because this foundation is neglected, and because of the lack time spent in preparation for the production of plays at present, the classic drama is said not to pay and we are flooded with the sensational drama of the day. Managers tell us that the people want the class of plays they present. Nothing is further from the truth. But no doubt people do prefer the wild-cat drama done well than Shakespere poorly rendered, for the same reason that people prefer a calico well made to a botched silk.

Our great actors and actresses have made their success in the classics, and the drama could be made as much of a success, if the time, study and perseverance were expended today. It was the reading which made Cushman, Forrest, Booth and Jefferson at present great. In all else they have had many equals. They left nothing to chance. Every line, every thought were thoroughly mastered. But naturally when only two, or three weeks at the outside, is given to the production of a play, and it would require that many mon hs assiduous study to at least read well any of the Shakesperean dramas, the classics are not made a success. In the rush and hurry of these times managers have not the time to produce great actors and actresses.

To illustrate how much time is spent in France and Germany upon such things, Legoure relates how one dramatic word was rehearsed eighty-six times, the great Mdlle. Mars being among the number of players, before they were sufficiently schooled to appear in public. Rachel attached as much importance to reading as the most pedantic elocutionist that has lived. One day with Legoure, Rachel sat three hours devoting herself to one passage.

Legoure says: "In one scene there was a somewhat remarkable passage. It contains not more than thirty lines, but to those thirty lines Rachel and I devoted not less than three hours close study. Never before had the power of concentrated attention, the fineness of keen appreciation and the modest but overwhelming sincerity of this truly admirable artist, so astounded me, so en-