

*School-Room Methods.*

## A LANGUAGE LESSON FOR BEGINNERS.

## DIRECTIONS.

- I. 1. Require pupils to write the names of objects.  
 2. Require pupils to write the names of parts of objects.  
 3. Require pupils to write the names of qualities of objects.  
 4. Require the pupils to name the uses of objects.
- II. 1. Require pupils to give a name that will apply to everything which they can perceive (matter.)  
 2. Require pupils to classify the different kinds of matter (mineral, vegetable, animal).  
 3. Require pupils to name things that belong to the different classes.
- III. 1. Require pupils to write the names of objects with the name of action, forming a sentence.  
 2. Lead pupils to an idea of a sentence, as asserting something of something.  
 3. Develop telling or declarative sentence, asking or interrogative sentence, commanding or imperative sentence, and feeling or exclaiming sentence.  
 4. Teach them that each sentence begins with a capital letter; that a declaration or imperative sentence ends with a period; an interrogative sentence with an interrogation point; and an exclaiming sentence with an exclamation point. (Drill them in writing sentences, and correcting sentences which violate these rules.)  
 5. Have them write sentences introducing adjectives, adverbs and pronouns, etc. (The teacher will give the words and have them form sentences. Of course the pupils are not to know anything about these words as parts of speech.)  
 6. Show the difference between particular and common names and teach the use of capitals for particular names. Teach also the use of capitals I and O. (Have them write exercises involving these things, and correct sentences which violate their correct use.)—*Central School Journal.*

## TEACHING BEGINNERS TO READ.

MISS SALLIE SHAPARD, PULASKI, TENN.

THE first thing necessary in teaching beginners to read, is to make the lessons as pleasing and interesting as possible. To aid in this I have in my hall a large and attractive chart; and when the little folks come to me for their first lesson in reading, books are laid aside, for a few weeks, and we read from the chart altogether. A large class of small children can be taught from the chart to much better advantage than from books, as the attention of the entire class can be held in this way. The first lesson is something like this:

"Children, what is this?" (Pointing to the picture of a cat.)

"Cat."

"Can this cat catch a rat?"

"No, it is the picture of a cat."

"This is the name of the picture, (pointing to the word cat,) what is it?"

"Cat."

"Here is a little word, or letter, before cat; we will read them together."

"A cat."

"Now tell me *whose* cat this is?" (pointing to the word "my" before cat.)

The children will not think perhaps to say "my cat," but after telling them the new word once or twice, and then reading the two together, the new word is impressed upon their minds. The words may now be written on the board and the children made to compare written and printed words. Learning the two together from the first, they find no more difficulty in reading one than the other.

The next step in this direction is to give a lesson on writing. Remember the class has just recited its first lesson in the school-room and does not know a letter. The children are not yet required to write the words taught in the reading lesson, as they know nothing of forming letters, but the letter "i" the simplest combination of the first and second principles, is given for the first copy. If there is sufficient space at the boards, it is well

to place the letter at intervals, allowing each child so much space to fill; and while this class is learning to handle chalk, making some awkward scrawls, and, perhaps, some droll pictures, another class can be called to recite.

Writing is introduced here in the class because it has been found, after much experience, that reading cannot be taught rapidly and successfully without a good deal of writing. The idea that small children can not be taught to write, or that it must be done with pen and ink only, is erroneous; for where there is a blackboard in the school-room, and slates in the hands of the children, they can be taught to write from the beginning, and thus employ much time usefully and pleasantly. Reading and writing should be taught together, step by step, and with the greatest care.

After reading many words and short sentences on the chart, the children may be made more familiar with them by "hunting words." For example:—

"Charlie, place the pointer on 'some word you know.'"

"I see 'and'."

"How many 'ands' do you see?"

"One, two, three, four, five."

"Sterling, show me a word you have learned."

"I have found 'see'." (And so on.)

These chart-lessons may seem tedious and slow at first, but to the interested teacher the rapid progress is gratifying, and to the parent astonishing.

It will be seen that no effort is made to teach these little beginners the alphabet. They acquire a knowledge of the letters by practical application of them in the daily written exercises in connection with the reading lesson, and also in the special lesson on writing. There is so little difference to them between written and printed letters, that they soon learn both in this way, and are not conscious of the exact time when the letters are learned.

The next lesson will be of more benefit to teachers who have no charts; and the writing in connection with reading will be more fully explained.—*Southwestern Journal of Education.*

*Correspondence.*

## INSPECTORS' PERMITS.

I HAVE seen several letters in your paper on the subject of the overcrowding of the teaching profession, and I should like to call attention to a circumstance which I have not seen mentioned. This is, that some Inspectors grant permits on their own authority to unqualified persons. I have been told of a case in this county, this spring, where the inspector granted a permit to a girl who was attending school, with the intention of writing for a Third, next year. Another girl, who intends writing this summer, declares that she will not care if she fails, for the same inspector has promised her a permit in that case. Now, is it any wonder that the profession is "overcrowded," when qualified teachers are obliged to give place to such as these? I do not date this letter, as the name of the place would disclose that of the inspector; but I inclose my card as an evidence of good faith.

A QUALIFIED TEACHER.

## OVER SUPPLY.

A NUMBER of teachers have written on the "Over Supply" question, and have offered hints as to best methods of remedy. Some suggest making it necessary that a pupil be at least twenty-one years of age on entering the profession. Some say do not allow persons who have not obtained Second Class non-Professional Certificates to teach.

Would it be just to those who by persistent study have had their minds developed at an early age, to say they shall not teach till they are twenty-one years of age, because others, less studious, are unqualified till they are of that age?

Many pupils could not afford to pay for high school instruction for four or five years. Pupils usually enter the high school at the age of thirteen

or fourteen. Would not the tendency be to cause the pupils to become indolent with regard to their work, as there would be "no hurry" if they could try no examinations till they were twenty-one?

Then, too, pupils with a prospect of salaries of \$280 or \$300, can hardly afford to attend school till they obtain Second Class Certificates.

District certificates are granted to many who fail (by only a few marks) on their examinations. Is any one who fails in the Third Class Examinations a competent teacher?

Would it not be better to make it illegal for the inspectors to grant permits or to renew certificates after the date of their expiration?

If only those who hold legal certificates were allowed to teach, the supply would be greatly diminished.

GREENBUSH, June 28.

A SUBSCRIBER.

*To the Editor of the EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL.*

DEAR SIR,—With your permission I should like to call attention in your valuable journal to the character of the Latin Grammar paper set for third class candidates at the late examination.

I have always been of the opinion that Latin Grammar is studied as an aid to understanding the author laid down for translation, and that the proper way to teach it is in connection with the author; but our worthy examiners of the present year seem to follow an entirely different theory, and believe, apparently, that the study of Latin Grammar carries with it *per se* some prodigious merit.

Of the words given in the first question to decline, three are Greek, though there is not one Greek word in the whole of the first book of Cæsar, which is the work prescribed; and three of the other words in this question (*pelagus, faber, and sestertius*) might also be looked for in vain, so far as the Cæsar is concerned.

Of the six words in the second question only one (*plebs*) occurs in the text, and there are four of them (*secur, femur, mas, and tus*) that one might read a hundred pages of Cæsar without meeting at all.

Of the three words in question (3) none occurs in the work or in any ordinary Latin.

Question (4) approaches somewhat the nature of a fair question, but the words *reus, feminis, decoris, clavis, clava, clavus*, do not occur in either the third-class or the second-class work, and I think I have met the word *clava* only once in all the Latin I ever read, which is probably as much as the average of classical masters in our high schools.

In the next question we are favoured with some quotations from Virgil and Horace, probably because the poetic minds of the gentlemen whose names are at the top of the paper soar far above anything so prosy as *Bellum Britannicum*.

No doubt, the third part of this question, like the second word in question (3), would call up pleasant thoughts about these gentlemen in the minds of the candidates.

Neither the "older form" referred to in (6), nor the "adverb" derived from it, occurs in the text, and the same is true of all the words but one (*amitto*) in the next question. On looking up one of the latter in Harper's Latin Dictionary, I find a note that it is "very rare."

But why go through all of the paper in detail? The first question strikes the key-note to the whole, and if ever there were "catch" questions, these are of them, for there is at least one half of the paper that the candidates have no fair means knowing anything about.

What makes it look all the worse, is the fact that the second-class paper set by the university professor (who does not need to air his learning), was a fair one with the result that, so far as the Latin Grammar is concerned, the examination for third-class was fully three times as hard as that for second-class.

If the object of the examiners was to pluck the candidates, I am afraid they have been only too successful. Evidently it was not, as it ought to have been, to direct the teaching of classics along the line of modern ideas in education.

JULY 11th, 1888.

Faithfully yours,  
MAGISTER.