

tendency of children is to yield to the first impulse. This is a good opportunity to teach them how a sensible person would wait before announcing his answer and test it by many, if not all, the lines. The answer is *THE EYE*. The application of some of the lines is quite ingenious.—*Chicago School-master*.

ENGLISH READING.

BY PROF. J. ROGERS, WALLA WALLA,
WASH. TER.

A LITTLE boy comes to me to learn to read. I ask him if he can say *O*.

"O, yes; I can say *O*; I love to say *O*."

He says *O* when he is pleased, and he says *O* when he is hurt,—different in tone, yet *O*. Then I make an oval mark on the slate or blackboard, and tell him it means *O*.

"When you see that mark you shall think of *O*, and say *O*."

"O, O; that is *O*."

I then make another mark, *g*, placing it to the left of the first; thus, *g-o*, and tell him that the two together mean *go*. "Can you say *go*?"

"I can say *go*; hear me say *go*."

"Point to the marks that mean *go*. Right. What do those marks mean?"

"They mean *go*."

"That is right; now *you* may *go*."

The boy leaves me well pleased; he thinks he has learned something, and likes it. The next day I tell him that *o* does not always mean *o*; that *do* means *dōō*; that sometimes *o* means *ōh*, as *on*; that sometimes *o* means *aw*, as *for*; that sometimes *o* means *ugh*, as *son*. Then I get him to read a line as follows: *Do go on for son*. By this time he begins to think that what I told him meant *o* may mean almost anything; and, unless he is treated very kindly, he will be afraid to speak the next word in which he sees *o*.

After several days he comes to a lesson something like this: "Move on, my son; for it is no trouble pouring out nourishing soup." Here is simple *o*, with five different sounds, and, combined with *u*, it has five values. Now the child-mind becomes con-

fused. There is no rule or reason to guide him. He must surrender blindly to the authority of those older than he. But his trouble is just begun. Some one asks him to read this question: "What notion of Orthoepy had Poe, the poet, when rhyming *felloe* with *canoe*?" Here is a combination, *oe*, with five different values; and, when the child has committed these to memory, he is not in the least aided in calling the next word in which he finds *oe*.

Still, he has not learned half there is to be learned about *o*, for some one says: "George Leonard McLeod, one of the people called yeomanry in feudal times, bestowed bounteous and gorgeous encomiums on John Bunyan as a righteous theologian, who wrote theology in a dungeon." Here is a combination of *eo* with twelve different values.

The child of average memory becomes so confused that he rightly concludes there is nothing certain about reading and spelling. He believes that any letter may mean almost anything, and he knows that it *may*, and often *does*, mean *nothing*. Now, I have a few questions for those who are expert in computation:

1. How much time would it take the average boy or girl to master the uses of *o* in our method of spelling?

2. What proportion of Public School pupils ever succeed in perfect spelling?

In this age of steam and machinery, with telegraphs and telephones on every hand, and in the glare of the electric light, I would ask:

3. Is it wise to require one million infants every year to plough through the rough lough, though they have had hiccoughs, phthisic, and the whooping-cough?

4. Is the value of the old spelling worth its cost?

5. If the people could really understand the amount of its cost to them and to their children, would they wish it entailed upon their grandchildren?

In my judgment they would not, but I have no wish to compel any one to adopt my views. But I do ask the Press that it let the millions know the true inwardness of fonetic speling as a time-and-money-saving