

ting the chapter of science thus presented and illustrated. Thus he sharpens their perceptive powers, quickens their wit, their reflection, presence of mind, and attention, — he interests them in the objects presented to such a degree, that they acquire knowledge almost imperceptibly and without severe efforts. Learning becomes pleasure, and is accompanied with the same intense satisfaction which accompanies every kind of growth and perfect assimilation. Such a teacher is sure to attract and advance every single pupil of his class; and although learning in such a thorough manner must needs be slow and gradual from the outset, a great deal of time is gained in the end by the rapid mental growth of the pupils, and by their self-activity. Beginning slowly, he may make rapid strides in the end, because his pupils meet him half way with keen mental appetites and ready assimilating powers. There is, of course, in every science a number of facts which are not mastered by simple reflection, but must, at the same time be impressed upon the memory for immediate practical use. The teacher will further this work of memory either by dictating, at the end of the lesson, a short paragraph containing those facts, and by repeating the same with the class properly; or he will set the pupils themselves, when far enough advanced to commit these facts to writing, and have the contents properly repeated; or he will, if a reading-book is at hand containing the facts, refer the class to their book, and repeat them from it. Thus the pupils will, in time, become living text-books, like the teacher, and what they have acquired will be their imperishable property, ready for any application in practical life. The science appropriated in this way will be alive in the scholar and shed light on all cognate subjects. This is the Pestalozzian system of instruction, as compared with the Anglo-Saxon.

Now it will be easily seen that the system in which the teacher is the text-book, has great advantages over the other system, in which the teacher has a text-book, and the text-book is the real teacher. How superior soever be the text-books you may devise, they are dead teachers, and cannot engender life in the majority of your pupils. Besides the pupils, if they advance materially by the aid of their text-books, will be grateful for this result, not to their teacher, but to their books. And if they do not advance, they will blame for this result, not the book, but the teacher. Thus the Anglo-Saxon system loosens, if it does not indeed destroy, the moral connection between the teacher and his pupils. The Pestalozzian teacher on the contrary, is very potent for good; his pupils have a boundless confidence in him and his office. They feel that they owe their rapid mental growth to him exclusively, and he is implicitly believed and obeyed.

He sways their whole being as with a magic wand; he exerts over them an enormous moral influence for all educational purposes. He is to them the impersonation of truth, dignity and moral worth; and he must have very little moral character, if he does not feel exalted by their appreciation of him, and stimulated to work out his own moral bearing into a model for them.

Now it may be pleaded in excuse for the Anglo-Saxon system, that there is in a country with a rapidly increasing population a great lack of competent teachers, and that, therefore, good text-books are to make up for this want, at least to some degree. Grant that this is so, it is an evil to be overcome. Incompetent teachers lessen the respect due to science and education, thus doing almost more harm than good. The sooner you get rid of them the better. The radical reform is also, in this respect, the cheapest and most practicable of all. Besides, text-books are, with scanty exceptions, faulty enough, and it is infinitely more difficult to prepare text-books (nay, it is almost impossible, because the understanding and the wants of every individual learner are different) than to raise a generation of true and good teachers, who know how to accommodate themselves to the individual wants of every pupil. Finally, the text-books used revision almost from year to year, science is now progressing in such a way as to revolutionize many old-established truths, and opening new views in an unprecedented manner. But a live teacher may always control his science according to the latest discoveries, and conform his teachings to the modern improvements in knowledge and philosophy. He will be up to the times; text-books never are.

## GRAMMATICAL NOTES.

### CERTAIN COMMON ERRORS.

Most for almost. A very common error. Examples: "I believe we are prepared for most anything."—*New York Paper*. This should be, "for almost anything." Any is the word modified by almost, and should, in spelling, be separated from thing. "Pittsburgh Landing is the place where most all the Federals landed."—*N. Orleans Paper*. "Most every dress-maker has a lib on her own."—*Phila. Paper*. "These are most always found near the sea."—*Boston Paper*. "He is most as tall as I." In these and all similar instances, almost is the word to be used, not most.

2. *Myself* for *me* or *I*. *Myself*, like *yourself*, *himself*, *herself*, is reflexive, and properly used only when it refers to an *I* or *me* in the same sentence with itself. The *I* is sometimes merely implied, especially when *myself* is used as a reduplicate pronoun, as in the following:

"*Myself* shall mount the rostrum in his favor."—*Addison*.

I nightly lodge her in an upper tower,  
The key whereof *myself* have ever kept,—  
SHAKESPEARE.

Here, in both instances, the complete form of expression is "*I myself*." But, whether expressed or understood, *I* in some one of its forms belongs to every sentence in which *myself* is properly used, so that the latter, as a reflexive, can have its appropriate word to relate to. Examples: "*I will disguise myself*." "*By myself have I sworn*." "*Thou hast kept me from avenging myself with my own hand*." "*After having been thus particular upon myself, I shall in to-morrow's paper give an account of those gentlemen who are concerned with me*." Here *me* for *myself* is unidiomatic. It is inadmissible. Though allowable sometimes in verse, (as, "*I sit me down a pensive hour to spend*,") in prose it is improper. So, on the other hand, the use of *myself* for *me* or *I* is elegant and incorrect. It is a perverting of the word from its proper function as a reflexive pronoun. And yet this misuse is very common. It would seem as though some persons have an instinctive dread of using *me*; for, whenever they can, they employ the longer, inappropriate, and improper word *myself*. Examples: "*Neither Dick nor myself could answer this question*."—*Ten Acres Enough*. "*Both myself and wife [Both my wife and I] had always coveted a cow*."—*Do*. "*Such as Hodgson, Caldwell, Logan, and myself have pointed out*."—*Max Muller*. "*Mr. L— and myself went to examine the falls*."—*Dwight's Travels*. "*It was determined to devote me to the church, that so my humors and myself might be removed out of the way*."—*Irving*.

To some there may be an appearance of propriety in this last example, if not in the second one. But both are equally incorrect. They resemble somewhat that well-known error of Addison's, "*My Christian and surname begin and end with the same letters*."—*Spect.*, No. 305. This, to be right, should be, "*My Christian and sur names begin*." &c. But this is not English. So, if *myself* were not one word, we might say, "*My humors and my self*,"—*humors* and *self* denoting two different parts or properties of the same person. In a similar manner we might say, "*My self and wife*," just as we say, "*My shoes and stockings*." But this is inadmissible. Not only is *myself* a single word, but its character as a reflexive forbids its being used with any propriety as a substitute for *me* or *I*. As Archdeacon Hare says, "*In such expressions as My father and myself, My brother and myself, we are misled by homophony; but the old song, beginning 'My father, my mother and I,' may teach us what is the idiomatic and also the correct usage*."

The above uses of *myself* are as improper as the following use of *himself*. "As the President can seldom be absent from Washington for any great length of time, it is desirable to furnish *himself* and family [The writer meant *him* and his family] with some such place of retirement." Correct writers and speakers never thus misuse the so-called compound personal pronouns, whether of the first person, or of the second or third. Walpole says, "*In the beginning of the differences between Gray and me, the fault was mine*." Modern school-