

school years. Writing should be the final test, but only after careful preparation orally. And in that preparation the letters should be grouped into syllables and the syllables pronounced according to the method of a generation ago. The poor results now so common in spelling would thereby be greatly bettered. In the end, time would be gained, and the pupil rendered better able to help himself. The method of leading the pupil to grasp the word as a whole through the eye has made confused spellers of large numbers of children. With some, however, it has produced excellent results.

The tests show that in the employment of this method many children seize the first and the last letters of the word, but leave out some of the middle letters or mix them. The naming of the three, four, or five letters, as the case may be, that constitute a syllable, and then attaching a name to these grouped letters, thus binding them into a small unity, aids the pupil to a remarkable degree. And the putting of these small unities together into the larger word unity, gives the pupil a synthetic power to this end and makes his progress more rapid and easy on the long road he must traverse in learning to spell. "Shall we turn the hands back on the pedagogical clock?" it will be asked. Yes, if the hands have got ahead and have been keeping false time.

For the last two decades or more this method has been almost wholly repudiated as an aid in learning to spell. The false notion that the eye is the avenue to which to appeal in teaching spelling began to obtain at that time a very firm hold upon the minds of teachers. Institute lecturers made strong efforts to inculcate this idea and their efforts met with large success. As much greater power was imputed to the eye in this regard, than it actually has, the time devoted

to learning to spell naturally became shortened, and the spelling lesson passed from the place of prominence in the program of work to a place of subordinate importance, and quite generally the spelling lesson was merely the writing of words selected from the reading lessons, with repeated drill in writing upon words incorrectly spelled.

The larger knowledge which has resulted from the great development of psychological study of recent years leads us to see that the teachers of a generation ago were not so wholly wrong after all in their teaching of spelling. They were right as far as they went, but they did not go far enough. Those who repudiated the old method and made the appeal almost wholly to the eye, were right in holding that for most pupils the eye is a stronger sense avenue of appeal than the ear when only these two are considered. But the motor speech apparatus was not regarded as a factor in the matter. It is true that in testing any hundred pupils according to the methods which are supposed to determine whether they are eye-minded or ear-minded, we shall find a large percentage of the hundred eye-minded, and only a small percentage markedly ear-minded. But it will also be found that a very large percentage will give good returns to the tests for determining eye-mindedness and also to the tests for determining ear-mindedness, with the returns usually in favor of the test for eye-mindedness. In every grade of pupils, it must be remembered, such differences will be found. The method in teaching spelling should therefore be broad enough to appeal fully to these differing aptitudes in different pupils and also to those pupils in which these aptitudes are combined. The method already suggested is broad enough to make this varied appeal. —*School Journal.*