Original Communications: At this season of the year our correspondents are usually so engaged, as not to have leisure to afford their usual contributions. We hope, however, soon to hear again from all our old friends and as many new ones as have anything useful to say and as feel like helping on the work.

Fundamental Rules for Study.
The following excellent rules for study, or rather for instruction, were prepared by the late Bishop Doane, of New Jersey; who, though the advocate for exclusive sectarian instruction, had many of the elements of a good teacher:

1. Subjects to be studied, rather than authors.
2. To read entire works, and not fragments.
3. None of the studies to be optional, except those of the "extraordinary course."
4. No Student to be advanced to a higher Form or Class, until he has completed the studies of those below it.
5. At the end of every division of a work or subject, the whole portion finished to be rapidly revised, before proceeding further.
6. The previous lesson to be always briefly revised, before taking up that of the day.
7. Lessons in the languages, in the revise, to be translated, and not construed.
8. The editions of the Classics employed, to be without notes, *ordo*, or translations.
and then from these to the deduction of particular truths or results, and to their practical applications. Even if the teacher fully comprehends and appreciates this method, he cannot follow it; for the present style of school-books, got up on a different plan, will constantly thwart his efforts. And if the teacher can do without any book—whatever, the learner, who is the party most interested, can not; he needs the best. The method now indicated was only about 250 years ago introduced to the minds of the philosophers; and the results they have achieved by it almost surpass imagination. It will work changes equally great in the schools. We want Bacon's tenets brought into the school-room, the plan of every school-book, and the standard of every recitation. This can never be, until the books are made to take the lead, and are radically changed.

The method in books and study now indicated, I call, for the sake of a name, the Method of Discovery, or Natural Method. The method now popular in the school books only retails the results arrived at by others, makes, and leaves the scholar to comprehend them by accident or good fortune, he can at all. They are framed on the Method of Assertion or Dogmatic Method. The best teachers and journals everywhere admit the pressing want of change in the processes of education. Will the change to a course of discoveries, which the books and the teacher shall help the learner to make, presenting meanwhile no complex subject until all its elementary ideas have been first brought forward and mastered in course, will this meet the educational want so constantly expressed?

This system, it appears to me, will make the learner, all through his course, what every bright child now is—an eager, inquisitive, and industrious seeker after knowledge. Every child begins with eyes open to the movements of nature and of human beings about him; this system would keep him so, making him an habitual observer, instead of, as now, averse to tasks and books. If so, then it will enable him in the time he now spends in study, to go over much of his lessons, not only as well as more successfully; and it will lead to the carrying of studious habits forward into business life, instead of leaving him as at the present, to drop and forget them at its threshold. It will favor the mastery of the practical sciences, and further the progress of the useful arts—inventions, agriculture, building, ventilation, healthful cookery and regimen, and so on. And not least, it must naturally exercise, and therefore strengthen all the intellectual faculties. Thus, it would prove not only the means of acquiring knowledge, but at the same time a course of intellectual gymnastics—doing, for the minds of the young, what gymnastics proper does for their physical being, the correct development of which is the basis of all the rest. It would be teaching and training combined; and it would finally demonstrate that no study—not even the mathematics nor the classics—possesses any exclusive claim as a means of discipline; but that every study can be made a perfect course of disciplining those particular faculties by the activity of which it must be acquired. Gymnast.

PRACTICAL GRAMMAR.

If English Grammar is, as has been defined, "the art of speaking and writing the English language with propriety," many, very many teachers, who pride themselves on a critical knowledge of all the niceties and intricacies of the grammar of the books, and skill in parsing, and correcting false syntax, are yet very far from having attained any skill in the art—especially as practised in the common chit-chat of everyday life; for we often find teachers who are really expert in teaching from the books, and who call themselves grammarians, yet who continually "murder the king's English" in their ordinary conversation.

And if they, with all their superior knowledge of theoretical grammar, fail to follow its teachings, what ought they to expect from their pupils who have less knowledge of the subject—and what do the results of their teaching show? We have frequently known young men in the "first English grammar class" to recite a rule of grammar, and the next moment violate the rule in answering a question of the teacher; and, indeed, it has not been unfrequent in our experience to find both teachers and pupils, during a recitation, violating those rules of grammar which were embraced in the lesson. We do not suppose that our experience differs from the experience of other teachers whose attention has been directed to this subject. Indeed, it is a common remark with well-educated practical grammarians, that the study of English Grammar, as it is pursued in the schools, does very little towards forming, in children, the habit of speaking correctly. And when we consider how few educated men (we refer to the whole class of college graduates) speak with grammatical accuracy in common conversation, and how seldom we hear a plea at the bar, a political speech, or even a written sermon, in which a crime cannot detect violations of some of the simplest rules of grammar, we are led to suspect that there must be something wrong in the manner in which grammar is taught in the schools.

Some years ago we were much interested in noticing the very accurate language used by a couple of lads in the family of a college professor. Brought up within the precincts of a college, in the society of the professors and their families, never associating with the boys of the city, nor yet with the students in college, they had heard none but correct language; and, without ever having studied the rules of grammar, they spoke correctly. They had formed correct habits of speech, and these would probably adhere to them through life. And was not this better, for them, than the most thorough, theoretical knowledge of grammar, without the practical part?

But children acquire bad habits of speech by associating with those who speak incorrectly; and these habits, the instruction which they receive in the school room is seldom sufficient to overcome.—Even educated men often carry through life certain ungrammatical habits which they know to be wrong. The great desideratum in grammatical instruction seems, therefore, to be, not so much to impart additional knowledge of correct language, as to adopt some course, if possible, which shall substitute correct habits of speech in place of wrong habits early acquired. For if a thorough knowledge of grammar is often found to be insufficient to remedy the evil, what can be expected from the imperfect knowledge of it acquired in the school room by the multitude of pupils? Just what we see, scarcely any good practical results whatever. And yet, without any of the toil for years over the technical abstractions of the grammar of the books, some acquire all the benefits of practical grammar without any labor or study. Cannot we approximate more nearly toward teaching grammar as these persons have learned it,—and cannot we, in some manner, more practically eradicate the bad habits early acquired?—Clinton Democrat.
THE OBJECT OF TRUE LEARNING.

The object is to beget manhood; the means are indifferent, so that the end is secured. How shall it be done? How does the son of the poor man rise amid all his disadvantages of birth and position to wealth, eminence and honor? By labor. How does the son of the wealthy, in spite of all his advantages descend to poverty, disgrace and reproach? Through his tendency to labor. Without books or schoolmasters, the one is educated and elevated; with them the other is depressed and degraded. The difference is, labor. The one is able to comply with the first great law of his being; the other is not. Labor is, therefore, education in its true sense. The man who knows not how to labor knows nothing; the man who knows how to labor, has within his reach the elements of everything. He who has not learned to support himself by industry—which not merely includes the knowledge of some branch of human employment, but the capacity to apply himself to it for the production of substantial results,—is, however elaborately he may have penetrated into books of science, un instructed in that which is, and will be until the entire constitution of humanity is changed, the thing, of all others, first in importance to mankind. Let not the poor boy, weary at the plow tail, or in the workshop, and longing for learning, repine. His labor, and the habits of consecutiveness industry which he is acquiring, are the best of all education—the highest foundation of personal independence, without which there is no manhood; and his very longing for that knowledge which seems beyond his reach, is, of itself, discipline of no common value.

What the mind goes out eagerly for, it either gets, or its equivalent; and the man who earnestly strove for excellence, however meager his means and opportunities, never failed of his reward in a commensurate improvement.

The practice of consecutive schooling year after year, with the expectation of making the educated and useful man, is undoubtedly wrong, and will often end in disappointment. The child put to school at an early age, readily masters the rudiments—letters, reading and numeration—which require little more than an effort of the memory. His mind then manifests a disposition to rest, the activity of his nature being transformed to his physical organization. If then he is pressed forward to tasks and lessons, both body and mind are liable to be dwarfed and narrowed by the process, and instead of enlargement, contraction is the almost certain result. His capacity to learn, as by the judicious it is sometimes called, is simply a temporary continence of memory acquired at the expense of the other faculties. Now is the time to teach him labor. This is indicated by the expansion of his body and its demand for active employment. The labor should be a productive kind, and such as requires attention and the endurance of fatigue, without overtasking his energies and driving him to indolence through disgust. The demands of the body being satisfied, the mind again awakes, and thus, instead of being opposing elements in the progress of the man toward his perfect condition, each acts as the friend and auxiliary of the other, and expansion and development go on efficiently and symmetrically.—Henry Reed.

OPPOSING THEORIES.

We have frequent complaints that too much attention is given in our system of education, and especially in our higher public schools, to classical and mathematical studies, and too little to the natural sciences. If the complaint be well grounded, it applies not only to the public schools, generally, throughout the country, but to nearly all our private institutions also. The tendency has been, of late years, very decidedly to mathematical studies, even with students whose scholastic education is limited to a brief period of instruction in the public schools. Mathematical studies are prominently put forward on the ground that they are, in an eminent degree, disciplinary, and that the proper office of education is to discipline and strengthen the mental powers, and not to store the mind with knowledge. On the other hand, the advocates of a greater proportion of scientific instruction urge, that for practical business men, education should be practical, that the powers of observation should be cultivated, and that sciences taught which are brought into requisition in the every day business of life. We have thus two classes of theorists upon systems of education, one contending for mental discipline, and the other for practical knowledge, and public sentiment is greatly divided between them. Professional teachers—and especially those who have grown old in the profession—are generally found in the former class: "mental discipline" is the great cardinal point with them; and that, as they believe, the embryonal course of every well-arranged system of school education—Teach a child, say the "Professors," the use of his mental faculties, and strengthen them by proper discipline, and you have educated him—you have drawn forth (duco), the hidden powers of his nature, and he will go forth from the school room, like Minerva from the brain of Jove, fully armed for the conflict of life.

But say the ignorers of the classics and higher mathematics, your disciple though a mental giant, goes forth ignorant of the wonders of science, and blind to the mysteries of art: he deals mighty blows, but they fall at random: he is powerful, but not expert: he is expecting to deal with great things, whereas little things make up the sum of life, and before his eyes are opened to a knowledge of the world around him, his competitors have left him far behind in the race.

In one respect, both of the opposing theories are right, and in another both are wrong. Those who argue the most tenaciously for mental discipline—for a thorough course of classical and mathematical studies, as the basis for a thorough education—are right, if they will confine their system to those who have time and means, not only to lay the foundations broad and deep, but also to erect the superstructure; but they are most assuredly wrong, if they would apply it to the great mass of children in our public schools, whose scholastic education, often interrupted, usually terminates before the age of fifteen. We would say, give the classics and the mathematics as a basis merely to build upon; for without them one cannot be a classical scholar. Philology—the science of language—is intimately connected with many important departments of learning, and there can be no such thing as mastering the sciences, without a thorough knowledge of mathematics. Let the classics and the higher mathematical studies, then, occupy their appropriate place in an extended educational course designed for professional scholars; but for others, let us adopt the maxim of the Grecian sage, and instruct boys in those things which they will need to practice when they become men. In our opinion our public schools are far from being sufficiently practical; grammar in our mis-called "grammar schools," is seldom made a practical art, and those sciences which
TEACHING YOUNG PUPILS TO WRITE COMPOSITIONS.

Mr. Editor:—It has occurred to me that it might not be out of place to suggest a few ideas, as to the method of teaching young pupils to write compositions.

Composition writing is a branch which ought to be introduced into all our schools as a regular daily exercise. When this is done, and not till then, may we expect to find anything like proficiency in writing among scholars or Teachers. I submit to you the following method of commencing:

Premising that all scholars are supplied with slates and pencils upon entering school, (which should always be the case,) they will at an early age, by a little attention from the teacher, be able to write or print upon their slates quite rapidly. Thus they can commence this branch of study when about eight or ten years of age. Let us suppose the Teacher to have a class of this age before him, and ready to give them the first lesson.

Taking from his pocket or table anything, it matters little what, he holds it up before the class and says: “Children, what is this?” Let us suppose he had taken a common lead pencil, and perhaps the following dialogue might occur:

Children—A lead pencil.

Teacher—Now, children, I want you to write down upon your slates a description of this pencil. We will talk about it a little, and whenever we have an idea fixed, you can put it down. First, then, this which I have in my hand is a lead pencil; who has it?

C.—You.

T.—But who am I?

C.—Our Teacher.

T.—Very well. Now you can write that much.

In a few moments all will be ready, and upon calling on some one for what he has written, the teacher will hear this:

“Our Teacher has got a lead pencil in his hand.”

Now is the time to fix that word “got,” the pest of all young writers. Show your scholars that the sentence would be just as perfect and much more elegant without it, and give them this rule—“Nine times out of ten, when you write this word, rub it out, for its of no use.” A class of this age, of course, cannot understand grammatical rules, &c.; but if you find an error, like the one referred to, root it out: and not only root it out thoroughly, but give them something correct and concise in the place of it. But to resume.

T.—Let us see what more you can think of about this pencil. You can write down its color, form, size and all you can find out by seeing it.

This will furnish several sentences more, and will afford an opportunity for the teacher to correct several errors in spelling and construction. Care should also be taken to teach them about the use of capital letters and punctuation marks. It has also another advantage. It will teach the little fellows the right use of their eyes. Let them write in this exercise only what they can tell by the sense of sight, and when this is done, and corrections made, you have used time enough for one exercise. At the next, you can continue upon the same subject. Let the pencil be passed around the class and let them write what new facts they discover, by the sense of touch, smell and taste. They will thus find out that it is smooth, hard, dry and light. They will also see, upon further examination, that it is composed of two substances, wood and black lead. Let them tell you what the office of the woody part is, and how the lead is put into it. They will find that it has a peculiar smell of cedar wood. Let them estimate its weight and value, and lastly give its uses. This will consume in all from three to five lessons. Let the next exercise be to write the whole thing out in full, in good order, and with care. You will find you have a tolerably fair composition from most of them.

As the class becomes accustomed to this exercise, you will have less and less to say to them, to draw out what they shall write, and you can take more complicated things; for instance, a book, a pocket knife, or a watch. If the exercise is rightly managed, the pupils will be greatly interested, and of course, proportionally benefitted.

But, Mr. Editor, this is, I fear, trespassing upon your time and space, and I will close, perhaps to resume at some future time.—Chester Co. Times.

HERMAN.