METHODS OF DEAF-MUTE INSTRUCTION.—III.

BY RICHARD S. STORRS, M. A., HARTFORD, CONN.

In articles I and II of the present series,* the initial stages only of a method of language instruction were briefly outlined, the pupils being conducted to a point where all the essential elements of the simple sentence should be, in their simplest form at least, within his clear comprehension and ready use; and the claim was made that the pupil thus taught has at his command, even at this early period of his course, (reached usually at the end of his first year,) a language apparatus reasonably adequate to his absolute need. It will be the aim of the present article to continue the development of the same method through the second year of the course; by hint and illustration, indeed, rather than in minute detail, as necessitated by the limits of a magazine article, but still in such manner as may enable the interested reader to supply omitted steps, and to construct for his own use, if so inclined, a similar pathway.

The same general principles already indicated as fundamental to an ideal course of deaf-mute instruction will of course continue to shape the method of the second and succeeding years, as of the first already outlined. Not to review too minutely the ground already gone over, these principles are:

A prime regard to the necessities of the poorer half of the class, resulting in a course so simplified and systematized in all its essential features as to be level to the capacity of the weaker

portion, while still so elastic and easily receptive of non-essential as to afford freest scope for the full activity of the brighter portion; so that the whole class may be easily carried along in one continuous, contented, and mutually profitable class-relation for any desirable length of time.

To this end, the entire ignoring of idiomatic correctness, as an immediate object of effort, and the deliberate choice, in its place, of simple grammatical correctness, as being both an attainable and amply satisfactory result.

To this end, the most careful systematizing of both the principles which underlie and the linguistic materials which compose the entire course, and the constant appeal to the reflective faculties of the pupils, as well as to the imitative, in a process and for a result as broadly and as truly educative as possible.

And, finally, to the end of the speediest and surest success of deaf-mutes in this, as in any other study, the most abundant possible visual illustration of the principles and relations involved, by means of sentence-maps, symbols, and other visual devices.

It is the further, though unmethodized, illustration of these principles which will be the aim of the present article.

The briefest indication of the work of the second and third years of our course would be to call it simply a work of substitution, for such, in truth, it very largely is. Those simplest forms of the essential sentence elements upon which all the work of the first year has been based, are, during the two following years, to be successively expanded into their more complex but nearly equivalent forms of phrase or clause; and these the pupil is to be encouraged to use, as fast as acquired, as simple and strict substitutes for the earlier forms. It is obvious that his immediately successful use of each of these new forms will depend only upon his implicit acceptance of it as a mere equivalent for some already familiar simpler form, into whose place he now, by substitution, adopts it. Whereas, e.g., he could formerly only write "the rich man," he may now substitute the new form of the same adjective modifier, "the man of great wealth." Where he had formerly only the one adverbial form, "I shall go soon," or "I shall stay here," he may now use the alternative equivalent forms of the same modifier, "I shall go in a short time," or "I shall stay in this place." Without multiplying illustrations at this point, in advance of their future necessary use, it must be evident that,
by thus emphasizing the substitutional idea, and by introducing each new phrase or clause as an already familiar friend, in its office at least, the pupil’s ready acceptance and speedy mastering of each will be much facilitated.

It will contribute greatly to the clearness and correctness of this substitution process, in its earlier stages at least, if the particular element for which an equivalent is sought can somehow be isolated and detached from the rest of the sentence as easily to receive the pupil’s concentrated and unconfused attention, while it is at the same time held, both mentally and visually, in a true relation to the rest of the sentence. This is precisely what the sentence-map already described renders it possible, easily and exactly, to do. By its skilful use with accompanying appropriate symbols and signs, the concentrated and coincident attention of both pupil and teacher at the same moment, upon the same portion of the sentence, under the same aspect of relation, is secured with almost absolute certainty; whereas, unless the various elements of the sentence are thus isolated by this, or some similar device, the undisciplined faculty of the pupil will inevitably fail to hold the particular one under discussion apart from other unrelated portions of the sentence which happen to stand in proximity to it, and so all clearness and exactness of analysis will become impossible.

Under this aspect it is not in the earlier stages of the course that the highest advantages of this device are realized, important as its assistance even then is to steady the hesitating steps of the yet untrained pupil; but it becomes an evidently even more invaluable auxiliary as the elements to be considered increase in number and complexity. The ease and the certainty with which each such element can thus be exhibited as a separate unit of expression for discussion, modification, or substitution, while still held in a visibly true relation to all the others, more and more recommend its use as the pupil advances in his linguistic course.

And this is especially and emphatically true, let it be noticed, for the poorer portion of the class, whose less alive and alert intuitions especially need such a subdividing and simplifying of the difficulties of a complex sentence. For all such, the number and variety of new sentences and constructions to be met and mastered during the next two years of the course is despairingly great, if each must be met in its entirety as a sep-
arate enigma. Perhaps it might not at first glance seem to be much of an assistance toward the original task to resolve each of these sentences, by our map-analysis, into their immensely more numerous sentence elements, each of which should require separate consideration, as being itself a unit of expression. When, however, due weight is given not only to the very great advantage of thus dividing to conquer, but also to the comparative simplicity of the classification to which these immensely numerous and apparently protean elements may be easily and exactly reduced, and to the great facility which the sentence-map offers for exhibiting these classifications and their contents, the very great advantage of this method of investigating language to every portion of the class, and especially to the weaker part, must be at once apparent.

For it is important to notice further in this connection, and as contributing to this advantage, that, such as the sentence-map has become at the end of the first year, such it is to remain, essentially, during all the accumulations of equivalents of expression of the next two years, however immense these accumulations may be. Hardly a single new element will need to be introduced during that time to embarrass the learner by any increased complexity of this, his now familiar symbolic outline-map. The five essential elements of the sentence—the subject, the predicate, the object, the adjective modifier, and the adverbial modifier—are already perfectly familiar to the pupil in their simplest word-form, general office in the sentence, and diagram location and connection. He has obviously, therefore, very little more to do, for the present, than to accept each new equivalent of phrase or of clause as it is introduced to him by his teacher; to unify it in his mind as a single and separate element or unit of expression; to classify it according to its perceived character and office in the sentence; and to assign it its proper diagram location and relation, corresponding to that of the earlier and simpler form, of which it has now become the substitute. The only new point in the whole process is the new position in the written sentence which this expanded element may, or must, occupy when thus taking the place of the simpler one; e. g., that the phrase or clause-form of the adjective modifier must follow the word which it modifies, instead of preceding it, as does the word modifier—the "rich" man becoming thus a man "of wealth," or a man "who is rich." With the
exception of this purely formal change, level to the capacity and
carefulness of the weakest pupil, all the rest of the process is,
in a real and helpful sense, familiar ground to him; and very
much the more vividly and consciously so, if all these thick-
crowding and heterogeneous accumulations of more complex
expressions are seen by him to take their appropriate place
thus naturally in that same symbolic outline-map which has
already become to him so familiar and significant. For the
weaker portion of the class, therefore, no more efficient aux-
iliary of language instruction than this can be imagined, or
need be desired. If I seem to any to press this point unduly
or erroneously, let those only criticise or contradict positively
who have tried the experiment faithfully.

If, now, to any even candid mind, all this process should
seem too sharply and exclusively analytic, and thus fatally op-
posed to nature's inexorable law of linguistic acquisition,—the
purely synthetic,—let me say to such an one that both the gen-
eral method which I am outlining; and the sentence-map as its
efficient auxiliary, are confidently recommended, not merely as
a guide to the teacher and an aid to the pupil's analytic faculty,
but equally as a most convenient basis or groundwork for the
amplest and most advantageous practice on the part of the pu-
pil. Strongly as I insist on the importance of training the
pupil to habits of reflection and analysis, I am not one of those,
if any such there are, who would antagonize or ignore that law of
linguistic acquisition which prescribes an almost infinite amount
of practice as the indispensable condition of real and rapid
progress. I recognize fully—as fully as the most ardent advo-
cate of the purely natural method—that only by such constant
and careful practice in all formulas of speech can any consid-
erable readiness or accuracy in their use be gained by either the
hearing child or the mute. I only insist that this very practice
of the deaf-mute, under his exceptional limitations, should, for
economy of time, be as carefully systematized as possible, and
should also be carried on with the utmost possible attendant
clearness and vigor of mental action. While it is true, therefore,
that the sentence-map does lend itself with special advantage
to the analytic method, it is also no less true that, by enabling
the teacher to direct and concentrate the pupil's attention and
practice upon those points where it is especially needed, in in-
numerable reviews and repetitions of detached elements, yet
with a perfectly clear accompanying perception of the relations of this practice to the thought of the sentence as a whole, the sentence-map gives greatly increased value to this very practice which it thus both encourages and facilitates, and is thus seen to be a scarcely less valuable servitor to the synthetic than to the analytic process of language acquisition. If this were not so, it would be thereby condemned at once and in advance of all argument, for no other method ever has been or ever will be devised for real and rapid linguistic progress except practice, practice, practice—always and everywhere—practice!

The exact order in which this substitution process shall be carried on, and practice in the new form of modifier secured, is not essential. The general order will of course be decided by those two broadest distinctions of complex modifiers—the phrase and the clause; and among phrases the prepositional will naturally first claim attention, both on account of its frequency and the simplicity of its analysis. The distinctive characteristic of this phrase form is the use of the uninflected noun as a modifier, with the aid of some linking word, either expressed or suppressed, to indicate its verbal relationship. It is this form which is now to be introduced to the pupil, and to which the work of the second year will be largely devoted; and as hitherto, so now, the effort will be to awaken a sense of want in the pupil's mind before attempting to meet that want.

There are two principal relations in which the single noun may be used as a direct modifier, without any linking word at all. These are the possessive relation and the appositive. Both might easily be included in the first year's course, as, indeed, the possessive has already been in completing the case presentation of the noun, (see the Annals, vol. xxv, p. 240,) where the pupil was instructed in the very slight inflectional change which fits the single noun to express this relation adjectively; e. g., "John's horse."

The appositive relation being that of mere identity, i. e., two names for one and the same object of thought, offers even less difficulty, and may be introduced whenever the teacher chooses. It is really the remnant of a contracted adjective clause, by which process "the boy who is named Henry," or "whose name is Henry," becomes "the boy Henry." Since this explanation of its origin cannot now be given to the pupil, it is preferable to treat it at this time as a simple synonym rather than
as an adjective modifier, writing the two names together in the sentence-map under whatever relation they both sustain, which, of course, will always be the same for each. It may, however, be treated as a regular adjective modifier, and so located in the sentence-map, if the teacher prefers.

Besides these two principal and genuine relations of the single noun as a direct modifier with no preposition intervening, we have also many apparent cases of the same direct relation, which, however, are not really such, but result from the allowed idiomatic suppression of the appropriate preposition—e. g., "I went last Monday;" i. e., on last Monday. The appropriate place for explaining these contracted phrase forms will, of course, be after the phrase itself shall have been taught.

For the present, then, the only form known to the pupil in which a single noun can be used by him as a direct modifier, i. e., as single adjectives and adverbs have been hitherto used by him, is the inflected possessive form in such sentences as "John's two horses ran." This, then, we will make the pivot upon which to swing the door which shall open to the pupil the whole range of prepositional phrase modifiers.

Let us suppose the class to have correctly written the above simple sentence, upon the basis of the first year's instruction, and to have analyzed it in the sentence-map, thus—

```
horses ran
 |
|  two
 |
|  John's
```

and to have shown by their proper use of the natural possessive sign—the open and pushing hand—that they clearly apprehend the real relation of this possessive noun modifier to the other. Let the teacher now, with emphasis of action, erase from this limiting noun its possessive inflection—which alone has hitherto fitted it for its adjective use—and, after emphatic dissent of gesture from the suggested possibility of leaving it thus single and uninflected, let him carefully prefix to it the little linking word "of," forming thus, for the first time in the pupil's experience, the prepositional phrase "of John." This phrase, let the teacher assure the pupil, is the exact equivalent.
of the adjective noun "John's," and may be used by him in precisely the same way in every respect except the single one of position in the written sentence—the word form of this modifier invariably there preceding the noun which it modifies, and this new phrase form as invariably following it. Finally, after renewed assurance that neither the meaning of the sentence nor the construction of the sentence-map have thus sustained any change, let the class be required to write out the new sentence in its changed form, "The two horses of John ran," and to construct their own sentence-map of it, thus—

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>horses</th>
<th>ran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

This is, of course, an extremely simple example; but it illustrates, perhaps all the better, the extreme simplicity and the ease of communicating the substitutional idea upon which the whole advance rests. There can be no question that this idea, at least, has been perfectly and practically apprehended by every member of an ordinary class.

If, then, it be asked why all this emphasis of action and assurance, the reply is, that it is desired thus to impress upon the pupil's mind the necessity of always looking closely at the real relation between two nouns thus to be connected, and to lay a basis thus for his own future careful examination of every proposed prepositional phrase, as to its inherent fitness to express some real and clearly apprehended relationship of ideas. This result, if secured, would amply justify almost any expenditure of effort or emphasis.

If the pupil should now ask which of these two equivalent forms is the better, he need only be told, at this time, that either is allowable, and that his own correct use of either will be accepted. Our preference of the possessive form to express personal relations, and other points of style preference, should of course be deferred for later explanation.

If the pupil should then ask why there is any need of this second form, both being equally correct, this will at once and naturally lead to the consideration of other forms of noun rela-
tion besides that of possession, for the expression of many of which usage does not allow us any alternative from the phrase form. The number of these is very great. A single example only is possible here, as a sample of the close examination of word relations possible for a very young class even, under this habitually thoughtful method, aided also by the sentence-map to concentrate and steady the pupil's attention.

Let us suppose the class, then, to have written upon the basis of the single word modifiers, the simple sentence, "A tall girl sweeps the floor fast," and to have analyzed it correctly, thus—

```
girl  | sweeps

   a  | fast

tall

floor
```

The teacher then suggests the noun "broom" as an important adjunct, and queries where room can be found for another noun in the sentence. The first point for the pupil to decide is, to which of the two principal elements will he relate this new noun? to the subject, as an adjective modifier of the girl? or to the predicate, as an adverbial modifier of the act of sweeping? This is not an altogether self-evident point, and probably the opinion of the class may be divided upon it. Let the teacher accept each view provisionally, and proceed to consider each in turn. "The tall broom girl sweeps the floor fast," would be the pupil's way of expressing the first idea. "The tall girl broom-sweeps the floor," would be his way of expressing the second—using the noun alone as modifier in each case—though very possibly some of the class might attempt to coin the new adverb "broomly," writing "The tall girl sweeps the floor broomly." By comparing these expressions respectively with these other, viz., "The tall flower girl walks rapidly," "The strong man hammer-dresses the stone," it will be seen that neither of those in which the noun is used as a direct modifier is inherently impossible or ridiculous. Both are, however, contrary to approved usage, as the teacher may now inform the pupil, and in the place of each he will offer him the new linking word "with," prefixed as before to the uninflected noun, form-
ing thus the new prepositional phrase “with a broom,” as a substitute for the inadmissible single-word forms. The former sentence would then read, “The tall girl-with-a-broom sweeps the floor fast,” while the second one would read, “The tall girl sweeps the floor fast with a broom.” The final question, or rather the first question of all now ready for final decision, as to the adjective or adverbial relations of the broom, may now be made intelligently to depend upon the pupil’s own judgment whether the phrase “with a broom” here answers the question in his own mind, “What sort of a girl?” or “How did she sweep?”

Of course no such minuteness of analysis is either necessary at this point, nor will be generally desirable subsequently. The essential ideas of the process, viz., the expansion of the word form of modifier into the phrase form, the perfect equivalence of the two forms, and the necessary use of the latter in many cases where usage does not sanction any single-word form—these main ideas might all be conveyed to the pupils’ minds by the simple erasures and substitutions of the sentence-map, with little comment or explanation, and perhaps with no subsequent inferiority of result in correct writing. There is much advantage, however, of another nature, in accustoming the pupils even very early in the course, and with considerable frequency afterwards, to exercise their own ingenuity in examining thus closely the real relations of the various elements of the sentence; and with the aid of the sign-language skilfully used, and of the sentence-map to symbolize relations and concentrate attention, there is no difficulty and much pleasure as well as profit in so doing.

It may be noticed incidentally, also, that this example happily illustrates the desirableness of great caution in criticising and condemning the efforts of thoughtful pupils to express themselves in language, simply because the results of those efforts are unapproved by usage. A moment’s reflection will frequently show the teacher that he would be compelled to sanction, and even to applaud, in some other analogous connection, the very same mental process of the pupil which here strikes him, at first, as almost absurd.

There are, I know, many among our visitors who seem unable to see any difference between the mistake idiomatic and the mistake idiotic,—i. e., the mistake born of thoughtfulness,
in distinction from that of pure thoughtlessness. Nor are teachers, even, so rare as they should be, who seem to regard any and every deviation from common usage as alike strange; to whom, indeed, any mere idiomatic usage, inexplicable by grammatical law, and perhaps even in direct violation of such law, is yet as seemingly sacred as the most fundamental of constructive principles. To such persons, language seems to be nothing more than agreed usage; and any and every departure from that usage seems to be always and equally absurd. To such, therefore, any pupil’s philosophical mistake, originating in his consistent application of some principle, or in some obvious analogy, is the same thing as a mistake of mere carelessness.

I confess to no little impatience with such mere surface critics, whether they be visitors or teachers. Like the apostle of old, let the teacher of deaf-mutes “glory rather in the infirmities” of his thoughtful pupils. Let him point out with pride how each such deviation from mere usage has its origin in the thought, and is the highest evidence of the pupil’s real ability. Let the pupil himself be heartily praised, and let him be assured that his own less idiomatic, and perhaps on that account rejected expression, is, after all, by all laws of expression, the more truly correct form.

Proceeding now with our practical school-room work from this basis of the expanded phrase form, let the teacher invite the whole class to furnish lists of nouns and verbs thus expanded, and suitable for use in simple propositions in place of his former word modifier; the exercise is one of great simplicity, and yet exceedingly attractive and profitable to the pupil. One method of pursuing it is to write on the black-board a simple predicative combination, e. g., “girl cuts,” either within the predicative rectangle of the sentence-map, or simply underscoring each word, extending below each a long vertical line as a connective for its modifiers, with the appropriate adjective or adverbial symbol drawn across this line near its top. Calling now for adjective ideas whereby to modify the general idea of the noun “girl,” let the teacher write in a column on the left-hand side of this vertical line single words, either nouns or adjectives, which may represent this idea. Then, upon the right-hand side of the same line, directly opposite to each such single word, let the teacher and the class, working together in
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mutual inquiry and suggestion, write the appropriate phrase form of the same idea. Let each be the subject of sufficient discussion to call out the pupils' real thoughtfulness upon it. If the single noun modifier is inadmissible in usage, draw a line across it. If usage allows or compels the suppression of the linking preposition in the phrase form, draw a line across that also, but do not erase any part of the real constructive work until it has made due impression upon the pupils' mind, as being the real basis and full form of the true phrase. Afterwards pursue the same course in obtaining and exhibiting adverbial modifiers of the verb "cuts." The black-board presentation, when completed, might present some such an appearance as this—the list being, of course, not at all exhaustive, but including only enough for illustration of the above description:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>girl</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrious</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red-haired</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W's</td>
<td>of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morning</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>here</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scissors</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast</td>
<td>with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cloth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This exercise is susceptible of indefinite and almost infinite variation, as the subject and predicate of the proposition are changed, and as new forms of modifiers, involving new relations, are introduced. It should be carefully repeated whenever any such new relation is discussed, as, e.g., adverbial modifiers of place or of time; and great care should be taken to furnish the pupil thus with an abundance of authorized prepositional phrase forms for his own memorizing, as well as to encourage his own experiments in originating them, by thoughtful consideration of the real relations of ideas as such, and in reliance upon analogy in construction.

The amount of condensed and systematized practice which may be thus engrafted on this exercise in phrase manufacture, if we may so term it, with the pupil's clearest critical comprehension of the relations and value of each factor, is immensely beyond anything otherwise possible, and the advantage to the pupil is proportionately great. Such practice, if thus thoroughly and thoughtfully pursued, will gradually so fix in the pupil's mental and manual habits the proper associations of these small linking words, with such an accompanying sense of their
importance, as to forestall, in a considerable degree, that loose and careless habit of pupils less thoroughly trained, to fix all their attention on the main word of the phrase, and to imagine the use of that to be alone really important. The isolating of the phrase, either in this tabular method just described, or in the sentence-map, both aid immensely in counteracting this careless tendency, each method accustoming the eye to receive the whole phrase as a single unit of expression, and to hold it as such in the memory. To the same end, it is well often to hyphenate the phrase in its current use, the “red-haired” girl becoming the girl “with-red-hair”—the “rich” man becoming the man “of-great-wealth;” any and every device being welcomed which assists to unify the whole phrase in its general adjective or adverbial relation, as a substitute for former simpler word forms. Of all methods, however, which I have ever employed for this purpose, the sentence-map is by far the most convenient and effective, enclosing the whole complex phrase modifier, as one evident unit of expression, in the same rectangle, and under the same relation and symbolization as the single word for which it has become the substitute.

There is, indeed, a variety of this phrase map representation which I have sometimes used, in which the linking preposition is placed between the principal word of the phrase and the word which it modifies, upon the line which connects the two, thus—

```
  horses    ran
    ↓      ↓
  the      of rapidly
    ↓      ↓
  two      John
```

This has, perhaps, the theoretical advantage of showing more clearly to the eye the real office of the preposition as a linking and relating word; but, upon the whole, I have found the larger weight of advantage to be upon the side of unifying the whole phrase within the rectangle.

It should be needless to add that all this practice in phrase manufacture, under whatever form it may be pursued, is only preparatory for, and wholly subsidiary to, the amplest practice in full sentence writing, embodying the phrases thus acquired.
This practice will be most readily and successfully undertaken by any pupil who has intelligently mastered thus the phrase itself. The construction of any new sentence including several more or less complex ideas, which under a less careful treatment would have been a wholly uncertain and bewildered effort, becomes, by this visible analysis and the resultant possible concentration of attention and explanation upon the precise point where it is most needed, wholly luminous and easy to the pupil.

The varieties of these phrases are of course very great, and their number almost infinite. For their even approximate mastery, the aid of the most careful classification will have to be invoked, as the basis of the most advantageous phrase practice. Of adjective phrases, for example, there are those which describe a noun by some peculiarity of appearance, or appendage, or possession, or location, or characteristic, or mutual relation of almost any kind between two nouns, whereby one is used to identify or limit another in an adjective manner, by the aid of a preposition.

The origin of our compound nouns, in the suppression of this preposition and the restoration of the limiting noun, when thus left alone, to its proper position as a single word modifier before the word modified, and the subsequent hyphenating of the two nouns thus made into one—as, e. g., "watch-chain," from "chain of a watch"—can thus be made so clear to the pupil as to furnish him with a perfect key to the proper order of the nouns thus used—a point upon which deaf-mutes are usually quite uncertain. The thoughtful pupil can easily be made to see that it is the noun of the assertion—i. e., the subject noun—which is used nearest to the predicate, and the simply modifying noun which precedes, without regard to the comparative size or importance of the two nouns. Most of the errors of deaf-mutes in this respect evidently spring from their attempt to conform their language to the natural order of thought, in accordance with which the most important noun obtains the earliest recognition of the mind, and the subsidiary noun obtains only a secondary and subsequent notice. The phrase modifier, which conforms to this natural order of thought, is thus seen to be more natural to the deaf-mute than any form of the single word modifier—all of which reverse this natural order.

Of adverbial phrases, there are those corresponding to the
adverbs already taught, answering the questions, where? whence? whither? when?—in time past, present, or future?—how? including manner, instrument, means;—and how much? including degree or measure, etc. The remaining principal modifier—of cause, answering the question, why?—has so few representatives among single adverbs that it could not well be introduced before the phrase. Its most frequent use is, however, under the clausal form, and its full explanation should be reserved for that. The pupil should be accustomed to classify nearly all adverbial modifiers under some one of these five leading divisions of time, place, manner, degree, and cause, and to indicate the nature of the modifier in any given case, in the sentence-map, by one of these initial letters placed against the adverbial symbol on the connecting line, thus:

![Sentence Map Diagram]

Intermediate, however, between these five forms of adverbial modifier—to which, perhaps, should be added that of the agent in the passive voice—and the true or accusative object, is the indirect or dative object, answering the question "to or for whom?" and therefore necessarily deferred in its introduction until the teaching of the phrases founded on those prepositions. Usage, indeed, allows us to suppress this preposition, giving it thus the appearance of a direct object; but this suppression should always be carefully noted, and the real character of this modifier, as indirect and partly adverbial, should be kept apparent. Appropriate place for this new element may be made in the sentence-map by extending downward the right-hand vertical boundary line of the predicative rectangle, to connect it with the new dative rectangle below, and the real character of this new modifier, as only partly objective, may be appropri-
ately symbolized by placing upon the vertical connecting line half, only, of the true objective symbol, thus:

\[ \text{man} \quad \text{gave} \]
\[ \text{a} \quad \text{is} \quad \text{large} \]
\[ \text{kind} \quad \text{on} \quad \text{yesterday} \]

\[ \text{with a large basket} \quad \text{me} \]

These slight additions complete the sentence-map, so far as it will be needed for use during any part of the second year of the course, if we except the fifth form of predication, referred to in a former article, and then deferred on account of its more complex form, involving the use of the phrase, or even the clause, instead of the single word, to express the attributive part of the predicate—as, e. g., “I am in Hartford,” instead of “I am here.” “The danger is that he will die,” instead of “The danger is this.” Obviously, however, this is only another instance of equivalents, and of that substitution of a new form for a familiar simpler one, which we have been considering. This fifth form, then, is not so much an essentially new form of predication as a substitute form for some one of the three already introduced, in which the copula with a noun, or adjective, or adverb, constitutes the predicate. Theoretically, therefore, we might perhaps better limit our number of essential predications to four, viz: I. The subject and predicate verb. II. The subject and copula-with-predicate-adjective. III. The same with-predicate-noun. IV. The same with-predicate-adverb; explaining that each one of the last three forms of predicate may also assume the form of a phrase or a clause. So different, however, in appearance does the predicate become when thus expanded, and so numerous are its expansions into the prepositional phrase form, that we have found it convenient, in practice, to accept the classification recommended by Professor Gibbs, and to consider this last a distinct form of predication, representative of all expansions of the predicate noun, or adjective, or adverb, of whatever nature.

It will be found very useful to keep these five (or four?) forms of essential predication constantly exhibited before the pupil’s eye, in a large wall chart, for constant reference in an-
alyzing his own work, and especially the language of textbooks, until the ability is acquired readily to recognize any one of these forms whenever it is met with; and until the absence of every form in any attempted sentence is as painfully felt by the pupil as by ourselves. This chart, with its symbols, might present either of the following forms,—according to the teacher’s preference for the theoretical or practical view of the so-called fifth form of predication:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{I} & \quad \underline{\text{I}}, \sqrt{\text{I}} \\
\text{II} & \quad \underline{\text{I}}, \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \\
\text{III} & \quad \underline{\text{I}}, \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \\
\text{IV} & \quad \underline{\text{I}}, \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \\
\text{V} & \quad \underline{\text{I}}, \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}} \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{\text{I}}
\end{align*}
\]

There are, indeed, some grammarians—so called—who would ignore the essential difference between the true verb, which unites in itself both the assertion and the attribute, and the copula, which expresses only the assertion, and so requires some other word or words to complete the predication. These grammarians are, of course, able easily to reduce all possible forms of predication to one only, viz., the noun and the verb. The conceded fact that the copula verb "to be," may sometimes be used as a true verb in the sense of "to exist," and in such usage does not require any other word to complete the predication, may give a slight appearance of plausibility to this view; but only a moment’s reflection is needed to show its exceeding superficialness and incorrectness. It is certain that there are four radically different forms of predication, and no real gain can result from the attempt to merge all these radical differences in one all-comprehending but utterly undiscriminating classification.

As has already been said, no particular order of presentation of either the adjective or adverbial modifier is essential; nor should an exhaustive presentation of any be attempted at the time of its introduction. Sufficient only of each variety should then be given to afford the class a glimpse of the resources in this direction at the command of the practical writer, and to meet his own most common need.

The natural experiences of school-room and of daily life will
suggest the various forms for presentation and practice far more rapidly than the teacher can meet or the pupil master them; and the teacher cannot do more wisely than to be guided largely by this trend of school-room experience, enlisting, as it certainly will, the pupil's own deepest interest. But under whatever form, and at whatever time each may present itself, the effort should always be made to ground the proposed new form in something analogous in past familiar usage of the pupil.

Inquiry for alternatives of phrase usage should also be keen and constant, broadening thus naturally and delightfully the pupil's acquaintance with these immensely various formulas, and preventing him from settling down into the habitual use of one only, when he might have his choice among several—as, e.g., "just now," "a little while ago;" "a short time ago," to express time only recently past. The fascination of this systematized search, for a bright class stimulated also by a keen sense of its practical utility to themselves, can hardly be imagined by one who has not witnessed it. Let any teacher try the experiment, for example, of writing at the top of three large wall slates three simple predications of time, past, present, and future, respectively, drawing a long vertical line downward from each predicate, with the adverbial symbol across its top. Let him then call upon his class for the largest possible number of adverbial time modifiers of word or phrase appropriate to each predication. I venture to predict that he will be not a little surprised at the extreme zest with which the class will engage in the exercise, under his guidance and with his assistance. The slates, as finally filled up by the joint efforts of the class and himself, might present some such an opening appearance as the following:

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\text{t}</th>
<th>\text{t}</th>
<th>\text{t}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{now}</td>
<td>\text{just now}</td>
<td>\text{soon}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{to-day}</td>
<td>\text{a short time ago}</td>
<td>\text{presently}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{at the present time}</td>
<td>\text{a little while ago}</td>
<td>\text{in a short time}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{this week}</td>
<td>\text{recently}</td>
<td>\text{a short time hence}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{this forenoon}</td>
<td>\text{a week ago}</td>
<td>\text{in a little while}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{etc., etc.}</td>
<td>\text{two days ago}</td>
<td>\text{to-morrow}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{etc.}</td>
<td>\text{day before yesterday}</td>
<td>\text{day after to-morrow}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{last week}</td>
<td>\text{two days ago}</td>
<td>\text{in two days}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{yesterday evening}</td>
<td>\text{day before yesterday}</td>
<td>\text{two days hence}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{etc., etc.}</td>
<td>\text{last week}</td>
<td>\text{next week}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{etc.}</td>
<td>\text{two days ago}</td>
<td>\text{next week}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{etc.}</td>
<td>\text{yesterday evening}</td>
<td>\text{next week}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{array}
\]
As regards the order in which the adverbial modifiers should be introduced into the sentence, no such exact and concise rule as governs the adjective modifier can be given to the pupil. He can only be safely told that his adverbial modifiers must not too widely separate the direct object of the transitive verb, with its own adjective modifiers, from the verb itself; that, with this exception, they should be grouped about, and principally after, the element which they modify; with this further exception, that the adverbial modifier of time may very often commence the whole sentence. The mental habit, however, which the sentence-map so strongly encourages, of holding each principal element, with all its modifiers, together, as one compound element, will doubtless show its marked influence upon the pupil's style, independent of, and even in spite of, any special suggestions from the teacher.

It is probably needless to say that the style thus formed will be more noticeable for clearness than for idiomatic elegance; since for the acquisition of this last nothing but a wide range of observation and practice can avail. For the deaf-mute, therefore, as for the foreigner endeavoring to express himself in our highly idiomatic language, the first and highest, and often the only and final ambition should be simple intelligibility and correctness. When this is once realized and conceded, we shall have fewer unreasonable complaints of the failure of deaf-mutes to master idiomatic English, and they will receive due credit for their frequent really remarkable achievements in mastering correct grammatical English.

But the adequate discussion of the prepositional phrase alone would evidently require a volume, and we have no alternative but reluctantly to leave it here. The participial phrase and the infinitive phrase, each on account of its close relation to the third form of modifier,—the clausal,—seem more appropriately deferred for their full examination until that form shall be reached, though some of the infinitive phrase forms, used simply as verbal nouns, will almost necessarily enter into the usage of the second year. I have said nothing, also, of much other work upon single word modifiers, which, as deferred portions of the first year's work, must necessarily find a place in this second year's teaching—as, e. g., the further inflection of the pronoun, some opening of adjective and adverbial comparison, the passive usage of the verb, etc., etc. With many classes,
indeed, three full years might advantageously be spent upon the points already suggested, without touching upon that further advance to the clausal modifier which we have designated as the third year's work, and which may certainly be made such by a bright class.

Nothing could be pleasanter than to retrace and describe in detail actual school-room experience of such a second year's course; but this is, of course, impossible. And it is, after all, the spirit of any method which can alone be properly and helpfully communicated. Details are of value principally, and have been here given only, for the purpose of conveying more clearly this spirit. The teacher who catches and approves this spirit,—of the reflective and analytic unfolding of language principles,—as the best basis for the pupil's amplest practice in language formulas,—aided by the most abundant visual illustration for the primary advantage of the weaker portion of the class,—such a teacher can and will necessarily originate for himself innumerable methods of applying this spirit; each such method, too, being most valuable for him, because thus originated by himself.

PADRE MARCHIÔ'S REPLY TO DR. GALLAUDET.—II.*

BY THE EDITOR.

In the February number of the Italian periodical Dell' Educazione, etc., which did not reach us until after the April Annals was printed, Padre Marchiô continues and concludes his criticism of Dr. Gallaudet's article on the Milan Convention, published in the January number of the Annals.

Referring to the assertion that "the declarations of the Convention (as to methods) are, in some respects, inconsistent with the expressed views of their prominent supporters," Padre Marchiô asks what convention was ever held, the declarations of which expressed the exact views of all its members, and inquires if the discussions of conventions are not, in fact, always supported by the differences of opinion which exist among the participants? Whether Mr. Kinsey's vote in the Convention was or was not consistent with the views of the paper he prepared for the Convention is a question Padre Marchiô does not stop to

* Continued from page 182.