

**BULLETIN**  
OF THE  
**UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS**

1915: No. 72

---

---

DECEMBER 25

1915

---

---

**The English Bulletin**  
(Vol. I, No. 1, December, 1915)



Published by the University six times a month and entered as  
second-class matter at the postoffice at

AUSTIN, TEXAS

# Publications of the University of Texas

## Publications Committee:

A. C. JUDSON

E. C. BARKER

J. M. BRYANT

G. C. BUTTE

R. H. GRIFFITH

C. HARTMAN

J. L. HENDERSON

W. S. HUNTER

J. A. LOMAX

The University publishes bulletins six times a month. These comprise the official publications of the University, publications on humanistic and scientific subjects, bulletins prepared by the Department of Extension and by the Bureau of Municipal Research, and other bulletins of general educational interest. With the exception of special numbers, any bulletin will be sent to a citizen of Texas free on request. All communications about University publications should be addressed to the Editor of University Publications, University of Texas, Austin.



B207-116-2m

**BULLETIN**  
**OF THE**  
**UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS**

1915: No. 72

---

---

**DECEMBER 25**

**1915**

---

---

**The English Bulletin**  
**(Vol. I, No. 1, December, 1915)**



**Published by the University six times a month and entered as  
second-class matter at the postoffice at**

**AUSTIN, TEXAS**

**The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government.**

**Sam Houston.**

**Cultivated mind is the guardian genius of democracy. . . . It is the only dictator that freemen acknowledge and the only security that freemen desire.**

**Mirabeau B. Lamar.**

# The English Bulletin

(Vol. I, No. 1, December, 1915)

**Editors: KILLIS CAMPBELL  
E. M. CLARK  
L. W. PAYNE, JR.**

The English Bulletin is intended as an organ for the expression of opinion by teachers of English in Texas concerning pedagogical and other problems that arise in their work. It will appear from one to three times a year.

Copies of this bulletin will be sent free, on application, to any teacher of English in Texas. Address The English Bulletin, the University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

---

## CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>THE INCIDENTAL TEACHING OF ENGLISH, by Morgan Callaway, Jr. . . . .</b>                                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>THE CLASSICS AND ENGLISH, by Robert Adger Law . . . . .</b>   | <b>17</b> |
| <b>THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH COMPOSITION IN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE, by Killis Campbell . . . . .</b>        | <b>25</b> |
| <b>THE CORPUS CHRISTI MEETING OF THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, by Gates Thomas . . . .</b> | <b>33</b> |



## THE INCIDENTAL TEACHING OF ENGLISH\*

BY MORGAN CALLAWAY, JR., PH. D., PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH,  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

Ladies and Gentlemen:—Please accept my sincere thanks for the honor you have conferred upon me by selecting me as chairman of the English Section of the Texas State Teachers' Association.

With your permission I wish to make a few remarks on the Incidental Teaching of English, a theme that seems to me timely and that, I trust, may appeal to all divisions of our Section. Let not the title, however, lead any to suppose that I do not believe in the systematic teaching of English as of every other subject in the school and in the college. On the contrary, even in that most delicate subject, religion, I hold it of the utmost importance that, from childhood up, in home and in Sunday-school, there be given daily and definite instruction such as is suited to the child's age; for I am not of those that seek to go to heaven on flowery beds of ease. Nor am I one who believes real kindness lies in forever concocting soothing syrups even for the little ones, though I would not unnecessarily offend a single one of them; nay, more, I would give to each every moment of happiness of every kind consistent with the highest self-development. But I hold that, to the young as to the old, higher and more abiding joy comes from the consciousness of having met and having overcome difficulties than from evading them or from having others to overcome them for us. That the soothing-syrup theory of education is not yet dead, we have abundant evidence. Says Dean Briggs, of Harvard University: "We leave the straight and narrow way, and wobble all over the flowery meadows. We are held down to accuracy so little that it is next to impossible to find a youth who can copy a list of printed names without misspelling."† To the

---

\*An address delivered before the English Section of the Texas State Teachers' Association, at Austin, December 30, 1908. Reprinted from *The University of Texas Record*, Vol. IX, No. 1.

†L. R. Briggs, *School, College, and Character*, Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., Boston, 1901, p. 44.—This book and the same author's *Routine and Ideals* (the same publishers, 1904) are so packed with common sense and with wisdom that they should be in every school library.

same effect are the words of Professor Irving Babbitt, also of Harvard, in a book just from the press: "As a result of long practice, from the kindergarten up, the American undergraduate has often acquired a remarkable dexterity in dodging every kind of discipline."†

Nor, once more, do I omit to discuss systematic instruction because I feel that there is less need thereof at present than in days gone by. Anyone inclined so to think can easily be undeceived by a brief survey of the situation. Professor Arlo Bates, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in 1906 declared: "The weakest points in the education of the modern student are certainly those which are continually taken for granted."\*\* From the current year's report†† on the entrance examinations at our Military Academy at West Point, we learn that graduates from schools all over the country missed very simple questions in each of the basic studies. The Delaware College Bulletin on *The High-school Course in English*,\*\*\* issued last month, the joint production of Professor W. O. Sypherd, of Delaware College, and Principal G. S. Messersmith, of Newark, Delaware, has these wholesome words: "Criticism of errors in spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence and paragraph structure is what high-school pupils need first of all. Teach a pupil to write correctly and clearly, and if he has any intellectual ability at all, he will learn to write forcibly and with ease. If teachers of English in Delaware would only realize the importance of this part of their English work and would only be willing to devote their time and patience to the thorough correction of frequent short themes, half of the criticism that is now being made about the work of the schools in English would be heard no more, and no other schools would send out better prepared students than the

---

†Irving Babbitt, *Literature and the American College*, Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., Boston, 1908, p. 145.

\*\*Arlo Bates, *Talks on Teaching Literature*, Houghton, Mifflin, and Co., Boston, 1906, p. 217.

††See C. W. Larned, "The Inefficiency of the Public Schools," in *The North American Review* for September, 1908; and F. G. Bonser, "Colonel Larned's Indictment of the Public Schools," in the *Educational Review* for January, 1909.

\*\*\*Published at Newark, Delaware, in November, 1908. The quotation will be found on page 11.

schools of our State." Of the same purport is *A Report on the Examinations in English for Admission to Harvard College*, published by that University in 1907. Nor do such judgments come from teachers only. We have each, no doubt, heard the complaints of business men concerning the frequent lack of habits of accuracy in graduates of high schools and of colleges. Here is the judgment of the editor of *The World's Work*, Mr. Walter H. Page, who reports his observation, as editor and publisher, in *The Atlantic Monthly* for November, 1907: "The most common fault is lack of form, of orderliness, and of construction. A certain verbal smartness is very common, but the careful construction of books is rare." Personally, I hold that now far more than formerly one needs to insist on definite drill in fundamental subjects, both in school and in college, and for four reasons. First, the pseudo-democratic doctrine of the equivalence of studies, as fallacious as would be that of the equivalence of foods, though dying, is not dead. Secondly, even when this false doctrine is not openly avowed, there is still such a multiplicity of studies offered, especially in the colleges, that the student needs to be directed to the fundamental subjects and to be urged to follow them with diligence. Thirdly, the pernicious doctrine that nothing not immediately pleasurable is profitable for study, already alluded to, leads many students to expect and many teachers to offer chiefly soothing syrups. Fourthly, now as hitherto, the willingness cheerfully to do one's routine work to the level of one's ability is, in teacher and in student, essential to the attainment of ideal excellence in English as in every other field.

Having elsewhere,\* however, stated as simply as I could my own views as to the systematic teaching of English, I wish, as I

---

\*In the following: "English in Our Preparatory Schools," in *Proceedings of the Southern Educational Association* for 1891; "English Composition in the High School," in the *Texas School Journal* for January, 1897; "English in the High School," in *Bulletin No. 1 of the Committee on Affiliated Schools*, University of Texas, January, 1901, given under the same title, but in a revised form in the *High-School Bulletin*, University of Texas, 1908; "The Teaching of English Composition," in *Outline of County Institute Work in Texas*, 1905-1906, State Department of Education, Austin, 1905.

have indicated, to say a few words on the Incidental Teaching of English.

The great value of incidental teaching is clearly demonstrable in all walks of life. The solicitous father who preaches temperance to his son, but himself drinks to excess, or swears, realizes the importance of incidental teaching when his son becomes a sot or a foul-mouth. So does the solicitous mother who preaches seriousness and philanthropy to her daughter, but herself spends her whole time in the inanities of the ultra-society set, when that daughter discloses more brains in her heels than in her head. So does the politician or the trustee who, trying to convince himself that he is under one law as an individual and under another as an office-seeker or as a member of a business corporation, finds that he is losing the respect not only of the decent element of the community but also of himself. In a word, in its place, incidental teaching, because of its very insidiousness, is perhaps more powerful than routine drill.

And yet far less use is made of incidental teaching in English than one would suppose, or, rather, far less effective use is made of it.

Take the subject of English Grammar. The English Section, at its latest session, was given a clear and strong paper on *The Place of Technical Grammar in the High School*, by Dr. Robert A. Law; and it is not my purpose to go over ground so well covered already. In passing, I wish merely to express my hearty approval of the stand there taken, and to add that signs are abundant that soon technical grammar, so long neglected, will be restored to its rightful place of honor. For instance, the New York State Department of Education, perhaps the strongest in the country, requires that English Grammar be taught in each year of the high school. Again, Mr. Arlo Bates, poet and professor of English in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in his recent *Talks on Teaching Literature*, already referred to, declares: "What is evidently needed all along the line is the cultivation of the reasoning powers in the ability to deal with abstract thought. Personally, I believe that this could be best secured by the simplification of the work in the lower grades, and by the introduction of thorough courses in English grammar and the

old-fashioned mental arithmetic.’’\* President G. Stanley Hall, I may add, in his *Adolescence*,† likewise laments the general inability of students to reason, but is apparently unaware that his onslaught upon grammar, if heeded, would only make the inability more wide-spread and more acute. More far-sighted, in this respect, is Professor Babbitt, who, though he flings not a few epithets at a certain sort of philologists, declares that, bad as these philologists are, the college is in more danger from the dilettante than from the philologist, and adds: “Language should be thoroughly mastered, both linguistically and as a medium for the adequate and artistic expression of thought. To attempt to train in ideas students who have received no previous discipline, not even the discipline of common accuracy, is to expect them to fly before they have learned to walk.’’’\*\* While some of our Texas schools seem to me to expect their students to fly before they have learned to walk, I am glad to say that such schools are growing fewer year by year, and that a number of schools are giving sound and strong courses in English grammar.

To come directly to our question, how may English grammar be taught incidentally? I should say, in conversation, by tactfully taking account of inaccuracies and inelegancies of expression and by inculcating an ideal of reasonable correctness and of good taste. This has long been the practice in a few of our best schools and in a few of our best homes,—or, rather, in a very few of our best homes, for the majority of parents seem to have resigned their responsibilities in this as in so many other respects to the teacher.

In connection with the composition work, both in colleges and in high schools, one has numerous opportunities, nay, demands, for the incidental teaching of grammar. If seized upon, as they sometimes are and should be always, these occasions give the best possible opportunities for drilling the particular student on his own individual weaknesses, whether in the simpler matters of concord and of case-relations or in the more delicate ones of the order of words or of the uses of the tenses, the moods, and the verbals. Such application of the principles of grammar to one’s speaking

---

\*Bates, *l. c.*, p. 242.

†Vol. II, p. 462.

\*\*Babbitt, *l. c.*, p. 142.

and writing seems to me the truest sort of grammar-teaching; and, though incidental, if tactfully, insistently, and persistently kept up, it will, in my judgment, transform a poor speaker or writer, if not into a good, into a decent one. The trouble is that too often no comment, at least no well reasoned comment, is made by the teacher. In scores of compositions from would-be-affiliated schools I have found written opposite an awkward or an incorrect sentence this statement, "Sentence not good," without the slightest indication as to the specific shortcoming of the sentence in question. Is it any wonder that, in such cases, the student sees no connection between grammar and composition? or that he is skeptical as to the utility of studying grammar when his teacher himself makes no use of it despite the Macedonian call?

In literature work, too, the occasions for the incidental teaching of grammar do not have to be sought; to my vexation, they thrust themselves upon me in almost every class, from Freshman English to the most advanced course. Surely, in the high schools the demands must be far more numerous and far more urgent. As we know by observing the students from our best schools, the sort of teaching for which I am pleading, already happily exemplified in a number of schools, would greatly reduce the vexatious interruptions to which I have alluded, and would leave more time and energy for the study and the assimilation of the spirit of literature,—the goal at which we are all aiming.

But it is time to pass to the teaching of Composition. Here, too, there is far less of incidental teaching than is desirable. Too commonly instruction is restricted to the recitation in the handbook and to the writing and the correction, too often perfunctory, of the set essay. Now, the set essay, in which I am a hearty believer, constitutes the lesser part of the writing necessarily done by the average student, and, in some ways, it constitutes the less important part of his writing. If, then, care is taken by the student and oversight is given by the teacher only in this minor part of the student's writing, teacher and student are like the man who is pious on Sundays, but on week-days is oblivious of the decalogue. Unless he mend his ways, and unless the Great Judge be more merciful than we have any right to expect, that man is on the "primrose way to the everlasting bonfire"; nor can I see that it will be otherwise with the seventh-day composition-

writer. But, I am happy to say, the seventh-day teachers are becoming fewer, and the every-day teachers more numerous. This is evidenced by the growing habit of having exercises in oral composition; by the greater attention paid to letter-writing; and by the incipient custom of requiring good English in examination papers, whether these papers be on English or on other subjects. About two years ago the University of Texas passed a law requiring that in all entrance examinations in any subject account be taken of the candidate's English; and during the present year Yale University has adopted the immemorial custom of Oxford University, England, and has decreed that course examinations in all subjects, scientific as well as literary, shall be written in decent English. In brief, the incidental, every-day teaching of composition, in the sense above explained, is gaining ground slowly but surely. May the English Section hasten the time when every-day composition shall be as commonly practiced as every-day morality is now generally preached!

The opportunities for the incidental teaching of composition in connection with the formal teaching of grammar are known and practiced by all the best teachers of the latter subject, those who require synthetic exercises as well as analytic, that is, those who have their students to build sentences of their own as well as to analyze those of others. The number of such teachers is, I believe, constantly on the increase.

Nor are opportunities lacking for this incidental teaching of composition, especially of oral composition, in connection with the recitation work in literature or, for that matter, in any subject whatsoever. To give only one illustration, are there not scores of instances, in every subject, in which the reciter, though he may have the right idea in his head, cannot get it on his tongue because of the paucity or the vagueness of his stock of words? And are not these the golden opportunities for unobtrusively re-enforcing and for amplifying what the handbooks tell us concerning that cardinal matter of all composition, the choice of words? I do not suppose for an instant that any teacher worthy of the name ignores this matter altogether, but I doubt not many of us do unduly slight it. Professor Bates, for instance, declares that he has "never discovered how far beyond words of one syllable a lecturer to students may safely

go with any assurance that his language will be understood by all the members of his class; but this is one of the things which must be decided if teaching is to be effective.”\* He undoubtedly establishes his position by citing a dozen amusing interpretations given of these two lines from *Macbeth*, by students who had supposedly made a thorough study of the play:

“And with some sweet oblivious antidote  
Cleanse the stuff’d bosom of that perilous stuff.”

The answers prove either that the students had not looked up the word *oblivious*, or that, having looked it up, they had forgotten its meaning. And Mr. Bates,\*\* though an ardent advocate of the study of literature for the pleasure that it gives, insists that “above everything the teacher must be sure, before any attempt is made to do anything further, that the pupil has a clear understanding at least of the language of what he reads.” Personally, I should make the study of the vocabulary incidental rather than, as Professor Bates advises, an independent and antecedent matter. Surely, however, the advice of Professor Bates is wisdom itself compared with President Hall’s continual insistence, in his *Adolescence*, on the study of content to the almost total neglect of the key thereto, language.

The incidental teaching of Literature is more common than that of grammar or of composition, and admits, therefore, of briefer treatment. Most teachers give much time and thought to the question of supplementary reading, trying sedulously to adapt this reading to the needs not only of each class, but also of each individual. But their praiseworthy efforts are seriously hampered in many cases by the lack of books. Many boards of education seem to believe in bricks rather than in books, as many students cultivate brawn rather than brains. For example, one of the oldest colleges for women in the United States has magnificent classrooms and dormitories, but scarcely a thousand volumes in its library. I believe that no greater service can be done our schools and colleges by our English Section

---

\*Bates, *l. c.*, p. 64.

\*\**L. c.*, p. 62. See also pp. 67 and 125.

than to insist that every school should have at least a small but well-selected library. And it might be well for a representative committee to make up a list of books for the help of young and inexperienced teachers. In the absence of anything better, they might use the bibliographies given in the *High-School Bulletin* issued this year by the University of Texas.

Despite the fact that Charles Lamb\* was once chided, by a two-weeks married lady, for expressing his opinion concerning the "properest mode of breeding oysters" because, forsooth, he was a bachelor, and was, therefore, ignorant as compared with my lady, I cannot drop this topic of libraries without expressing my amazement at the indifference manifested by many well-to-do and otherwise intelligent parents as to the home-reading of their children. The incalculable advantage of careful oversight at this point was never better illustrated than in the case of John Ruskin. In childhood he was required to read and to memorize some portions of the Bible day by day immediately after breakfast; and of the effect of this daily habit he tells us in his beautiful autobiography, *Praeterita*:† "And truly, though I have picked up the elements of a little further knowledge in mathematics, meteorology, and the like, in after life, and owe not a little to the teaching of many people, this maternal installation of my mind in that property of chapters I count very confidently the most precious and, on the whole, the one *essential* part of all my education." At another place\*\* he distinctly tells us that, in his judgment, whatever gifts of style he may possess are to be attributed to his mother's oversight of his reading. And we all know that much of the highest eloquence of America's great orator, Mr. Bryan, is due to similar oversight, and is drawn from the same inexhaustible fountain. Because of neglect at this point, many a son and many a daughter of upright and God-fearing father and mother waste their time on the inanities of the Sunday supplement; nay, more, they read prurient problem novels, and follow her "whose lips drop as honeycomb and whose mouth is smoother than oil, but whose end is bitter as

---

\*See his "A Bachelor's Complaint of the Behavior of Married People," in his *Essays*.

†Second edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1888, Vol. I, p. 58.

\*\**Ibidem*, p. 3.

wormwood, sharp as a two-edged sword," for "her feet go down to death, her steps take hold on hell."\*

But the most important single factor in the incidental teaching of English, as of every other subject, is the teacher. No matter what text-books he may use or what methods he may follow, the competent teacher will instruct and edify, and more by his example than by his precept; the incompetent will instruct and not edify, again more by example than by precept. The most powerful way to help on the cause of English teaching, then, is habitually to demand of ourselves the highest preparation possible to us for the task to be assumed, the habitual exemplification in our teaching, whether incidental or formal, of the good habits and the high ideals that we profess to believe in. At times there yet crops out the belief that almost any one can teach English, provided, at least, one has some intuitive knowledge of the subject. Now, intuitive knowledge in any line is a precious thing, but, with all except geniuses—a class for whom, I dare not say to whom, I am not speaking—its range is very limited, and its staying power not remarkable. I believe, therefore, that definite training is absolutely necessary for effective teaching. And I am glad to say that training is being more and more demanded of themselves by the teachers of English. The time is forever past, I trust, when, as happened in the earlier days of the University of Texas, the Committees on Affiliation and on Entrance Examinations were excoriated because they insisted that students desiring to enter the University should have at least a homeopathic knowledge of the structure of the sentence and of the paragraph. Indeed, I know few things more heroic and more pathetic than the personal sacrifices that many of our poorly paid teachers yearly make in order the better to equip themselves for their arduous and honorable duties. Surely such casting of the bread upon the waters cannot return void!

So far I have spoken of the English teacher only. But much of the incidental teaching of English is done, or should be done, by teachers of other subjects. To me it seems as clearly the duty

---

\**Proverbs*, v, 3-5.

of non-English teachers to correct the palpable errors in English occurring in the papers handed in by their students as it is the duty of English teachers to correct palpable errors as to facts, whether of history, of science, or what not, in all English papers. It may be answered that both English and non-English teachers would often run across errors that they know not how to correct. In that case they should hasten to find out from book or from teacher. Nor would the labor of learning be great for the non-English teacher, for, as a brilliant friend of mine, not a teacher of English, remarked the other day: "The English question will be settled as soon as schools and colleges demand of the teacher of every subject the ability to write a decent paragraph." If superintendents and presidents would insist that non-English teachers take account, to the limit of their ability, of the palpable errors in composition occurring in all papers received by them, the battle would be more than half won. And it is a pleasure to say that I know some teachers who, without any such request, have for years given precisely this sort of magnanimous assistance to their English colleagues.

It may be that some of my hearers are saying, "Instead of entitling his talk 'The Incidental Teaching of English,' he should have called it 'The Everlasting Teaching of English.'" And in a sense they would be right. I am pleading for the continual seizing of each opportunity to instill in ourselves and in our students high ideals concerning thought and expression and for crystallizing these ideals as early as possible into life-long habits. In so doing I am following, I believe, the dictates of common sense and of the most recent and trustworthy psychology. Does not Professor James,\* of Harvard University, tell us that the Duke of Wellington was right in declaring that habit is, not second nature, but "ten natures"? Mr. James continues: "The great thing in all education is *to make our nervous system our ally instead of our enemy*† It is to fund and capitalize our acquisitions, and live upon the interest of the fund. *For this we must make automatic and habitual, as early as possible, as many*

---

\**Talks to Teachers on Psychology, and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals*, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1899, p. 65.

†Throughout the quotation the italics are the author's, not mine.

*useful actions as we can*, and as carefully guard against the growing into ways that are likely to be disadvantageous. The more of the details of our daily life we can hand over to the effortless custody of automatism, the more our higher powers of mind will be set free for their own proper work.”

My plea is, however, not simply that as teachers and as students we crystalize our highest ideals into habits, but also that we have as few lapses as possible in these habits when formed. To some this seems too exacting; but, if held up as an ideal to be striven for rather than a command to be followed, it is, again, but the dictate of common sense and of psychology; for, as Professor James\* rightly says, “Each lapse is like the letting fall of a ball of string which one is carefully winding up: a single slip undoes more than a great many turns will wind again. Continuity is the great means of making the nervous system act infallibly right.” For such continuity of training in English I pleaded long before the appearance of Professor James’s book, being driven thereto by my own bitter-sweet experience; indeed, I never read this particular work of his, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology*, until all of this paper was written excepting this concluding section. I need scarcely add that I am delighted to find my own experimental conclusion confirmed by so distinguished a psychologist.

To sum up my argument in the terms of Professor James’s simple but instructive figure: I advocate the tactful winding of the English ball, whether of grammar, of composition, or of literature, not only at the stated periods set therefor, but on all appropriate occasions that present themselves, especially in letter-writing, in note-taking, in recitations, and in examinations, not only in English, but in all subjects. And I oppose the witting unwinding of the ball at any time, unless it be in a pinch like that of Penelope.

---

\*L. c., p. 67.

## THE CLASSICS AND ENGLISH \*

BY ROBERT ADGER LAW, PH. D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH,  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

I have been asked to discuss briefly the subject of "The Classics and English." Put into question form I suppose the topic would run: "Of what practical service to a student of English is a knowledge of the classic languages and literature, particularly of the Latin language?" This question I shall endeavor to answer from the standpoint of a college teacher of English. Necessarily excluded from the topic are discussions of such matters as the disciplinary value of classical study, and the importance of Latin and Greek in comparison with modern languages. Only so far as they affect the student's knowledge of his mother tongue and of literature written in that tongue, are these questions to be taken into consideration.

The study of English in American colleges, a subject practically unknown fifty years ago, comprises nowadays three distinct branches—composition, grammar, and literature. Of recent years there has been a marked tendency in the leading universities and colleges to stress the first one of these branches rather than the others. It is so easy for a comparatively poor teacher or a comparatively weak student to expend all his enthusiasm in the interpretation of some beautiful English poem, meanwhile neglecting the formalities of correctness in speech or writing, that educational authorities almost everywhere now prescribe a rigid course in English composition for all freshmen, with elective courses in English literature or philology open to the higher college classes. As a rule these composition courses are not nearly so interesting to student or teacher as are the courses in literature. Nevertheless, despite occasional murmurs heard upon the outside, college instructors are as one in declaring that the end in these admittedly unpopular courses justifies the very unpleasant means in giving them.

To the college boy or girl who is laboring week after week

---

\*A paper read before the classical section of the Texas State Teachers' Association at Houston several years ago.

grinding out his full quota of themes, a thorough knowledge of the Latin language is of the greatest assistance. For, in the first place, to know any foreign tongue helps one mightily to understand one's own. So today the specialist who is fitting himself to teach English is not satisfied when he has made himself acquainted with Anglo-Saxon, Middle English, and Elizabethan grammar, and knows English literature from the time of *Beowulf* to the present day. He goes further; he is obliged to study Latin, German, Old and Modern French, and he frequently takes up Gothic, Greek, Norse, Italian, Spanish, or perhaps Celtic. That is to say, the best institutions of America and Europe are insisting upon the comparative study of grammar and literature in order to understand our own speech. And while no one would argue that the average American schoolboy should be taught a half-dozen languages, yet an acquaintance with at least one foreign tongue is necessary to those who would completely understand English.

For several reasons Latin can be of more assistance to them than can any other language. One of these is the very nature of its grammar. The American schoolboy at first, as we all know, is amazed at the number of inflections found in Latin. The variety of conjugations, declensions, moods, voices, tenses, numbers, and cases bewilders him completely. When he finally gets these matters straightened out in his mind, he learns that the inflections are often of great assistance in translation—that by the ending of the noun he can tell whether it is the subject or the object in a sentence, by the ending of the adjective he can tell what word it modifies, and by the ending of the verb, whether its subject is first, second, or third person, singular or plural. He may even wish for more inflections than the Latin has; for instance, he may desire that the neuter accusative be different in form from the nominative.

Now the chief reason for his temporary, if not permanent bewilderment is the contrasted nature of his own speech. The English language has practically no inflections, though in Anglo-Saxon times the variety of its grammatical forms was almost as great as that of Latin. The meaning of a sentence in modern English depends almost entirely on its word order. This the schoolboy knows, and hence in beginning to compose Latin sen-

tences he is careful to make the word order the same as that of the English sentence he is translating. If he resembles most other boys and girls, he has never paid particular attention to the few inflected forms that still exist in English. He is likely to write as a college sophomore wrote the other day: "There *is* more and better descriptions of nature in the *Knight's Tale*"; or as another one wrote: "Some parts of the sea *is* shown as cold with ice floating around." It is obvious that in each of these sentences the grammatical blunder resulted from the unusual position of the subject with reference to its verb. Now a Roman boy or girl, who would be trained to watch the endings rather than the word order in his talking and writing, would be unlikely to make this particular error nearly so often as we hear it in careless American speech. The American has so little occasion to think of inflections that he grows absolutely reckless in his case- and tense-forms. Not only does he use participles unattached to any noun or pronoun, but he may even use them as finite verbs and tell us: "The rain *done* the crops considerable good." One who has been systematically trained in Latin grammar ought to be much more careful. Probably no foreign language is superior to Latin in this respect.

But if the schoolboy finds the Latin particularly difficult on account of its inflections, he probably finds the vocabulary less difficult to learn than that of any other foreign tongue would be. Before beginning the study of Latin as a language, he has probably picked up the meaning of several Latin phrases in current usage as mottoes or proverbs, or else as law terms. Besides this such English words as *rose, tube, long, primary, education, question, instructor* he has known for a long time, and it is no particular trouble to him to learn their Latin equivalents. In other words, a large proportion of the English words that he is accustomed to use, and a much larger proportion of those he will use as he grows older, come directly from the Latin, or indirectly through the Romance languages. For this there are certain historical reasons which, though often recounted, it may not be improper to relate here.

Even before the fifth century, when the Angles, the Saxons, and the Jutes came to Britain, these tribes had already come into contact with peoples using the Latin language, and had adopted

a number of Latin derivatives into their own speech. Arriving in Britain, they found there many relics of Roman rule and Roman custom, and perhaps even a popular Latin dialect spoken among the Celtic inhabitants of the island. Thus in the Anglo-Saxon language with slight formal changes are such Latinate words as *street, pine, rose, silk, port, and lake*. Two centuries later, when the Saxons were converted to Christianity, the influence of the church brought a number of new words like *abbot, clerk, priest, school*, into the common speech. But it must not be forgotten that the church services were in Latin, the Bible for many centuries was known only in Latin, and Anglo-Saxon scholars were writing through successive centuries Latin books for the instruction of the learned class. More than a hundred Latinate words have been counted by scholars in the meager Anglo-Saxon documents that have come down to us.

With the Norman Conquest in 1066 the character of the language was violently and completely changed. Indeed, it seemed probable for a long time that the language of the English people was to be no longer Germanic but Romance in its composition. For centuries after the Conquest practically all books written in England were either in Latin or in French. Up to the middle of the fourteenth century French was used in the schools, in the courts, and at the opening of the English parliament. Not until a hundred years later can English be said to have gained the supremacy. Even as late as the beginning of the seventeenth century, after Shakespeare had completed his work, that very wise man, Francis Bacon, translated some of his English works into Latin that they might be preserved to posterity. And ever since that time through the careful study of Latin grammar in the schools, its use in the medical and legal professions, and the influence of classical and Romance literature on the masters of English prose and poetry, this so-called dead language has exercised constantly a vigorous and powerful effect on the shaping of our own speech. No one acquainted with the history of the English language can honestly believe that Latin will some day be regarded in much the same light as is Sanskrit today. The boy who has been studying Latin only a few months knows better on this score than some professional educators.

But if this boy finds that his knowledge of English words aids him in the translation of Latin, certainly his knowledge of Latin should assist him in reading and writing English. After difficulties of grammar are overcome, the teacher of English composition probably finds errors of diction the most troublesome stylistic faults to his students. If the pupil is not awkward or clumsy in his style, his expression is likely to be wholly vague. In part this is doubtless due to loose thinking, but in large measure it is due to the student's lack of an adequate vocabulary to serve as his medium of expression.

Perhaps I may be pardoned for illustrating from personal experience in teaching English. An intelligent college senior in an essay on some literary subject wrote of "active descriptions." When told that the expression was vague, he defended himself, stating that he had in mind not a vague, but a very definite conception. It seems that what he intended to say was, descriptions of objects in motion as opposed to objects at rest. His command of English was insufficient to express that simple idea. Precisely the same difficulty is apparently responsible for the following somewhat interesting sentences gleaned from examination papers:

"*Beowulf* though imbued with a few Christian touches is nevertheless a pagan poem."

"They had a strong *sensation* to seek foreign lands and waters."

"He was one who cared much about his dress and spent much of his time *with reference* to it."

"In the end, however, they came to an agreement and are somewhat *reconciliated*."

"He was fond of drinking and eating *other gluttonous* foods."

These sentences are not quoted to make fun of the pupils, or to charge that they have not been properly trained in English in the high schools. All of them have had at least a year's college training, and I fear that college students are not alone in such abuse of their mother tongue. The point is simply that each one is in need of a larger vocabulary. Translation from a foreign language will inevitably add a large number of English synonyms to one's speech. Latin is particularly valuable because the Latinate words in English comprise largely the

most definite, exact terms that we have, and those that we most frequently misuse.

Aside from that, the reading of such Latin prose works as those of Cæsar, Cicero, and Sallust certainly ought to give one a stronger grasp of the sentence than some writers possess. To the American chance reader of English newspapers or magazines their style of writing furnishes a marked and delightful contrast to that found even in the better class of American publications. One wonders how much of this is due to the rigid training even schoolboys in England receive in Latin and Greek. This sentence taken from another examination paper is no worse than what one sometimes finds printed in this country: "How cunningly Chaucer criticizes the clergy of his day by his description of the Parson in the *Prologue*, and how nicely he criticizes the other classes of people described in the respective persons of the different characters of the *Prologue*, always carrying the satirical meaning to be conveyed, but never with undue harshness or unfair judgment, but always with a humorous touch that makes us believe Chaucer is dealing justly with all men." The fault with this sophomore's sentence lies not primarily in the diction, though one might desire improvement in that respect, but in the looseness of the whole sentence structure. To use a colloquial expression, it lacks backbone.

Surely the same fault, though not to the same extent, is to be found in another sentence, which appears in a work on *The Teaching of English* by a well known New York school man: "It is this linguistic form of patriotism by which we rejoice that we

‘speak the tongue  
That Shakespeare spake; the faiths and morals hold  
Which Milton held’—

that is to be the mainspring of scholarly conscience in our literary culture,—a culture that need not be less fine, and may be much more vital, because it is nourished upon Shakespeare and Milton; upon the Bible and the *Pilgrim's Progress*; upon Addison and Irving, Burke and Webster, Scott and Hawthorne, Tennyson and Longfellow, Browning and Emerson, Whitman and Thoreau much more than upon the masters of antiquity,

although these masters are gaining a wider currency by means of masterly translations, of which the latest example is Norton's noble version of Dante." Inevitably, I believe, in reading this sentence one who is careful about his own English will feel that the last two clauses have no organic connection with the sentence and do not belong there. One longs for the short and terse phrasing of Bacon. "Travel, in the younger sort, is a part of education; in the elder, a part of experience. He that traveth into a country before he hath some entrance into the language, goeth to school, and not to travel." It is no accident that the man who composed these last two sentences was able to write Latin with the same facility as he wrote English.

Indeed, I believe it could be successfully maintained that all the great masters of English prose, those who serve as models for the present generation, were themselves good Latinists, and were influenced to a greater or less degree by their knowledge of Latin prose in the formation of their own English style. A work quoted a few minutes ago contains a sentence urging that boys and girls draw inspiration not from "Homer and Demosthenes, Virgil and Cicero," but from "Chaucer and Spenser, Burton and Hooker, Marlowe and Jonson, Browne and Bacon." Now it so happens that with the possible exception of Marlowe and Spenser, both of whom show first-hand acquaintance with the classics, every name on this list is that of a man who drew more inspiration from Latin writings than he did from those in his own tongue. Chaucer was seemingly Gallic in temperament, and owed probably more to Italian and French than he did to Latin, but no one can overlook in him the influence of the Latin works of Boethius, Ovid, Virgil, Statius, and Petrarch; and he is constantly quoting Cicero, Seneca, and certain medieval Latin writers throughout his poetry. It would be hard to find five more pronounced classicists among English writers than the others on the list: Burton and Hooker, Ben Jonson, Sir Thomas Browne, and Francis Bacon. Among nineteenth century essayists we commonly place before our students the writings of Macaulay, Newman, and Matthew Arnold, each one of whom is thoroughly steeped in Latin or Greek literature. Carlyle, who shows more strongly the influence of German, is sometimes put

in their hands for the tonic effect, but young students are carefully warned against affecting the "Carlylese" style.

There is no need for me to discuss the means by which a knowledge of Virgil and Homer or Plato helps one to an understanding of English literature. Enough has already been said to show how unremitting has been the influence of Latin writers on English prose and poetry from the Anglo-Saxon period to the present. Although Greek was practically unknown in England up to the sixteenth century, and has not since that time affected English literature to the same extent as Latin, we should not forget that every English schoolboy must become thoroughly acquainted with Greek—both the language and the literature—before entering one of the great universities. The result is that the makers of English literature have probably had a far wider and more thorough knowledge of Greek than is possessed by most of the teachers in American colleges. The student of English literature, then, who is well read in either Latin or Greek authors, will, I believe, possess an advantage by no means fanciful over one who is not. At the same time ignorance of this subject will not show itself so readily perhaps as will ignorance of Latin grammar before the teacher of composition.

Classical teachers must sometimes be discouraged over the present-day tendency in many quarters to minimize the value of the work that they are doing. It must often seem to them that they are engaged in a losing fight. English teachers can sympathize with them. Just as Latin has been objected to as hard, dry, and uninteresting, so English grammar has had to contend against the same objections, and is being actually displaced in some schools to make way for more extensive study of literature. But the best English teachers do not believe that the study of either Latin grammar or English grammar should be done away with. Your cause is ours.

## THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH COMPOSITION IN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE\*

BY KILLIS CAMPBELL, PH. D., ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH,  
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

In *Harper's Monthly* for November, 1911, there appeared a highly interesting essay by the lamented Professor Thomas R. Lounsbury, of Yale, directed against the teaching of composition in our colleges. In the course of this essay Professor Lounsbury makes a number of observations that are in every way true and wholesome; for example, that the best discipline of the mind is hard study, that "constant reading of the masters is the best aid to the cultivation of the taste," that "no progress worth speaking of is ever made in any study where the learner himself is not interested." But the main theses of his paper I take to be, first, that most of the teaching of composition in our colleges has been incompetently done, and, second, that the chief aim kept in view by our college teachers of composition is the developing of literary ability, the training up of authors.

I am ready enough, ladies and gentlemen, to believe that much of the teaching of composition in our colleges has been ill done; but I cannot believe that any large proportion of our college teachers of composition keep mainly in view, as the object of their instruction, the training up of authors. The developing of "budding genius" is a highly legitimate and worthy aim, and an aim that no teacher of composition can afford to ignore, or is likely to ignore; but, save in a few advanced college classes made up of picked students, the development of literary skill can hardly be thought of as a main aim of our instruction. The prime aim of instruction in composition, whether in school or college, I conceive to be simply that of fitting our pupils for the ordinary activities of life by cultivating in them habits of clear and correct and effective thinking and speaking and writing. It is, first, the cultivating of orderly habits of thinking, for clear thinking must precede clear and effective writing and speaking; it is, secondly, the fostering of habits of neatness and accuracy,

---

\*An address delivered before the English section of the Texas State Teachers' Association at Corpus Christi on November 26, 1915.

of directness and forcefulness, in communicating thought. Its aim is not primarily to develop literary skill, to enable the boy or the girl to invent a good story or to compose a stirring lyric, but to enable the student to write a good letter, to present simply and logically and forcibly the points of an argument, to record naturally and cogently his convictions as to the meaning or the worth of some piece of literature. It is these solidier and soberer acquirements that the rank and file of our students, whether in the grades, in the high school, or in the college, are most in need of, and it is these things that must be kept most in view in our work in composition.\* I may add that, so far as I have read what has been written about the teaching of composition, I have found nothing that leads me to believe that the view I am here proposing involves anything new or radical.†

Assuming, then, that the training of the logical faculties and the developing of the plainer and soberer virtues in writing and speaking are the chief aims of instruction in composition, how, I next ask, may these ends best be attained?

To this question I answer, first of all, that in any course in composition, main emphasis must be placed on practice, on actual practice in writing and speaking, rather than on theories as to how to write or to speak. A textbook is valuable as a guide; indeed, it is hardly possible to do without a textbook at certain stages in the teaching of composition: but it is valuable primarily as a means, not as an end in itself. The conning of rules and the discussion of principles will avail little unless rules and principles are exemplified in practice. The plight of the student who would learn how to write without practice is much the same as

---

\*If I am correct in this position, the complaint that is sometimes made against the colleges, that they demand a different preparation in English for the boy that is to enter their halls from that which is best for the boy who expects to enter business or to return to the farm immediately upon leaving the high school, is manifestly unwarranted.

†The fullest and the most helpful discussion of the teaching of composition that I am acquainted with is that of Professors Carpenter, Baker, and Scott in their volume, *The Teaching of English in the Elementary and the Secondary School* (Longmans, Green, and Co., New York, 1903). In an appendix to this volume (pp. 350-356) will be found a valuable list of books and magazine articles that have been written on the subject.

that of an artist who would acquire skill at painting without use of palette and brush. I believe, then, in much writing, both in the classroom and out of it. If possible, I would have the student write something every day; and, besides the shorter papers, I would have him write from time to time longer papers, calling for more concentrated effort and for organization of thought on a larger scale. The work done outside the classroom will ordinarily count for most—at least, this will be the case in the later years of the high school and in college; but writing done in the classroom will be invaluable in developing naturalness and facility in expression and in stimulating interest and confidence.

In the second place, the work of the course should be kept in close touch with life, and with life as the student knows it. The boy who is asked to write about his pet dog, or about the last game of ball he saw, or about the most striking character or the most stirring incident in some book he has recently read, is not likely to find the task uninviting. But assign him a subject that he knows little about or that he cares little for, and his time and his teacher's are largely wasted. Occasionally the student may be sent to the library, may be encouraged to read up for a paper; but it is a safe rule to keep him at what he already knows something about or is interested in.

The work in composition should, in the third place, be kept in close touch with literature. Principles should be constantly illustrated and enforced by appeal to the example of successful writers—and successful speakers. Such illustrative material need not invariably be drawn from the work of standard authors; incidental use may be made from time to time of well-written articles appearing in contemporary newspapers and magazines, or, again, of some able sermon or address that the class may have chanced to hear; but the bulk of such material—and especially of material that is to be studied intensively—should be drawn, I believe, from writers of established reputation.\* Naturally a student will have more respect for the principles that he is called on to observe if he can be brought to see

---

\*For an able statement of the case for and against the use of current periodicals as the staple of the materials used for purposes of analysis, see an article by Professor Homer E. Woodbridge in *The Nation* of September 9, 1915 (Vol. CI, p. 327).

that the same principles have guided Macaulay and Kipling and Ambassador Bryce. The supply of well selected and well edited texts for rhetorical study and analysis is abundant. But I would also have the student read widely in good literature without any conscious effort to relate it to his own writing. I cannot subscribe to the doctrine that one may learn to write merely by reading: there is, I believe, no learning to write—or to speak—without practice; but after practice in writing, there is nothing that will contribute so much to proficiency in self-expression as wide and thoughtful reading.

Need I add that it is highly important also that the student's written work shall be carefully examined and criticised by his instructor? In the lower grades, I am quite willing to grant, there will be less occasion for close inspection and comment; but the need steadily increases with the high school and college years. There should be marginal notations calling attention to particular errors; there ought also to be some general comment either at the beginning or at the end of each paper, in which the chief merits and imperfections are pointed out and suggestions are made for improvement.\*

That such criticism should be intelligent and discriminating ought to go without saying. The teacher of composition should know his grammar; he should also have a fair acquaintance with English literature; he should be fond of reading, and he ought likewise to be fond of writing; he should be familiar with the usage of words and with their meaning. He should know that it is possible to begin a short essay without a set introduction, and to end a short paper without a formal billing and ticketing of the points that have been made; that it is not a capital offense to end a sentence with a preposition; that slang is not always to be condemned out of hand; that repetition sometimes contributes to force; that certain idioms that are objectionable in literary style may yet be permissible in colloquial speech; that *had rather* is better than *would rather*; that *somebody's else* is an abomination; that the *t* in *often* is silent; that it is not improper to pro-

---

\*Ideally the teacher in high school and college will read all the written work submitted to him. But if he finds it impossible to do this without injuring his efficiency in the classroom, he should not on that account reduce the amount of written work assigned. Mere practice in writing is of itself immensely valuable in giving one facility in the use of the pen.

nounce *at all* as though it were spelled *a-tall*, or *literature* as though its last syllable began with *ch*. At the same time, he must not make the mistake of supposing that Macaulay's use or Kipling's use of some questionable construction affords sufficient warrant for his using it.

The teacher, it stands to reason, should also be tactful and sympathetic with his criticism. He should not overwhelm his pupils with *don'ts*. He should not be over-minute with his comments, nor even give the impression of being over-minute. He should let slip no opportunity to encourage a fondness for writing, and to stimulate originality and individuality. While making corrections—or, rather, while suggesting corrections, for the student should himself be required to enter all corrections\*—he should be careful also to point out the good traits in the student's writing, and to suggest how what is good may be made better. Where possible, he should have some word of praise for every piece of work that is honestly and faithfully done, if it be only to note that the handwriting is legible or that the manuscript is neat.

But the teacher must not delude himself, or his pupils, into thinking that correctness—or what is sometimes called "good form"—is of little worth. It is just such things as spelling and punctuation and grammar and accuracy of statement that he will find most tangible, and hence that are most teachable. At times he may feel that in dwelling on errors in spelling and grammar and the like he runs the risk of dulling the student's enthusiasm; but ordinarily there is no real clash between the two. And for many students the teacher's problem will be largely that of rooting out evil habits. For the boy or girl who says *you was* and *I seen*, who sets off dependent clauses as though they were sentences, who knows not the meaning of indentation—and there are hundreds of such students graduated from the Texas high schools every year—the problem is mainly that of saving the student from illiteracy. Dulness is bad enough; but illiteracy, it will be agreed, is even worse.

Much may be done towards counteracting or softening the effects of negative criticism by personal conferences with the

---

\*Either on his papers or (as is the custom in the classes of some of my colleagues at the University of Texas) in notebooks.

student. These serve to break down the barrier which the student imagines to exist between the teacher and himself. They also furnish the teacher an opportunity to make such adjustments as may seem wise to the peculiar needs or interests of individual pupils,—to encourage, for instance, the boy or girl who has literary promise and ambition. Such conferences involve, I know, a heavy drain on the instructor's energy, and they may degenerate into a mere parroting on the part of the instructor of the criticisms already recorded by him; but these difficulties may be offset in large measure by having it understood that the student is himself to conduct the conference and by demanding that the student shall enter all corrections before he presents himself for conference.

I have said little so far about oral English. This is not because I do not believe in oral English, but because I believe it to be less difficult and—in the later stages of instruction in composition\*—less helpful than written work. The teacher, moreover, is less likely to neglect oral work—both because it is easier and because skill in it is popularly held in higher esteem than is skill in writing; and in Texas, I believe, we have neglected the written work more than we have the oral work. But that the oral work has been neglected also, I have no doubt. Certainly it is important that we teach our pupils to pronounce correctly, to enunciate distinctly, to read with expression, and it is of the highest practical importance that they shall know how to think and to express themselves clearly and effectively on their feet. Accordingly, I am for more of oral work than I suspect is being done in some of our schools—for more of reading aloud, for much informal discussion in the classroom, for frequent oral reports on specially assigned topics, for constant attention on the part of the teacher to the student's habits of speech.

I have said little also about making the work in composition attractive. I hope I shall not be suspected of having gone completely over into the camp of the Philistines if I now say that I

---

\*In the primary grades, naturally, much more importance attaches to oral work than in high school and college. In the few primary schools known to me in Texas, nothing has pleased me more than the attention paid to reading aloud and to the memorizing and reciting of brief poetical masterpieces.

believe it to be vitally important that instruction in composition shall be made attractive. I do not say that it should be made easy; I do not believe that it can be made easy: the subject is essentially a difficult one for most students, one that calls for solid effort on the part of those who are to succeed in it. But by reason of its very difficulty it becomes all the more important that it shall be made attractive. Nothing will contribute more towards making the subject inviting than keeping the work of the course in touch with good literature. Class discussions and the reading aloud of papers will also contribute largely to this end. But much depends on the personality and tactfulness of the instructor.

The views that I have expressed are, I believe, in accord with those held by the majority of English teachers in our colleges. It will be asked, then, why we have not attained more satisfactory results—why, if such methods are good, the graduates from our colleges have not given a better account of themselves; for it will be admitted that the English of some of our graduates is bad, very bad. To this my reply is, that there have been both incompetent teaching and not a little unsympathetic and tactless teaching; that the practice of the teacher of composition has not always accorded with his faith; that many—may I not say *most*?—teachers of composition have been overworked, and hence have devoted but little time to the criticism of their pupils' written exercises; that there is too little cooperation on the part of teachers in other subjects with the teacher of English; and, finally,—and this is the main point that I should urge in explanation of the situation—that many of our pupils, even in our colleges, come from homes where bad English is constantly spoken and where little reading is done. It is too much to expect that the English instructor shall in one hour a day succeed in counteracting the effects of six or eight hours' association with those who are habitually careless of their speech.

And now a word as to conditions in Texas. I cannot speak with full confidence and authority of conditions in Texas; but from my reading of freshman essays and of the English admission examination papers at the University of Texas through some fifteen years, I have come to hold certain beliefs as to conditions in this State that amount almost to certainty. I believe, in the

first place, that our teachers are overdoing the textbook, that they give too much time to drilling their students in matters of rhetorical theory. And I believe, in the second place, that they are demanding too little of written work from their pupils. On inquiring of my weaker pupils as to their training before entering the University, I have been told again and again that no written work had been required of them in their high schools save a graduating essay. Even where there is written work, too little effort is made, in many of our schools, to connect it with the student's own life and interests. And half of my people affect a learned or a homiletic style in the first paper that they submit to me. Few of them realize the nearness of good prose to natural conversation. Most of them shy at written work during the first few weeks. Others come up to the University possessed with the notion—caught, I fear, in some instances from their teachers—that cleverness and the high-sounding phrase are the things of chief moment in writing, and that correctness is of little worth. Everywhere there is too little cooperation between the teacher of other subjects and the teacher of English.

It gives me pleasure, however, to add that conditions in Texas, bad though they are, have been gradually improving. Statistics that we have gathered show that with the graduates of some of our larger high schools the percentage of failures in our freshman English at the University of Texas has been less than twenty per cent.; and I know of one of the larger high schools that managed to make a clean record of passes throughout a period of five years. It is due to the teachers of the State, furthermore, to say that the neglect of the written work—what I conceive to be the most serious defect in the teaching of composition in the Texas schools at present—is to be attributed not so much to our teachers, most of whom are supremely conscientious in the performance of their duties, as to our school boards, who have failed to provide an adequate teaching force, and to an unenlightened public sentiment that encourages them to pursue a close-fisted policy in the administration of school affairs.

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE TEXAS ASSOCIATION  
OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AT CORPUS CHRISTI  
ON NOVEMBER 26, 1915

BY GATES THOMAS, M. A., PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH, SOUTHWEST TEXAS  
STATE NORMAL SCHOOL

The commodious auditorium of the Corpus Christi High School was pretty snugly filled when Chairman Campbell called the meeting to order. Following is the program:

1. The Teaching of English Composition in High School and College.....Killis Campbell, University of Texas.
2. Business Session.
3. Poetry in the High School.....O. D. Wannamaker, Southern Methodist University, Dallas. (In the absence of the author, this paper was read by the Secretary.)
4. The Teaching of English in the Grades.....  
.....Miss Mary Johnson, Wooldridge School, Austin.
5. Suggestions for an English School Library.....  
.....Mrs. Kate S. Schenck, School No. 12, San Antonio.

If there is anything in numbers, in interest, and in the presentation of a program that provoked more spirited but friendly discussion than there was really time for, the meeting was very successful indeed. In addition, the Association, in its business session, adopted three resolutions all of which would seem to be constructive in their effects. First, it endorsed the "extension and legislative work of the Texas Library Association," pledging its cooperation with the latter and favoring the organization of a "library section, to be accorded a place on the program of the general association at its annual meeting."

In the second place, the Association resolved that the report of the Committee on Certification of High School Teachers of English (adopted at the San Antonio meeting in 1914), should be presented to Superintendent Doughty by the Secretary in person, with a view to ascertaining if the provisions of that report may be incorporated, substantially, in the school laws of the State. As the provisions mentioned are not familiar to all of the teachers of English of the State, they are given below:

1. The minimum amount of preparation for any teacher of English in the high school should be not less than two full courses of College English.

2. It is the sense of the English Section of the Texas State Teachers' Association that such a requirement should at an early date be enacted into the school laws of the State.

3. Such a law, if enacted, should not affect the status of those who have taught English for as long a time as ten years, nor should it become operative under three years from the date of its enactment.

In the third place, the Association appointed the following committee to investigate the teaching of English in the public and private schools of Texas, with a view to determining the character and amount of work being done in our schools, and authorized this committee to present their findings at the next annual meeting of the English Section, and to make recommendations at the same time, on the basis of this, looking to the improvement of English teaching in the state of Texas:

Dr. R. A. Law, Chairman, University of Texas.

Dr. Constance Pessels, San Antonio High School.

Miss Nina Hill, Austin High School.

Miss Emma C. King, Baylor Female College, Belton.

Mrs. Mamie Doak, Taylor High School.

Mr. Herbert Rather, Bonham High School.

Prof. Gates Thomas, State Normal, San Marcos.

It was the general opinion of the meeting that this survey is the most ambitious and most constructive piece of work yet undertaken by the English Section. The committee will have a meeting in due time, tentative plans will be projected, and the work started. The cooperation of all those interested in English teaching and in the betterment of speech training in the schools is earnestly desired.

The Association then elected the following officers for 1915-16:

President, Mr. Herbert Rather, Bonham High School.

Vice-President, Dr. Killis Campbell, University of Texas.

Secretary-Treasurer, Prof. Gates Thomas, State Normal, San Marcos.







