

Educational (1902) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 456

DATED 6.8.02.

INDEXED.



[Despatch Abstract.]

Old Govt. Telugu Readers

*Passing No orders on the Subject of the inclusion of
in the list of approved text Books.*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Stock Form No. 127
2,000-1-5-02.

Educational (1902) Department.

CURRENT No. 1116

From

[Name] The Honble Mr. G. H. Stewart, Secy.

[Designation] Director of Public Instruction,

[Station] Madras

DESPATCHED

28 JUL 1902

Dis No. 3938

Received 30 JUL 1902 190

Dated 28th July 1902.

Enclosures one Registered 190

SUBJECT.

Sub. copy of a letter from the Telugu Translator to Govt. and recommending that the old Govt. Reader which were removed from the list of approved text-books need not be reintroduced.

BACK PAPERS.

7075-13-2-02

FURTHER PAPERS.

EP 30/7

To

The Secretary to Government,
Educational Department.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter Ref. on C.No 9011,
dated 4th February last, I have the honour to submit herewith
copy of letter No 97, dated 1st July from the Telugu Translator
to Government and in view of the opinion expressed by him I do
not consider that the old Government Telugu Readers which were
removed from the list of approved text books need be reintroduc-
ed.

2. I propose however to ask Messrs. Macmillan & Co. to consider
the question of revising ^{their} ~~these~~ readers in the light of the
criticisms that have been passed upon them.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

J.R. Chow

For Director of Public Instruction.

No 97.

1st July 1902.

To

The Director of Public Instruction,

Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No 9011 of 1901, dated 4th
February 1902, requiring an expression of my opinion on the
merits of the Government Telugu Readers and of those published
by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., I have the honour to remark that the
wholesale condemnation of the latter set of readers by the
Godavari Teachers' Association referred to in the said letter, is
to say the least of it, quite unwarranted. For the style of
these readers is as good and simple as of the other set of
readers. But here and there it is somewhat stilted and in
this respect, the Madras series is equally defective. In fact
no graduated scale of style is observable in the several
readers of either set.

Macmillan's Readers are strictly grammatical, even to the
point of observing the much abused semi-circle (c) uniformly
in the earlier as well as in the higher readers. Whereas
the first three readers in the other set have scrupulously
omitted the semi-circle, while it is introduced anew in the next
three readers much to the bewildered surprise of the young
pupils.

As for the subject matter, the Madras series, as a rule,
more scientific than the other series. But some of the
subjects in the earlier readers (Madras series) are too much
for the young pupils. They can find a place, if necessary,
in the higher readers. The subjects treated of in the
Macmillan series are more practical and some of them are no
doubt very familiar ones. (But they are not so debased as to
be styled "repulsive". Although it is said "that the lessons
contain nothing new that the Hindu child has not ordinarily
seen" it is one thing to see and another thing to observe.
The faculty of observation is better trained by drawing its
attention to familiar things at first). They (the subjects
in the Macmillan series) refer more to natural history than to
morality or science. In this series there is no infant
reader, whereas in the other set that particular reader is very

good, all things considered.

As for violations of idiom, both the series must be pronounced guilty. But they are not very serious violations. So it is idle to think of excluding one set in preference to the other. Both are good and the managers may be allowed the option of selecting either. I have therefore to fully sympathise with the said "Association" in their sorrow that the Madras series was "entirely removed from the list of approved books".

I have &c &c

(Signed) S. Rungiah Chetti,

Telugu Translator to Government.

/True Copy/

J. R. Subb

Personal Assistant to the D.P.I.

[E.]
5

509-5-7-02.

EDUCATIONAL DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 1116.

SUBJECT.

The inclusion of the old Goul.
Telugu readers in the list of
approved text books.

See G.O. no. 75 Est. 5/13th
Febry: 1902. The Godavari district
teachers' association may perhaps
be now informed that the Director
of Public Instruction does not consider
that the old Goul. Telugu readers
which were removed from the list of
approved text books need be reintroduced.

Would it not be better to record the paper and see
if the Assn. comes up again? An answer may then be
given.

Re given.

1/8/2
P.H.
2/8/2

We had better not
pass orders, I think.

No orders.

M.P.
4.8.02

5
Hus
4.8.02

The draft placed below may be passed.
P.H. 5/8/2

1,000-25-10-01.

READ ALSO :—

” ” ” ” ” ” ” ” 190

" " , " , " 190

ORDER No. 456, dated 6-8-1902.

No orders.

578/2

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____ } 190
When signed _____

READ AGAIN G.O., No. _____ DATED _____
190 .

CURRENT No. _____

REFERENCES TO C. No. _____

OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

OF GOVERNMENT.

SENT WITH DITTO.

FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
ORIGINAL.

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.