

PA 2065

.G7 B65

Copy 1

From the Author.

PA 2065
.G7 B65
Copy 1

A LETTER

TO THE

REV. DR. MOBERLY,

HEAD MASTER OF WINCHESTER :

BEING A REPLY TO A PAMPHLET BY
E. E. BOWEN, ESQ.

ENTITLED

“THE NEW NATIONAL GRAMMAR.”

BY

BENJAMIN HALL KENNEDY, D.D.,

HEAD MASTER OF SHREWSBURY SCHOOL.

Οὐχὶ διδάξεις τοῦτον Κρόνος ὦν.—
Εἴπερ γ' αὐτὸν χρὴ σωθῆναι
καὶ μὴ λαλίαν μόνον ἀσκῆσαι.

Aristoph. Nub. 929.

(PRINTED FOR PRIVATE CIRCULATION.)

1866.

PA 2065
G7 B65

LONDON :

PRINTED BY C. F. HODGSON & SON,
60UGH SQUARE, FLEET STREET, E.C.

205449
'13

A LETTER,

&c. &c.

MY DEAR DR. MOBERLY,—

You are aware that Mr. E. E. Bowen, one of the Masters of Harrow, has privately circulated a pamphlet attacking what he calls “The New National Grammar,” meaning thereby “The Public School Latin Primer,” the reprint of which is now all but complete.

As my name is prominently brought forward by Mr. Bowen (in spite of my remonstrance against this course), I seem to have no choice but to notice his pamphlet; and this is the more needful, as it contains errors of fact, which ought to be corrected. I regret to say, that I regard the circulation of this paper at the present moment as an act which transgresses the ordinary laws of fairness and courtesy.

In the first place, if it was fit to be done at all, it should have been done many months ago. To establish this, I must recall the circumstances of the two past years relating to this matter. More than *two* years ago (not, as Mr. Bowen says, *one* year) the nine Head Masters of the Public Schools included in Her Majesty’s Commission met to consider various matters of common interest; among others, the adoption of Common Grammars, as sug-

gested by the Commissioners. A feeling was expressed favourable to this measure; but no actual motion was then brought forward. Still I believe it was pretty well understood that at the next meeting a proposal would be made by one of the body to take my Grammar as the basis of a new Latin Grammar. I must here say, in passing, that I expressed a wish from the first to absent myself from this discussion; but my presence was thought necessary for the purpose of explanation. Of course I gave no vote. I took no part (explanation excepted) in the debate; and—to meet at once what I will not suppose to be an insinuation in Mr. Bowen's pamphlet, but what *has been* very broadly insinuated elsewhere—I add, that to influence high-minded gentlemen and scholars, assembled to consult for the public good on a matter of supreme importance, was a thing as far removed from my desire as from my power.

Just about two years back the proposal in question was made, and would, seemingly, have been then carried, if one gentleman had not desired further time to examine and test my book, with which he was not familiar. This wish received immediate assent; and it was not until the last week in June, 1864, that the motion was carried without a dissenting voice, none being more cordial in its support than the gentleman last-mentioned. I was requested, by Resolution, to prepare and lay before the body a revise of my Grammar, and to print about 200 copies for distribution among the Masters of the nine Schools, and such others as I might desire to consult. It was also declared, by common consent and mutual understanding, that all Masters in the Schools should be free to communicate with me respecting the form and

contents of the Grammar ; and, as I was going to Switzerland for change of air, my address was given with that express view. Yet Mr. Bowen (p. 16), after hearing these statements from me by letter, can speak of "the privacy with which the matter has been conducted." Certainly the fact was not proclaimed by advertisement in the newspapers ; but, short of that, I know not how it could have been made more public than it was. For my own part, I supposed that all the Schools learnt it through their Head Masters. It was generally known at Cambridge ; I believe it was no secret at Oxford ; I heard it mentioned in quarters which it seemed little likely to reach. There are, I know, Masters of Harrow to whom it had been communicated. Why Mr. Bowen should have remained in ignorance for a whole year, is to me a mystery. That he did so remain, is unfortunate ; for that was the time when he ought to have expressed to me and others his opinions about grammar and grammatical teaching ; that was the time when he, and those of whom he speaks as feeling with him, should have made their opinions known ; and, if those opinions could not prevail, have entered their protest. He and they should not have allowed me, for nearly two years, to devote my time, my thought, and my health to this one subject ; and then, later than the eleventh hour, come forward and demand, virtually, that the fruit of this toil be consigned to the flames, and a new book substituted, which shall not be a Grammar, but a mere book of exercises, accompanied with a few paradigms of declension, &c.

A draft of the proposed new Grammar, so far as done, and including all lesson-matter, was circulated among the Schools, and elsewhere, in the spring of 1865. Mr. Bowen says he was indebted to my courtesy for a

copy. I hope such courtesy would not have been wanting; but I was simply obeying the terms of the Resolution.

Here was another opportunity for Mr. Bowen to speak to me and others. But he remained silent.

Then the Primer, as proposed, was similarly circulated in November last. Two months were to elapse before the Head Masters should meet to consider its contents. During those two months Mr. Bowen was still silent.

In the second week of January, the Head Masters met under your hospitable roof to review the Primer. No voice from Mr. Bowen reached us then, or had reached us at any previous time.

Various alterations in form and matter were suggested and discussed; and I am sure you will bear me out in saying that all which appeared to be generally acceptable were by me willingly accepted, though they involved an almost entire reprint of the book. Indeed I do not think that any point affecting the Primer came to a division, but that a short conversation led to speedy agreement.

During the last month I have been engaged in the revise and reprint; and within that time I have had letters from Mr. Bowen intimating his intention to "agitate" against the book, but not favouring me with the slightest hint as to the nature of his objections. I have laid before him what I deem to be the unfairness and inconvenience of the course he takes; but I have only so far prevailed (if indeed *I* can be said to have prevailed at all) as to induce him to assail, by private, not public, circulation, a book placed in his hands for confidential use—a book not yet published—nay more, a

book never to be published in the form he has now before him. Yes; *this* is the position in which Mr. Bowen has placed himself by the step he has taken. He has actually circulated statements about this book which are at variance with its present contents; and cited many things which, when it appears, he will not find in it.

On this state of facts, I leave it to all men of honour and feeling, who read these lines, to determine whether I—and indeed the nine Head Masters collectively—have received from Mr. Bowen courteous and fair treatment.

I protested, too, against Mr. Bowen's calling me by name into the arena, not because I dreaded his assault, not even because I have scant time and no taste for controversy, but for other and obvious reasons. I told him that my name would not be in the title-page or preface. Yet all he does is to append a note on this point, which I cannot accept as an adequate representation of what I meant to convey to him.

It would be waste of time to follow Mr. Bowen step by step through the desultory and somewhat inconsistent declamation in which his opinions are conveyed. Neither will I meet him with his favourite weapons of gibe and jest. There is a comic side to everything; but, if it be true, in Horace's limited sense, that

Ridiculum acri

Fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res,

it is equally, and much oftener, true that

Risū inepto res ineptior nulla est.

I shall therefore take, in my own order, the several topics of controversy advanced in Mr. Bowen's pamphlet, and explain the grounds of the opinions to which his are opposed. In doing so, I may sometimes use the

pronoun "we," when I am sure that the collective sense of the nine Head Masters has been expressed ; sometimes "I," when I do not feel that the question is one upon which they can be said to have pronounced a distinct verdict.

I. As to the adoption of a Common Grammar. Mr. Bowen, "for himself," "thinks it unnecessary." So did not the Commissioners think ; so did not those who were examined by them on the subject ; so did not the Head Masters, when it came before them. So most assuredly do not I, after 36 years' experience, at Harrow and Shrewsbury, of the immense evil caused by the use of various grammars in Preparatory Schools. It is not long since I was asked by a country gentleman of this neighbourhood, an Etonian and First Classman, with reference to his own children, when my book was coming out ? Some little conversation ensuing with regard to the plan : "Oh," he said, "it does not so much matter what the book is, as it does that we should have one common standard for use." This was, and obviously was meant to be, the statement of a very strong opinion in the form of paradox ; and I only cite it as the unprejudiced feeling of a very sensible man in favour of that measure which Mr. Bowen, in the face of preponderating authority, "thinks unnecessary." Again it must be asked, why Mr. Bowen did not proclaim this opinion two years ago, when the question was under consideration, instead of waiting for the moment when the book is complete and on the eve of being published ?

II. As to the plan of the Elementary Grammar. Ought it to be a scientific outline (within judicious limits) supported by a book of exercises ; or a book of exercises,

with a few essential paradigms, but without a scientific outline? Mr. Bowen votes for the latter method. The Head Masters unanimously preferred the former. I say unanimously; because no dissenting opinion was expressed. The Head Masters had before them a grammar on Mr. Bowen's plan—the Charterhouse Grammar; but no voice was raised favourable to the adoption of that book as the Common Grammar, or as the basis of a Common Grammar. My belief is, that the general feeling was decidedly against it. Mr. Bowen must be well aware that the arguments he urges against scientific grammar, and the difficulties he suggests in its application to the teaching of boys, contain nothing new. He might cite in favour of such views high names; as those of Milton, Locke, Basedow, Pestalozzi, and many more: and I doubt not those views find much support outside our Universities and Public Schools, and some little within them. He must not suppose the Head Masters unfamiliar with such opinions and arguments. For myself I can say, that they have occupied much of my attention and consideration in the course of my grammatical studies and writings. And the conclusion to which I have come is this:—Give me a sound scientific grammarian, who is at the same time an able teacher, and I will trust him to teach Latin Grammar to children with a book of well-arranged extracts and a few paradigms. But "*quis custodiet custodes?*" Who will ensure the exercise-book against falling into the hands of men altogether incompetent to use it for the inculcation of sound principles? It cannot be done. The scientific outline, therefore, (or Primer) is the STANDARD for the guidance of teachers as well as learners,—I should rather say, for the guidance of teachers even more than of

learners ; because the former are supposed to see its value as a whole, the latter gradually acquire it, part by part : though every step they firmly take is a solid gain ; and those who have mastered the whole have gone very far towards a mastery of Latin and its literature. No doubt, the scientific outline may be unwisely and badly taught, as well as wisely and well. And most of the instances which Mr. Bowen cites as beyond the limits of the learner's intellect, I meet with this simple observation : I do not suppose any master to force upon the memory of his boys, by a system of rote-learning, any parts except (1) paradigms, and of these, the first time or so, a selection only ; (2) such rules as he will be afterwards required to cite in " parsing ;" (3) matter containing principles of great importance, which have to be kept constantly in mind : but with respect to these last, I observe that, if any boys show incompetence to master them where they first stand (for instance, all the sections which come before *mensa*), such boys should not be kept poring over them against the grain, but should go on with the rest to the paradigms, and be referred back to the rules of principle as occasion offers. The same remark applies to the rest of the book generally, more especially to Syntax. I say, then, that Mr. Bowen has assumed, without any right, that I expect all the matter in the Primer to be learnt by heart equally, and with equal insistence of the teacher. And again, he seems to suppose that I wish to keep a boy working for a great length of time at the Primer alone, without construing and exercise work. Very far from it. I had hoped that I should be able to get ready for publication, at the same time, its companion book, "*Subsidia Primaria*," the plan of which is what I suppose Mr. Bowen desires

for the Primer itself. But the claims on my time, and the interruptions (this among the rest) to which I am subject, have made it impossible to get this book ready for the ensuing school term. I must, however, protest against the fairness of any criticism which does not take the two books together; or does not, at least, in the absence of the second, assume the Primer to be accompanied with an efficient construing and exercise book.

This view of the question might be expanded into a little volume; but, as I do not expect to convert Mr. Bowen, I must content myself with stating, and so far explaining, my opinion. But, as I have suggested a few authorities in his favour, I must, on the other side, remark that in Germany the deeply learned, in France the theoretic, and in England the practical, the weight of authority and example is in favour of Standard Grammars; and I am not acquainted with any seat of learning in which they are dispensed with. Indeed, if the advantage of Mr. Bowen's method is so great and so obvious, having been before the world for such a length of time, we may well ask, how it comes to pass that those advantages have not been demonstrated with evidence irresistible; how it is that scholars have not started up from private schools, throwing into the shade all the puny products of our old and worn out Public Schools,—scholars who would carry off with the utmost ease University Scholarships in their first year, and claim, if strict justice were to be done, First Classes (*incomparabiles*) of their own. In short, we are entitled to ask, where are the experimental proofs of the excellence of Mr. Bowen's method? There are none extant, though the method itself has been practically in existence for a

century or more. Surely, then, the Head Masters of our English Public Schools may well be excused from committing themselves to the formal adoption of a plan in favour of which nothing can be adduced but crude theories, unsustained by any real proofs of success.

III. Mr. Bowen ranks himself with those who "doubted whether it really is, at the present moment, desirable to stereotype one Grammar for permanent national use." There will always be those who doubt whether the time to begin that, which many deem 'the better,' is 'the present moment.' But the Head Masters thought the time when the authority of the Queen's Commissioners suggested change, *was* a desirable time for a desirable change. It is not for me to say by what reasons they were severally led to select my book for the basis of the Common Grammar. But I consider it not out of place to state what facts they had before them of a nature calculated to influence their opinion. The nine Schools used four Latin Grammars, in the proportion of 4, 3, 1, 1. The figure 3 represents my Grammar, the latest published of the four. It was known that, in 20 years, this Grammar had attained an annual circulation of nearly 7000 copies, and had been every year enlarging its circulation. It was known to be (except the Charterhouse) the only Grammar which had laid aside the old rules for gender, perfects, &c. It was known to be the only Grammar which had grappled with the laws of Mood, as dependent on the analysis of the Compound Sentence; and it was known (I do not say this without authority) that, in regard to Latin Prose Composition, those who had been trained in these principles stood well at the Universities. It was known, also, that the author was far from regarding

his book as an ideal of what a Grammar should be; that he looked upon it as a compromise, and desired an opportunity to adapt it more thoroughly to the principles of advanced philology. It was known, also, that by God's blessing he seemed to have health and strength left to undertake this task. These facts, I say, may possibly have had some weight with the Head Masters. They may have thought this a concurrence of circumstances which might not recur so favourably at the close of Mr. Bowen's cycle of thirty years. In any case, if thirty years should produce so great an advance in the philological development of a dead language as Mr. Bowen seems to contemplate, I see no reason why the Common Grammar may not be subject to the purgation of a new Reform.

In quitting this topic, may I be allowed to remark, that our English classical scholars are too much in the habit of appealing to the authority of foreign writers, and neglecting their own countrymen? The name of Madvig, for instance, has been of late years cited on almost every occasion. Yet, whatever Madvig's merits as a grammarian may or may not be, I venture to say, from intimate knowledge, that his contributions to Latin philology cannot be compared in value with those of Donaldson and Key.

IV. Mr. Bowen's minuter criticisms are, for the most part, undeserving of a reply. Where they are not misstatements, due to his rashness in assailing *a* book which is not *the* book, they are reducible to empty cavil or pointless sarcasm. It would seem, however, that (besides the fact of its being scientific) he regards two points in the Primer as specially objectionable:—(1) the use of rhyming lines to assist the learner's memory; and (2) the adoption of a Syntax with Latin instead

of English rules. I shall now speak of both these points, simply premising that, if the feeling of the other Masters had been against one or the other, I should not have been disposed to offer any resistance to that feeling. The use of memorial lines in the higher book did meet with objection ; but I heard none offered to their use in the Primer.

(1.) Mr. Bowen pours out the vials of his wrath upon these unhappy lines through two pages and a half of cheap and easy ridicule ; calling them “ gloomy poetry,” “ gram-matic muse,” “ run of Walter Scott,” “ Pegasus run riot,” “ canto,” &c. &c. : but in that space I have looked in vain for any single reason why children, who, as he elsewhere urges, find grammar laborious and uphill work, should not have their labour eased by these technical helps to the mind and the memory. Positively the only approach to a reason which I have been able to discover is, that boys learning these rhymes may mistake the quantity of Latin words, such as “ nātat” and “ cānunt.” (In the latter case, it so happens that the English rhythm would throw the accent on the second syllable.) All that is to be discovered from these pages is, that such helps are an abomination to Mr. Bowen. But they are not, and have not been, in equal disfavour with teachers generally. Memorial verses have been used, from the days of Lily and Ruddiman to our own times, by “ blandi doctores,” who have written Elementary Grammars both in Germany and in England. Even Dr. Donaldson has not disdained them in his “ Complete Latin Grammar for the use of Students,” an octavo volume of 540 pages ; as Mr. Bowen will see by reference to pages 28, 36, 41 of that work. His number of rhyming lines on Gender is

about the same as mine ; and without daring to rival Walter Scott, I do venture to hope that the “ gloomy poetry ” of the Primer may compete with the following lines, for example :—

Nouns, in which a final -s
A consonant preceding has,
For instance, *stirps*, or *ars*, or *frons*,
With those in *x*, or *-ens*, or *-as*,
Increasing in the genitive,
Will *femininum genus* give.

Exceptions : (1.) Sex masculina sunt in *-as*
Vas (vadis), gigas, elephas,
As (assis), mas, et adamas.
Sed neutra sunt artocreas,
Fas, nefas, erysipelas,
Vas (vasis) atque buceras.

My own experience (and it is neither a short nor a confined one) is decidedly in favour of *smooth-sounding* memorial rules for certain matter, exactly that kind of matter for which I have used them : (1) such elementary principles as boys may soon be trusted with ; (2) lists of words falling under rules like those of Gender ; (3) such specialties as the memory might easily let slip or confuse. In my own young days I often helped myself in this way. I have from boyhood recollected the order of the mouths of the Nile by the line,—

Canop—Bolb—Seben—Phatnit—Mend—Tanit—and Pelus.

A technical couplet remains in my mind for the Attic months. I suppose we all had some obligation in childhood to the doggrel that tells us,—

Thirty days hath September,
April, June, and November ;
February hath twenty-eight alone,
And all the rest have thirty-one.
Except in Leap-year : then's the time
February's days are twenty-nine.

Many may have found help from remembering that

The 5th or 13th day divides
 A Roman month at Nones or Ides :
 In March, October, July, May,
 The 7th or the 15th day.

In my old Grammar, the Genders are in memorial *Latin* rhymes, to which surely more objection may be made than to English; and also the Rules for Perfects and Supines. These last are now condemned by my experience and judgment, and banished accordingly: but the former I have found useful; and in an English shape I find them yet easier and more available, having brought them into use here for some time past. Upon the whole, then, I think Mr. Bowen might well condone his personal antipathy to a little harmless jingle, which is easily learnt, and, with exercise under a zealous and careful master, remembered and applied without much difficulty. I do not suppose he wishes us still to carry boys through the heap of strange words,—*quae priscis jure relinquo* :

Antidotus, cossus, diametrus, byssus, abyssus,
 Diphthongus, synodus, methodus, dialectus, et arctus,
 * * * *
 Lecythus atque atomus, grossus, pharus, et paradisus.

To sum up : I am in favour of memorial rules, so far as I have used them; (for much of what Mr. Bowen has cited will not appear in the published book;) but if it should prove that the feeling of Masters is against them by a decisive preponderance, I would not resist the substitution of unrhyming matter.

(2.) Next comes the question of Syntax Rules in Latin. Here I was ready to place myself without reserve in the hands of the other Masters. But I understood and believe the opinion in favour of Latin Rules to have been unanimous and strong. They were certainly carried without

a division; I might say without debate, if I did not remember some sentiments expressed in their favour which would be very telling, if I were at liberty to name the speakers. It was, indeed, stipulated that they should be as few and concise as the nature of the subject would permit; and this stipulation I have tried to fulfil to the utmost possible extent. They were to be followed by a translation, with a few notes; and a glossary of terms was at a later time suggested. I fancy that the main argument for Latin Rules lies in their superior precision, and aptitude for citation; and in this argument I see great force. But really, when it is noticed that the Syntax only occupies 14 pages, and that the actual Rules, without Examples, amount only to about 170 lines, I think the question is not one of very grave importance. The translation gives any master the opportunity of teaching them in English to whatever extent he may desire; and they are so concisely expressed, as not in more than four or five instances to exceed two lines; and a great many of the Rules are contained in one line.

(3.) As to Grammatical Terms. Here it is, most especially, that Mr. Bowen's objections seem to me to take a merely carping and cavilling form. Of the Terms which he cites in page 7, only one (Quasi-passive) is of my own invention. The rest, as well as "the Infinite Verb," appear in other books. And are not Quasi-passive and Semi-deponent Verbs as easy terms as Neutro-passiva and Neutralia Passiva, to say nothing of their superior fitness? I am unable to see how a "mountain of toil" is to be found in the mere heading of a section. Under the heading "Semi-consonant Verbs of the third conjugation," (for which, however, I have written "Verbs in *io*

of the third conjugation,") the boy's real work was to learn a short list of such verbs, and partially to conjugate two, *cipio* and *patior*; with exercises corresponding in the *Subsidia*.

Among the inaccuracies of Mr. Bowen's pamphlet, I find him saying (p. 8) that I "talk of the infinitive mood as other people do in most parts of the book." I never talk of the infinitive *mood*. I call the infinitive (a Verb-noun) with gerund, supines, and participles, the Verb Infinite, a term, I repeat, not peculiar to me. When I speak of the Infinitive alone, it is but natural and proper that I should speak of its uses as other people do; for I can assure Mr. Bowen that I am only too glad when I can do so without any serious compromise of principle. Nay, though I do consider it a rather serious compromise of principle to retain the usual order of the declensions and conjugations, instead of placing them in the just order of their characters, yet he will find that in the forthcoming Primer I have sacrificed to the convenience of existing books and customs, even my former purpose of inverting the places of *rego* and *audio*. *Verbum Infinitum* is of course (as Mr. Bowen sees) the mere negative of *Verbum Finitum*; and the change is not made because I prefer *Infinitum* to *Infinitivum*, but because the latter term is pre-engaged to the chief Verb-noun of the group. In *Facciolati's Lexicon*, and, I doubt not, elsewhere, he will find *Infinitum* often used for *Infinitivum*.

In banishing old, or introducing new, terms, I am not swayed by pedantic considerations of etymological correctness, but by the mere utilitarian desire to make the Science of Grammar simpler and more correct. Declension, Case, Genitive, Dative, Accusative, Ablative, Ge-

rund, Supine, Participle, and many other terms, are impeachable, when etymology and use are compared. But I should not dream of meddling with them on that account, both because they are too firmly in possession, and because their etymological falseness is forgotten in their established and defined use. The terms which I have banished or changed are such as, having no true fitness, also tend to confuse the learner; as, Neuter Verb (for which I use Intransitive Verb only); Verb Substantive, meaning the Verb *Sum* (which I call Verb-Essential); Predicate, as applied (in a sense neither strictly logical nor soundly grammatical) to a Substantive or Adjective following *Sum* or another Copulative Verb; for which I substitute the term Complement. A few terms I have introduced with a view to that improved scientific classification which, whatever Mr. Bowen may think, does really tend to enlighten and enlarge the student's mind. *Copulative* Verbs had been thus classified in my older Grammar. *Factitive* Verbs may be found in other books. *Trajective* Verbs and Adjectives, or such as *throw* their force *over* to a "remoter object," are so described for the first time. The term "*Suboblique*" is used as a convenient abridgement of "Subordinate to Oratio Obliqua." A few other terms (Clause, Enthesis, Ecthesis), with those which describe the several relations in which words stand in construction, were necessary to complete that analysis of sentences, which I have endeavoured to carry forward to the point where Rhetoric succeeds to the functions of Grammar. As a matter of course, all this is not done in the Primer, but much of it is shadowed out there; without, I hope, being allowed to interfere with the work of teaching young boys, if

masters have good sense enough to make the explanation of technical terms a minor matter for a considerable time after boys have begun Latin. I do not know, after all, that on this point Mr. Bowen and myself are so very far at variance. I too wish exercise-work (rendering to and fro) to march in advance of theory, being practised from models given; but then I would always (as I before said) have the Scientific Outline or Grammar ready at hand as "the Law and the Testimony," to be appealed to and cited. And I would have it taught "diligently," but discreetly; according to its spirit, not according to its letter *merely*.

And now, perhaps, Mr. Bowen's objections have been sufficiently considered. He hopes he "has said nothing which can give offence." If he can read his letter through, and say honestly of every passage in it, that it was not *designed* to give offence, then he has given none. But I have nothing to retract. I say, he ought to have circulated his letter at a much earlier time, or not to have circulated it at all. He ought to have made his opinions and objections known to me privately: he ought not to have printed for circulation an assault on a book which was put into his hands confidentially for a different purpose; still less ought he to have criticised in print what was no more than an uncorrected proof, and thereby to have quoted passage after passage which the forthcoming book does not contain. He had no right to make use of his private information (which he neglected to use for its legitimate purpose) in order to connect my name with the book, after I had told him that my name was not to appear, and that I protested against being personally called forth. All this places Mr. Bowen himself in a

position so undesirable, that my chief feeling is that of deep regret that a gentleman and scholar, a Fellow of the noblest College in the world, should have thus committed himself. Then, too, I see in Mr. Bowen's pamphlet an absolute determination to find fault at any cost. While he sets forth the difficulties of grammar in a very formidable light, his chief assault is directed—without any reason assigned but his own personal prejudice—against the memorial artifice by which much of that difficulty is removed or lightened. And this from one who is teaching, or is supposed to be teaching, *Propria quae Maribus, As in Praesenti*, and *Quae Genus*, those bugbears of my childhood, the recollection of which, more than anything else, impelled me to try to rescue from their terrors the coming generation of school-boys.

Mr. Bowen concludes with an ominous presage of the effect of the Primer in hastening the extinction of Classical Education. Now the New Primer contains 92 pages of lesson-work; the present Harrow Primer contains 179; and the *average* number of lines in a page may be in the two books about equal. In other words, the New Primer is in quantity little more than half the old one. As to the difficulty of what is to be learnt, the two books cannot be brought into comparison: the times within which an average boy could learn one and the other may be called incommensurable. Of their respective merits, in any other point of view, it would be unbecoming in me to speak; but Mr. Bowen's vehement exaggeration has given me a right to compare the new book, in respect of magnitude and difficulty, with that which up to this time he is using.

Of the extermination of classical learning by the

advance of science, I entertain no dread. Science and learning ought to go hand in hand. Science must have the aid of language. The mother-tongue of European, American, and Australian languages must always be studied by those who would have a more than superficial acquaintance with the progeny. But, for a more than superficial acquaintance with any language, a knowledge of its scientific grammar is required. The valet or the lady's maid will pick up the *λαλία* perhaps sooner than the master or mistress; but the mind is trained by acquiring principles. When principles are acquired by sound training in one suitable language, the mastery of cognate languages is mere matter of detail. And what language so suitable for this training as Latin?

One last word. Mr. Bowen tells us he has reason to think that an opinion unfavourable to the Primer (and Grammar, so far as known) is very widely spread. "It is spread," he says, "almost as widely as the horizon of his own personal knowledge." And, at the close, he talks about "consulting public opinion." As to this last expression, I deny that, on such a question, the possibility exists of consulting public opinion. I do not acknowledge any public opinion which can be consulted with advantage on this subject, but that of good scholars, experienced in teaching. I am disposed to think that most men of discretion will consider that, when a book has been adopted by the Head-Masters of the nine Schools, after the labour of two years,—when it is founded on another book of the same kind which had gained a circulation of 7000 copies a year, without ever having sought or received the aid of any one of those publications which are called "organs of public opinion,"—that

book may possibly deserve public confidence, and ought at least to receive a courteous reception and a fair trial.

Not for my own sake, not for the sake of the other Head-Masters, who need no defence of mine, but to quiet the minds of any timid persons who may read Mr. Bowen's pamphlet, and be alarmed by the loud and confident tone he uses, I append three testimonies, from totally distinct quarters. The first, which relates to the Grammar, is from a brother Fellow of Mr. Bowen, whose opinion may perhaps be thought by some of not less weight than Mr. Bowen's, seeing that he is the Editor of *Lucretius*. The second (on the Primer) is from a scholar of eminence, the Head-Master of B—— School, who was at first alarmed by the larger Grammar, supposing it meant for the use of beginners. The third is from an excellent scholar, my colleague here for fourteen years, but now conducting a preparatory classical school.

You will understand how much I lament that this letter is called for; yet I believe you will recognise its necessity, and give it the moral weight of your sanction, which none can value more highly than myself.

I am, my dear Dr. Moberly,

Yours most sincerely,

BENJ. H. KENNEDY.

SHREWSBURY;

March 12th, 1866.



APPENDIX.

I.

“Many thanks for the portion of your Latin Grammar which you were so kind as to send me, and which I have looked through with much pleasure and admiration. I heartily congratulate the coming generations of school-boys who will get their knowledge in such a clear, systematic, condensed shape, and will not have to charge their memory with what it would be better to forget.”

II.

“Thanks many for the two Grammars. The Primer is simply admirable. It is all, or nearly all, that is wanted. Almost the only thing I desiderate is the set of examples, pp. 85—91 of the larger Grammar.”

III.

“You have been kind enough to send me a copy of the Public School Latin Primer. Allow me, in thanking you, to say that both boys and masters will have real cause to be grateful for it.

“Of the matter it is hardly for me to speak, knowing the care and labour you have bestowed on every portion of the book; which seems to have attained what it aims at, the highest standard of soundness and accuracy.

“It is a great advantage, and one that no Grammar that I have seen before possesses, to be able to work the younger boys through the Accidence without requiring them to turn a page in advance of the actual page of lesson. This advantage your arrangement seems to me to secure most completely, and I feel sure that I shall derive great help in this particular for my own teaching.”

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 006 672 980 1