

THE MUSEUM.

I. MODERN LATIN AS A BASIS OF INSTRUCTION.*

It cannot be denied that the mental relations of the nineteenth century towards Greek and Latin literature differ widely from those of the sixteenth. At the earlier era that literature was the noblest existing, and was the only material for high education. Whoever aspired to be educated learned the two languages, not for their own sakes, but as keys to a literature otherwise inaccessible. But in the course of three centuries, the moderns, lifted above the ancients on vantage-ground, have far surpassed their teachers. The new literature of at least three nations, built upon new science, has a solidity and accuracy with which Greek and Romans cannot possibly compete. Hence the inevitable result, that even with the most active-minded men, who really mastered Greek and Latin in their youth, it is a rare thing to study any part of the literature in their manhood. Neither statesmen nor magistrates are addicted to the systematic perusal of Tacitus, Livy, or Cicero; much less to extend their reading of Aristotle, Plato or Polybius, Demosthenes or Euripides, beyond what they read at college. The enormous fecundity of each year pours out a mass of literature with which no one can keep up, and makes it difficult to find time for the thorough study of our own great writers recently departed—Hallam, Mackintosh, Burke, and many others. In such a state of things it would be untruthful and absurd to say that the British youth *collectively* learn, or ought to learn, the Latin or the Greek language for the sake of the literature.

I am aware that in England, Germany, and even in France, it is avowed by the best judges, that no one attains the highest education of the day, who is not master of the Greek as well as of the Latin language. This verdict I have no thought of contesting; indeed I thoroughly believe it, as applied to Europeans. But two remarks are here suggested. First, That a main reason with us for learning these languages, and especially Latin, rises out of our *history*; a sufficient mark of which is, that no one recommends the natives of India to

* I may be allowed to mention that these pages were written before the Second Number of *The Museum* had appeared.

make these languages the basis of high education. Secondly, In considering the general question of school teaching, we are concerned with boys and men in general, not with those who are to have the highest education accessible, which is indeed incompatible with any early and complete immersion in practical life, however noble and honourable. From the vastness of modern knowledge, and from the exigencies of professions and trades, it is certain that the very great majority will terminate their Latin and Greek studies with their collegiate or school-reading. Hence the common utility of these languages now ends in themselves, and is independent of the literature, except to theologians, antiquaries, and professed men of letters.

This total change of relation between ourselves and the classical literature would of itself demand reconsideration of the modes used for the acquisition of the languages. But, while asserting this, I am not ignorant that no fundamental change could be effected except in the course of long time. Schools, like national politics, have their roots in the past, and move on by a force of routine which may be guided or modified, but cannot be thwarted. If in what follows I seem to suggest radical alterations, let it be understood that I am aware how little *immediate* change is possible to individual teachers; and how often eccentricity may be a mischief hurtful to pupils. Still, a thorough knowledge of right principles, even when we cannot apply them, must in the long-run tend to practical improvement.

The examinations conducted all over the country, under the influence of Oxford and Cambridge, are already doing what they intended, —to put the screw upon private schools; but with some results which they probably did *not* intend. To produce pupils who will pass the examination with credit is becoming essential to the success of the schoolmaster in his trade, and the immediate danger is that of perfunctory teaching. In whatever book an examination is to be conducted, that book (I am told) is selected as the special and almost the exclusive topic of study. The complaint was made to me lately, by a highly intelligent under-master of a school, that the pupils who are to be examined occupy a most unreasonable proportion of the masters' time, and yet have less time themselves for each separate subject than before. A boy who has to learn a book of Cæsar is put to it (as I understood) *forthwith*, and the whole effort is narrowed to it. I do not at all assert that this is universal, but my experience of a like tendency in the examinations at London University makes me jealous of it.

Let it be considered how far such a method would recommend itself in a real and practical case. Suppose, for instance, a Frenchman to present himself to us, with the request that we should teach him English, in order that he might be able to read our literature. Even if he were to specify certain modern authors, as Hallam, Carlyle, Walter Scott, and Tennyson, we should not forthwith take one of these as the text-book, furnish him with grammar and dictionary, and, while the pupil was yet in the mere rudiments, exact of him to construe and translate. But we should reply to him: "Well! you wish to read

this and that *writer*: I will teach you the *language* first, afterwards you will be able to read what you please; or whatever difficulties in detail remain (such as often meet natives themselves), will more easily be solved." Instead of plunging him into complicated prose, or highly-condensed and peculiar poetry, we should at first teach him everything which was easiest, shortest, and commonest, aware that to postpone difficulties is almost equivalent to removing them. Nor can this remark be set aside by replying that our problem is that of a dead, not of a living language. This circumstance, no doubt, immensely increases difficulty to the learner, by depriving him of a thousand means of learning; but so far from its being a reason for voluntarily plunging him into hard books, it is an additional reason for trying to confine him long and sedulously to easy books. We cannot attain the facilities of a living language; yet, the more we can assimilate our methods to the ease of the natural method of learning, the better for the pupil. That we cannot do this entirely, is due primarily to want of accomplishment in the teacher, who, having nobody to talk Latin and Greek to him, every day and on every subject, with the accuracy of natives, cannot possibly acquire anything approaching to the readiness and the certainty of a native.

Really and fully to know a language is indeed an immense attainment, so many styles does it embrace. To say nothing of technical words, known only within the precincts of particular arts, trades, sciences, professions; to say nothing of provincialisms and of slang, there remain polite talk, formal prose, diplomatic language, poetry, old poetry, old style of speech or books, and the language of children and servants. All of these must be discriminated. No educated man speaks to a child or to a servant exactly as to his equal, and in speaking to his equal he sets the pitch of his diction according to the subject. To gain a delicate feeling of all these distinctions is a vast and arduous enterprise. In a dead language we in fact do not aspire to the whole of it. Most of us lessen the difficulty of our problem by limiting our ambition. Yet (confining the view to Latin) we have at least to learn three kinds of style:—1. The simplest admissible, whether it be that of polite conversation, differing not much from Terence, or whether it be the epistolary. 2. The involved prose of Cicero or of Livy. 3. The poetical style, with its harsh dislocation of words. Now, inasmuch as *to take difficulties one by one* is of all things most important in all learning, it must be of great value to have an intimate acquaintance with the right order of words before we are embarrassed with a new order assumed by license. In fact, it would be well to learn, if possible, in the *natural* succession of difficulties; that is, as a Roman child learnt. What this order was we can pretty well judge. First, A very limited vocabulary of nouns and verbs was picked up, with a very complete stock of prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, numerals, and adverbs of time, place, and degree. Secondly, The few nouns and verbs were subjected to very various inflection, so that nearly all the grammatical forms became familiar in connexion with them, while the sentences remained very simple. Thirdly, Inversion of words in obedience to

emphasis was learnt. Fourthly, The vocabulary was gradually enlarged. Fifthly, Poetical inversion was learnt. Sixthly, Sentences with more and more complication in the clauses were admitted. The last thing, I apprehend, was to understand condensed complication, such as Livy and Horace so freely employ. I do not say that exactly this order either was necessary or is desirable; but the natural principle is both obvious and important, *to learn idiom fundamentally by the often-repeated use of a limited stock of words, and by very simple sentences.* The words in daily use with a Roman child sufficed to give cardinal types of every sort of inflexion. The principal uses of even the subjunctive mood and of the infinitive were learnt, and can be learnt, in sentences which have *never more than two clauses.* In this respect, and in some others, it is certainly possible for us to come nearer to the natural order than our scholastic routine attempts.

How great is the superiority of the natural method, is indicated by the fact that it never strains the brain. Children may learn two languages, or even three at once; and this, if these are spoken to them by different individuals, without confusion, and without being less able to learn other things. Memory is aided, because imagination connects the words with a person, a scene, and events; and, little by little, the utility of speech calls forth active efforts in the learner. No abstract rules are given by nature, but endless examples; and infinite reiteration impresses phrases as well as words on the memory. These are precious advantages, some of which we can partially attain, and used to attain in the old-fashioned mode of teaching, which has been abandoned as unphilosophical. Comparing the methods of teaching Latin, which are peculiarly modern, with those which they have to a great extent superseded, I confess myself in favour of the *principles* which underlie the older and generally despised routine. And this is the first point which I desire clearly to explain.

I assume that the learner is young,—is at a time of life at which memory is capacious and unpreoccupied, while the abstract powers and the judgment are very immature. The old grammars, I admit, contained some superfluous attempts at philosophic procedure, such as *definitions* of the cases, and of the subjunctive mood; but these were, I believe, generally left in suspense. They were learnt to be said, not to be understood, and therefore gave little trouble: if the pupil could say them off, no further question was asked. But in general the old method was one of repetition: *it dealt immensely in committing Latin to memory.* Ridiculous as was the system of giving to boys a Latin syntax in the Latin language, it at any rate did accustom them to the reiteration of a small number of words, expressed in very simple sentences, and conveying knowledge of *immediate utility.* In every grammar the classified examples to a rule are of much greater value than the rule itself, which they explain or even supersede. These, I presume, are in every case committed to memory, even in the most modern use of the grammar; though I have met advocates of the modern “philosophical” method, who maintain that the grammar should not be learned by heart, but should be consulted at the pupil’s

pleasure as a mere book of reference. Such, no doubt, is the general use of a grammar which every grown man makes. While I nevertheless believe that at most schools the boys still learn grammar by heart, I venture to remark that the newer method of teaching, so far as known to me, has immensely lessened the *quantity* of Latin which is thus learned. At school I myself was taught in what would now be called a loose and unphilosophical way, but it was very effective. We learned to repeat great masses of Latin poetry, besides the grotesque "Propria quæ maribus," and "As in præsentî," with the Latin syntax. Moreover, we learned Latin vocabulary, both of nouns and of verbs; nor can I remember that we thought it slavish and stupid, as it might seem to an adult. I never meet with such a thing as a Latin vocabulary now, even as a book of reference; yet, if well executed, it is very valuable as giving the specific differences of words which learners wrongly imagine to be identical. I am not now advising that vocabulary should be learned, though I believe it imparted to us a readier command of words. We also learned by heart Latin dialogues, of modern composition, and all who rose to the highest class learnt, or heard and understood, from one to four plays of Terence. Of prose Latin we scrambled through great quantities in the course of several years; since every day brought its lesson, and no effort was made at any profounder explanation than that of "parsing." One day in every week every boy was subject to examination by the head-master as to all that had been learnt in the week; and perpetual repetition, with a minimum of assistance from a teacher, familiarized even dull boys with the facts of the language. Such teaching left them ignorant of the philosophy of the syntax and etymology, no doubt; but so are natives prevalingly ignorant; and surely it is best, especially for young minds, to learn the facts first: the philosophy is then easily superadded. I am jealous lest any try to make the philosophy come first. In the present day, schools seem to me ambitious to do the work of college: one symptom of the tendency is the extensive disuse of committing masses of Latin to memory. Against this disuse I wish earnestly to protest. Nothing is easier to boys than such learning, even when the thing learned is uninteresting, or is in prose; yet, as I shall presently insist, means should be taken of making it interesting, and instructive, and rhythmical. Moreover, since we cannot talk Latin as we talk in a living tongue, we can the less afford to lose the partial compensation which is afforded by learning off whole pages of Latin writing.

Before further opening what I wish to recommend, I have a few words to say in defence of *modern Latin* as the basis of text-books: for here I encounter a great modern prejudice. Three centuries ago, when Latin was the medium of practical oratory as well as of writing, a great deal of teaching went on by word of mouth as well as by modern dialogues; but in recent years this has not only been discontinued, but has been visited with pointed censure. Elementary books pride themselves on exterminating all modern Latin, because (they say) "everybody but a native is liable to make small blunders; one

cannot *trust* even the best of modern scholars." This has been said by very respectable authorities. I do not intend disrespect to them in saying that I think it to be an argument quite misplaced, inconclusive, and misleading. For I cannot imagine that any one who uses it would scruple to concede to me that an ancient Spaniard who went to Rome to learn Latin, or even who learned it from a Roman crew and Roman settlers, learned it to great advantage as compared to ourselves. Consider then the practical position of a Spaniard who landed at the mouth of the Tiber when Cicero was in his prime. Even if he found some Roman scribe or freedman to give him lessons in grammar, it was not in this that he had the chief advantage over us, but in hearing Latin talked every hour of the day. But whom did he hear, and what? First, The talk of slaves, which is not likely to have come nearer to good Latin than the talk of African domestics in the West Indies to good English. Next, the talk of foreigners innumerable, who had picked up the tongue imperfectly, and without grammatical cultivation. Thirdly, He heard Italian provincials who were little else than foreigners, their fathers at least having talked Oscan or Etruscan as their mother-tongue. Fourthly, Men of genuine Latin birth, yet of lower than aristocratic rank, and wholly destitute of scholastic training. Considering the extreme difficulty of talking so complicated a language with grammatical correctness, in any but the shortest sentences, we may feel certain that our Spaniard hour by hour would hear errors fully equalling (probably far surpassing) the worst blunders made in English by peasants of the counties whose speech deviates least from our standard tongue. I do not claim much for modern scholars, or for myself as an individual, in saying that such errors as alone we could commit in a book, deliberately written and printed, would be small and quite microscopic compared to those which were heard every hour in the streets and shops of Rome. But such errors never vitiate the tongue of the hearer unless they are fixed provincialisms consistently reiterated. The disadvantage of having to hear them is as nothing compared to the advantage of learning words and phrases *in great quantity, and in such connexions as impress the imagination and excite interest.* In short, in the natural and most effective mode of learning, a pupil is not taught everything perfect from the beginning. Very much of error is poured in upon him, which, if he imbibe, he has afterwards to unlearn; but if, in anxiety lest he should imbibe error, our Spaniard had stopped his ears to all but the few who spoke as Cicero and Brutus, he would have sacrificed all the advantages which he possessed over us, except in the rare case of his actually living as a friend, and socially an equal, in the bosom of an aristocratic family. Not but that even there the children, accustomed to talk with slaves, and untrained as yet in grammar, would let drop many a solecism.

It is therefore most unreasonable to object against modern Latin, that we cannot be sure of its being perfect, as though this were a sufficient reason for exploding it. Not a fraction of the English boys who learn the language can be expected ever to attain the same amount of

knowledge in it as is possessed by all superior teachers; and however far short this may be of Ciceronian perfection, it would be a great thing to impart. If, therefore, a modern Latin literature were proposed as the elementary text-book for learners, the sole question which need be asked concerning its purity is—"Will it aid a pupil to learn the language as well as our superior scholars know it?" If, indeed, it gave no other aid than Cæsar, or Cicero, or Livy can give, then it would be gratuitous and unmeaning. But if it will lead more easily and rapidly, more pleasantly and usefully, to that point of attainment which will enable the reader at his pleasure to peruse either Cicero or Livy, then it will fulfil for us the same function as the talk of Roman slaves and provincials fulfilled to a Spaniard, and certainly with very far less risk of teaching error.

Men may, or may not, value the existing Latin literature. They may wish to read one or two choice parts of it,—selections of Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, Livy, Cicero; or they may desire to pursue the study extensively, or they may be quite indifferent to the literature as such, and care solely for the language. Whichever case may be supposed, but little of the literature can be actually read while the student is a pupil; and in every case, to learn the *language* while he is a pupil, whether for its own sake only or also for the literature, must be the chief effort, and, if attained, is surely the chief reward. Not that I have the least wish or thought of excluding from the *highest* class of an ideal school choice portions of the ancient writers; only, in the earlier stages of learning, I think they involve far too many difficulties, and therefore do not furnish the best steps towards an understanding of themselves.

Of course, I am aware that many persons extol the difficulties as an advantageous exercise of mind. To walk straight up the steep of a mountain is a great exercise of muscle, of heart, and of lungs; so great indeed, that to go round by a road four times as long, which ascends gradually, not only tires less, but probably consumes less time. As in mountain ascents there is no danger of not getting enough fatigue, so in the learning of languages we need not fear deficiency of difficulties, the benefit of which to the mind I admit and maintain, provided always that they are taken separately. But in modern literature we are universally agreed that the shortest way to the end is one in appearance round-about: and I contend that the same thing is to be believed still more emphatically concerning ancient literature. The changes which have taken place in religion and in philosophy, in the organization of society, in geographical nomenclature, in the division of States, in mechanical and chemical art, in the habits of life, in law and in executive government, with all the allusions to history and mythology, present a thousand difficulties in ancient writings over and above those which are involved in the mere language. After the language is, up to a certain point, familiar, these very things are found to be interesting, because they impart information: but while the language is quite new, they exceedingly embarrass and impede. In the natural process of learning we guess what is meant, and are helped out by it,

and even learn from the beginning by this alone; as when any one with gestures says in a foreign tongue, Come hither! or, Give me. When we cannot guess what is meant, we are slower in learning the tongue: hence whatever is thoroughly foreign in thought, and lies beyond the beat of our knowledge, impedes the learning. It is true that, by aid of a translation and ample notes, if they are read *before* the learner attacks a piece of ancient literature (suppose, a speech of Cicero), this source of difficulty may be removed; though many teachers (wrongly, as I think) would deprecate the process. But in that case a boy has to learn the laws and constitution and manners of Rome, and much of history, as well as to grapple with the language; and this, by lessening the quantity learned, must gravely retard his progress. One of the many great advantages, inferior to none other, of the natural method, lies in the enormous mass of words poured in upon the ear incessantly, *with reiteration before there is time to forget*. If we can dispense awhile with the effort needed for learning the facts of the old world, we may considerably increase the quantity of Latin learned, and thereby the better fix it in the memory.

Again, to take *interest* in Latin literature is perhaps a peculiar taste. To a powerful and well-prepared mind it is hard to say what may not be interesting. A treatise on Formal Logic, on Mathematical Notation, on Criminal Law, on Prevalent Diseases, may have a high interest: so, too, have Tacitus, Cicero, nay, and even Cæsar to some minds. But to the majority, to the uninformed and to the young, the greater part of these writers is extremely dull, and not least what is most read at schools:—the Gallic War, the Germania, the Cato Major and the Laelius; also the Catilina of Sallust. Ovid always seemed to me stupid in the extreme, even when it is not too difficult. Horace's Odes are, many of them, gems of perfection as regards mere language; but when their whole compass is so small, and they can be read in so very moderate a time by one already advanced in the language, nothing whatever is to be gained by prematurely encountering their very numerous difficulties, which must seriously lower their interest to a learner. Now, precisely because in dealing with a dead language we cannot supply that stimulus which utility gives to a living tongue (as, when we wish to ask a foreigner for something, or to impart or learn something of immediate importance), it is therefore the more urgent to secure other grounds of interest in the dead language,—such as is given by the perception of Beauty. So valuable is this, as often to outweigh the objection derived from the difficulties of poetry, when they are not extreme or too various in kind. For, that which the mind admires dwells on the imagination and inheres more easily in the memory; and to get a book, the substance of which interests the learner, is a great help to the acquisition of the tongue. On this ground, if I rightly remember, Professor Pillans has strongly advised Q. Curtius as a schoolbook. That its interest gives it a high advantage over Cæsar, I readily believe, if the condensed style does not make it too difficult.

Having tried to remove *a priori* objections to modern Latin, I proceed to state in what way we may nearest approach to that order of learning, which (according to my own experience in several languages) gives to the learner the greatest command of the tongue in the shortest time, and with the shortest effort. I will add, that I am brought to the same conclusion from *one* modern language which I learned in the country, and from *two* other languages which I have never heard pronounced. Whether the language is learned scholastically or orally, the same order of learning seems to me the easiest.

I begin by very easy sentences, containing a full apparatus of pronouns (personal, possessive, interrogative, demonstrative), pronominal adverbs of place, time, manner, quantity, etc., joined in the first instance to no verb but the verb *To Be* (which in some languages indeed is often omissible). With these should be combined a select number of the commonest nouns. This is my idea of the earliest *Delectus*, which indeed may precede anything grammatical. When a language has no cases, prepositions may also be learned in the first stage: but in Latin, this must be a little delayed. What I have written might suffice: but many readers will feel it easier to read my own examples, than to make examples themselves; I therefore add illustrations, omitting the English, which of course would be presented to a learner along with the Latin.

Hic ego sum.
 Ubinam es tu?
 Quis est hic vir?
 Quænam est hæc mulier?
 Quid est illud?
 An tu es illic?
 Hic non est illic.
 Hoc est meum.
 Ubinam est tuum?
 Anne hoc est tuum?
 Non meum est.
 Ubi est meus liber?
 Tuus liber est apud me.
 Ille est meus pater.
 Pater meus hic est.
 Pater tuus foris est.
 Mater mea domi est.
 Tu meus es pater.
 Ego tuus sum filius.
 Unde tu es?
 Quare tu hic eras?
 An ille hic erat?
 Num tu hic es?
 Quando ille hic erit?
 Hic nos nunc sumus.
 Illic vos nunc estis.
 Ibi illi nunc sunt.
 Ubinam ille mox erit?
 Num tu ibi eris?
 Nunquam ego illic ero.

Quis pater tuus est?
 Quidnam horum est tuum?
 Numquid horum tuum est?
 Hi sunt nostri cives.
 Hic est noster civis.
 Fuit ille civis noster.
 Vester civis illic erat.
 Numquis est illic?
 Aliquis est ibi.
 Nemo hic est.
 Nihil illic erat.
 Hæc sunt mea.
 Illa erant tua.
 Omnia hic sunt nostra.
 Mox erunt vestra.
 Vestra sunt apud nos.
 Mea sunt apud te.
 Quot estis?
 Quantum apud te est?
 Qualis est hic vir?
 Quale est hoc?
 Quot erant illi?
 Ut tu es, sic est ille.
 Hoc est, sicut illud.
 Hæc sunt, velut illa.
 Tu es mihi tanquam pater.
 Hic est alius.
 Hoc est aliud.
 Ille est alter.

The pronouns *sui, suus* cannot be used in this stage, nor can *quispiam, iste*, and some others. When the principal pronouns are thoroughly learned, I apprehend that it will be expedient to proceed to learn all the personal pronouns, and *hic* and *ille*, through all their cases, and the declension of many very common nouns, in conjunction with these, or with possessives. I mean that while one boy would have to decline *hic equus, hujus equi, huic equo*, etc., another would say *meus pater, mei patris*, a third, *illud regnum, illius regni*, etc. This habit of connecting some pronoun with a substantive appears to fix its gender in the memory much better than is done by technical rules which rest on no principle.

This leads me to remark, that in French and German no error from a foreigner is thought more venial than mistake as to the gender of a noun. To attain a sound knowledge of words, and good idiom, are the cardinal virtues, which atone for all other defects. Surely it cannot be wise to reverse this judgment in Latin: to visit severely on boys everything which can be called a "grammatical" error, while we in mere despair are lenient towards error in idiom. Of course there are grammatical errors which imply a total want of reading; as a mistake in the mode of conjugating the commonest verbs in the language, as to which there is no variety in the classics. But in other cases a grammatical error may be the least which can be committed. Indeed a scholar who disuses a language, and returns to it after awhile, finds that though its idiom is natural to him, and its sense clear, he is often embarrassed with many small doubts: he asks perhaps what is the gender of *cupido*, of *dies*,—knows there was some puzzle about it, and perhaps cannot remember what.

When the cases of a moderate number of nouns are known, small sentences should be constructed introducing principally the *imperatives* of verbs, and perhaps the whole present tense of *habeo*, joined with various prepositions and personal pronouns. I mean such as the following:—

Da mihi librum meum.
Duc me ad patrem meum.
Mitte has epistolas.
Fer opem mihi extemplo.

Habeo apud me nihil.
Habet multa secum.
Habent omnia apud se.
Habent nihil secum, etc. etc.

In a language which we need to *talk*, a full knowledge of all the numerals is wanted as early as anything else; but in Latin a moderate number at first suffices: say, the ten first cardinals and ordinals, with 20, 30, 40; 90, 100, 1000. But these should become *very* familiar. After this, my own experience would suggest that a young pupil should actually learn off, but an adult (or one who learns with the heart and intelligence of an adult) should keep under his eye, and often refer to, a full table of the commonest words, which are neither verbs nor nouns, classified in some convenient way. Such are:—

Hic.	Quomodo ?	Nunc.	Multum.	Prope.
Hinc.	Quare.	Tunc.	Parum.	Longe.
Huc.	Cur.	Jam.	Paullum.	Procul.
Illic.	Quamobrem.	Mox.	Parumper.	
Illinc.	Quapropter.	Dudum.	Vix.	
Illuc.	Quemadmodum.	Diu.	Fere.	Hodie.
Istic.		Nunquam.	Duntaxat.	Cras.
Istinc.	Tanquam.	Semper.	Tantum.	Heri.
Istuc.	Quamquam.	Pridem.	Modo.	Mane.
Ibi.	Is—qui.	Paulisper.	Nonnisi.	Vesperis.
Ubi.	Tot—quot.	Illico.	Pæne.	
Ubinam ?	Tantum—quantum.	Extemplo.	Valde.	Quum.
Ubi ?	Talis—qualis.	Stätim.		Quando.
Unde.	Quisquis.	Continuo.		Simul ut.
Unde ?	Quicumque.	Postea.		Simul ac.
Quò.	Non—quidquam.	Antea.		Ut primum.
Quonam ?	Non—ullus.			Si quis.
	Nullus.			Si quando, etc.

All this first part of learning belongs to Preparatory Grammar, which should not attempt to be exhaustive, and should be such as mere memory is easily able to take in. But I proceed from this to the question of the first Reading-Book.

This I should wish to consist of easy dialogues, or letters conveying a narrative, on some topic in which the ancient world had nothing fundamentally different from what we now see and know. For instance, one of the talkers might give an account of a journey, or any story which conveys information. *The essential thing is, that no sentence should consist of more than two clauses*, and the participle and the infinitive mood should be carefully restricted to the simplest cases. (The verb *Dico*, followed by the infinitive, may be translated *Declare*, in order to keep the English infinitive, until the pupil is familiarized with the idiom: as, *Dixit se velle*, He declared himself to be willing. So, *Scio eum fecisse*, I know him to have done; *Scivi eum ire*, I knew him to go.) Any small tales, fables, myths, of Germany, Greece, or England, that are about as long as a fable of Æsop, but are neither hackneyed nor stupid, would serve as good material. Perhaps some passages of Terence and other old classics, carefully selected, might also be found easy enough to be added.

Here, nevertheless, the remark is in place, and I think is important, that *very short pieces complete in themselves* draw out effort from the learner much better than long compositions. Even with elder pupils in a college every new book is a relief: a large part of a class is tired by anything so long as even a book of Virgil, and is very glad of a change. An intelligent learner, for some time self-educated, told me that in spite of the great difficulties in Horace's Odes, their shortness had been an invaluable stimulus to the study. Every time the learner finishes something, he seems to have made a real step; and he pauses with satisfaction as one who is ascending a mountain rests and looks down from a piece of flat ground. I will not here spend more words on the topic, though I believe it deserves an attention which it has never yet received.

At the same time, specific words should be translated specifically, and sentences should be rejected in which the English is thereby made too enigmatic. I mean, for instance, that *Unda* should be always rendered wave, and never water; *Vis* should be rendered force, and never strength; *Robur* should be rendered stoutness, and never strength, etc. Unless this is done, young students will almost infallibly carry off a false notion of the meaning and use of words.

But the more important question is, What should be learned by heart? For it ought to have both *intrinsic interest* and *moral excellence*: it ought to deserve to dwell in the imagination, and remain permanently in the memory. For this, it ought not to be merely morally harmless; the sentiments should be such as one can regard to be positively good and pleasing. Then again, it should have something of beauty; and, to aid the memory, something of rhythm. My notion is, that we ought to select a large number of elegant, easy, pleasing pieces of *English* poetry, each short and complete in itself,—all of which ought to be learned off, and with each of them its close translation into Latin poetical style, without metre, but with such rhythm as its correspondence to the English would easily suggest. The knowledge of the English would aid to imprint the Latin in the memory, and this would furnish the pupil with a great amount of Latin diction, by a process far more pleasing, not only than the learning of vocabulary, but also than the learning of Latin poetry, which is so often alien to our sentiment and judgment; besides that we should be able to avoid those extreme entanglements of words, which often make Latin poetry an enigma to the learner. I have made attempts myself in the following manner:—I employed two young persons to select pleasing pieces of English poetry, distrusting my own sole taste, and then translated them into Latin. Having put them into the hands of one who had not read much of Latin poetry, I requested to have all passages marked which were thought obscure. By some such process, I think it would not be difficult to correct and correct, until the translations were extremely perspicuous. It afterwards occurred to me that Longfellow's *Hiawatha*, though by reason of the monotonous rhythm it is less suitable in English to learn by heart, contained excellent material for instructive Latin, if occasionally abridged. This poem* I accordingly translated; and, until something better shall have been thought of, I feel assured that a vast deal might be learned from it with more pleasure and ease than from poems which excite no interest in a pupil. Further, it seems to me that we want what I may call a Latin novel or romance; that is, a pleasing *tale of fiction*, which shall convey numerous Latin words which do not easily find a place in poetry, history, or philosophy. Nothing has struck me as being so much to the purpose as an imitation of the story of *Robinson Crusoe*, which brings in much that is technical to special occupations, as in nautical affairs, carpentering, fowling, pottery, basket-making, agriculture, etc. But the main point on which I

* [We shall take an early opportunity of laying a specimen of the style of this translation before our readers.—ED.]

would insist is, that the style should be as simple as that of Terence, of course without its elliptical or allusive character. If any one had genius to produce in Terentian style Latin comedies worthy of engaging the minds and hearts of youth (for I can never read a play of Terence to a young class without the heart-ache), I should regard this as a valuable contribution.

Finally, I am disposed to believe that a learner gains much from seeing difficult pieces of English prose (or poetry) well translated into Latin, provided that the translation is very close to the original; but otherwise it does not instruct. Nothing else so clearly marks the diversity of the two languages.

My general persuasion is, that if during two years the usual proportion of school time devoted to Latin were employed on such a plan as I have indicated—that which has been learned by heart being of course proved and checked by questionings and "parsings"—in a third year the learner would find he had so grasped the material of the language, that with moderate effort any Latin author would be within his reach, except so far as the subject was intrinsically obscure. He would still need to learn peculiar usages of words, which, though common in some of the very best authors, are undesirably ambiguous; not only nouns and verbs in plenty, such as *consilium*, *imperium*, *recipio*, etc., but what is worse, conjunctions, such as the *quum* in Cicero; or the use of *ut-ita* for *quamquam*—*tamen* in Livy and Tacitus. Smaller peculiarities of style would make a dictionary occasionally needful; yet, I believe, a youth of average talent would find himself nearly independent of a teacher (as far as the mere language was concerned) after the course which I have indicated. He would also be fully prepared in his third year to receive philosophical views both of etymology and of syntax, such as the modern grammarians develop.

It is for my reader to consider what weight there is in these considerations; and, if he approve of anything which I have written, to give his moral influence in that direction whenever the practical occasion is offered.

F. W. NEWMAN.

II. ASCHAM AND HIS "SCHOLEMASTER."

EDUCATION can boast of several noble representatives in English literature. Considering, indeed, the extent to which the subject has been written about, a greater number of works might have been expected to have taken a place amongst the classics of the language. In proportion to the scattering abroad, the harvest is doubtless small. But let us be thankful that it is good, containing as it does Elyot's *Gouernour*, Ascham's *Schole-Master*, Milton's *Tractate*, and Locke's *Thoughts*,—works which, though none of them may satisfy the require-