

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE TOLEDO MS. OF THE AGRICOLA.

ALL students will be disappointed to hear that there appears to be no present probability of our obtaining any collation of this MS. As long ago as Jan. 26 I received information from Dr. R. Wuensch, of Breslau, respecting his visit to Toledo in 1896. It was only with difficulty that he obtained permission from the Bishop even to look at the MS., and no examination of its readings was allowed, on the ground that any publication of its contents would lessen its value. He was only able to note as follows. It is entitled 'Codex bibliothecae capitularis Toletanae No. 49, 2; chart. s. xv. fol. min., about 200 pages of 29 lines: fol. 1-15 contain the Germania, beginning, 'Cor. Taciti de vita moribus et origine Germanorum opus elegantissimum feliciter incipit,' and ending 'ῥέλωσ. Fulginie scriptum gerente me magistratum pu. scribae, Kal. Jun. 1471.'

The Agricola then follows on fol. 16-36. Afterwards comes Joannis Antoni Campani oratoris oratio,' with the subscriptio: 'scripta per me M. Angelum Crullum (Trullum?) Tudertinum Fulginii pu. scribam noñ Decembr. 1471.' Then follow letters of Plin. mi. (Books 8 and 9) with occasional signature of M. Angel Tuders, 1468. The MS. ends with an incomplete letter.

I should have long since communicated to the *Review* this information so kindly sent by Dr. Wuensch, but have been hoping from time to time to hear that the efforts made by Professor Gudeman to obtain a collation had been more successful. As no news to that effect has arrived, I fear we must conclude that his friend has also been stopped by an episcopal 'non possumus.'

May 18, 1899.

H. FURNEAUX.

THE REVISED LATIN PRIMER.

THE announcement of a new revision of the Latin Primer raised many hopes: its publication has dashed them to the ground.

Some improvements have been made, but they are few. The book still remains thoroughly unsatisfactory. How unsatisfactory only those who have had to teach from it for years can adequately realise, and it would take many pages to show with any completeness; but the following are a few samples of its quality.

The last edition gives, what was much needed, lists of exceptions to the regular formation of the Gen. Plur. of the 3rd Decl. (Appendix IV. p. 225). The heading runs thus: 'Nouns not increasing in Genitive Singular which have Genitive Plural in -um.' This is the first and only intimation in the book that there is any connexion between increase in Gen. Sing. and the formation of Gen. Plur. Then there follows under 'I Stems'

'In the Plural Genitive
vates (bard) does *vatum* give:
And generally agree with this
panis, apis, volucris.'

Now leaving out of consideration the late forms *caedum, cladum, subolum*, Cicero uses

mensum, sedum, and vatium, Ovid *ambagum* there is no known instance of *volucrum* as a substantive; the only authority for *panum* is a grammarian, and *apium* is decidedly the better prose form.

Therefore each of the four statements is inaccurate in varying degree, while three words are omitted altogether.

The lists of 'Nouns increasing in Genitive Singular, which have Genitive Plural in -ium' are not more successful. Here under 'Consonant Stems'

'ium in Plural Genitive
os (*ossis*) and *as* (*assis*) give:
mas, mus, dos and *cos* and *lis*,
nox and *niç*, and *sol* and *glis.*'

To class *as, os* and *nox* under Consonant Stems is, to say the least, doubtful doctrine. *Cos* and *sol* are usually believed to have no Gen. Plur. in use: the authority for *dotum* is as good as for *panum*, while no mention is made of *fraus, laus, lar, strix, vis, fauces, renes, penates, optimates*, the 'civitas' class, nor of the patrials in -as or -is (e.g. *Arpinas, Quiris*). To sum up, the lines omit more than they insert, and of what they do insert more than half is incorrect or doubtful.

The second list under this heading runs thus: 'I Stems,'

'In the Plural Genitive

frons (*frontis*) does *frontium* give:
so *frons* (*frondis*), *stirps*, *arx*, and *dens*,
mons, *urbs*, *ars*, *bidens*, and *parens*.'

This is an even more curious production than that which precedes. There appear *frons* (*frontis*) and *mons* but not *fons* or *pons*; *frons* (*frondis*) but not *glans*; *dens* but not *gens* or *mens*; *ars* but not *pars*; *parens* is bereft of *infans*, and such words as *sors* and *cohors* are ignored altogether.

Of course no sensible master would dream of letting his boys learn such erroneous and misleading lines. Their only use could be, like the drunken Helot, to serve as a warning of what a Grammar ought not to be; but it raises a blush to think that this is published *urbi et orbi*, under the special patronage of the great Head Masters of England, as the ripest fruit of our academic scholarship, matured by the experience and revisions of thirty-three years. Let us only hope that few foreigners see it.

In such fashion have the latest additions to the Primer been compiled. The revisers have not been more successful in dealing with the mistakes and omissions of the earlier edition.

Mare still remains declined in full as a type of its class in spite of its Gen. Plur. *marum*.

The Future Imperative, after long banishment from other conjugations, still keeps its unintelligible footing in *edo*, § 140. Including this erratic survival there still are found four different methods of printing the Imperative Mood, a large discretion having, it would seem, been left to the printer's devil.

Tulisse still figures as derived from the Supine-stem of *fero*, amid a confused mass of Infinitives and Participles, Active and Passive, without order, name or meaning, *inops inhumataque turba*.

There still stands the brazen assertion in § 55 that *acus*, *tribus*, *lacus*, *partus*, *portus*, *artus*, 'have always *-ubus*.'

In defiance of Vergil *glacies* is still classed as 'singular only,' and *veru*, without reserve, as 'dat. abl. plur. *ubus*.'

The rules for Gender still gape with omissions in well-nigh every part. The few lines given to the important subject of defective comparison of adjectives remain as before erroneous, misleading, and miserably inadequate.

Even in the 'Shorter' Primer the beginner cannot get beyond the 1st decl. without being taught that *terrae* is the ordinary Latin for 'on the ground.'

In the above remarks I have confined myself to a few points out of many in the *Accidence*. Some consider the *Syntax* even more faulty.

The comparison in this case would be particularly odious, and it is perhaps well that limits of space forbid it.

If the Primer stood upon its own merits, it would not be worth criticising and would long since have given way to a better book—even under the present discouragements at least one such has appeared—but, as it is, nearly all the great Head Masters use it and the small Head Masters must perforce follow suit, so that practically the whole Latin education of the country is based upon a work for which 'unsatisfactory' is a euphemism.

What harm has been and is being done to British scholarship it would be hard to estimate. Many of those who really have to teach the book have long been exasperated or depressed by the inferiority of the tool with which they are condemned to work. Not a few, it is to be feared, have never recovered the effects of being educated upon it themselves.

Of those who have, some in their bitterness of heart affirm the 'great' Head Masters to be like careless gods—

'For they lie beside their nectar, and the bolts are hurled

Far below them in the valleys,'

and it must be admitted that to be bombarded by bad grammar in a foreign tongue from a coign of vantage is trying.

Such, however, is not quite the writer's view. He believes those exalted personages to be not so much indifferent as simply ignorant of the facts of the case. Great Head Masters do not teach the Latin Primer to little boys. Their duties are multifarious and concerned with higher things. Naturally, therefore, they do not know the details of the book; and if perchance a voice of lamentation should now and then reach their ears, trusting to the author's honoured name, but forgetting that as a great Head Master himself he was little fitted by practical experience to write a working grammar for junior boys, they deem the cry 'like a tale of little meaning, though the words are strong.'

Monopolies and vested interests are no doubt hard to deal with. But surely the matter is one of such importance, both for the credit of the scholastic profession and the future of British education, that those who are responsible for these difficulties ought to grapple with them promptly, and, let us hope, effectually.

A. SLOWAN.