

larger book and for the prose parts of Lily, except perhaps for the fewness of the metrical rules to be noticed on its pages (there are a few of them there), and the Dutch words and phrases (many of them curiously English in sound) that appear as translations of examples. I learn from the earliest preface to this work, dated at Utrecht in 1626, that Vossius had done for Holland what the decree of Henry the Eighth had affected for England, namely, cleared it of the pest of conflicting grammars: an exploit which Vossius alludes to as resembling the "Augean labour of Hercules." The States of Holland had first desired the great critic Justus Lipsius to undertake the work; but he declined. The task was then imposed on Vossius. For his countryman, Despauter, of whom we have already heard something, Vossius had a great respect. Despauter, it seems, was blind of one eye, and Vossius said that he saw clearer into the grammatical art with his one eye than all his contemporaries with two.

Gerard John Vossius was a great scholar, and he came to an end not inappropriate. While he was ascending a ladder in his library at Amsterdam in 1649, the ladder broke; an avalanche of volumes descended, and Vossius was found dead on the floor, buried beneath a pyramid of books.

Kendrick's abridgment of Zumpt's Latin Grammar, of which I find I have a copy, appeared in England in 1830. Herein for the first time perhaps, young English lads were introduced to the German method of deducing the rules of the Latin Syntax from the analysis of a proposition into its elements of subject and predicate; and other terms began to be rendered familiar to them, which in sound belonged to logic, as for example, protasis and apodosis, the hypothetical or limiting clause, and

the consequent proposition, in a sentence.

My little Valpy's Elements of Latin Grammar I have looked over again with considerable pleasure. It is admirable for its brevity and great precision, and for the excellent clearness of its typography. It is wholly in English, but it deviates not at all from the old lines. Dr. R. Valpy was one of those solid English Latin scholars who fought to the last against the flood which he found rolling in over England from Germany, in philology as in other matters. We can understand the mood of mind in which he roundly asserted in the volume before us, that Johnson's Grammatical Commentaries (Richard Johnson, a once famous schoolmaster at Nottingham, who died in 1720), and Ruddiman's Institutiones, of which we have already heard, are "the two best works on Latin Grammar in this, and perhaps in every other country." (The latter portion of the observation sounds more cis-Atlantic than English.)

The Elementary Grammar of the Latin Language (London, 1847), by Dr. Benjamin Hall Kennedy, which I have placed as a companion to Dr. Valpy's manual, is another very conservative production; exceedingly complete, sound and solid. It goes strongly in for keeping the grammatical rules in Latin, and for making use of metrical memorial lines, but he departs from the tradition of Ruddiman and Lily, by substituting for the old hexameters rhyming Latin octosyllabics; which are certainly pleasanter to hear. A class of lads repeating the following, might be supposed to be engaged in the recitation of an old monkish hymn:

(I select at random. I take the lines which relate to nouns defective in Number.)

Singularis numerus—Multis deest nomini-bus.