

LB
1576
L8

UC-NRLF



LB 59 700





00
19
22

UNIVERSITY OF
CHICAGO

The University of Chicago

ENGLISH GRAMMAR IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS BEFORE 1850

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

LB1572:EG English U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BY

ROLLO LAVERNE LYMAN

Private Edition, Distributed By
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF EDUCATION, BULLETIN, 1921, No. 12
1922

70 VINI
ABSORUJA

The University of Chicago

ENGLISH GRAMMAR IN AMERICAN
SCHOOLS BEFORE 1850

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY
OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND LITERATURE
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

BY

ROLLO LA VERNE LYMAN

Private Edition, Distributed By
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Reprinted from

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF EDUCATION, BULLETIN, 1921, No. 12

1922

0 VNU
ALPHALAO

(LB1576
L8)

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Introduction.....	5
Chapter I.—Early instruction in the vernacular preceding English grammar.....	11
1. Character of vernacular instruction in English, 1596–1622.....	12
2. Reasons for early emphasis on vernacular in America.....	15
3. Character of vernacular instruction in America, 1620–1720.....	17
Chapter II.—Early appearances of English grammar in America.....	21
1. Schools and schoolmasters teaching English grammar before 1775....	21
2. English grammars in America before 1784.....	33
3. Early instruction in English grammar in American colleges.....	36
Chapter III.—Influences adding grammars to the curriculum.....	43
1. Franklin's English school.....	43
2. The influence of the Philadelphia English school.....	49
3. Educational theories supporting grammar in America up to 1775....	55
Chapter IV.—The rapid rise of grammar after 1775.....	70
1. The legislative recognition of grammar.....	70
2. The flood of textbooks after 1784.....	77
3. The extent of instruction in grammar in representative States, 1800–1850.....	82
4. The status of grammar, 1850 to 1870.....	92
Chapter V.—Traditional methods of teaching Latin grammar transferred to English grammar.....	103
1. Grammar as an art.....	105
2. Methods used in studying Lily, and Latin grammar in general, seventeenth century.....	107
3. Latin methods carried directly to English grammar memorization....	111
4. Parsing.....	120
5. False syntax.....	122
6. Subordinate methods.....	124
7. Methods used by Hughes and Byerley.....	128
Chapter VI.—Gradual changes in method before 1850.....	132
1. The nature of the dominating textbooks, 1823–50.....	134
2. Other agents and agencies in the inductive approach.....	140
3. Chief features of the inductive movement applied to grammar.....	144
Appendix A. Chronological catalogue of English grammars in America before 1800.....	155
Appendix B. A comparison of the English programs of Turnbull and Franklin.....	158
List of authorities cited in this dissertation:	
I. Primary sources.....	161
II. Secondary authorities.....	165
Index.....	169

NO. 1111
ABSTRACT

ENGLISH GRAMMAR IN AMERICAN SCHOOLS BEFORE 1850.

"A history of English grammar in the United States would afford some amusement if a rational mind could derive any amusement from perusing a record of abortive attempts to teach the correct use of language by every means but actual practice in the art of speaking and writing it."—WALLIS (W. B. FOWLE) (1850).

INTRODUCTION.

PRIMARY PURPOSES OF THE STUDY.

English grammar, as a formal subject, distinct from other branches of instruction in the vernacular, made but sporadic appearances in the American schools before 1775. After the Revolution its rise was extremely rapid. English grammar gained momentum as the hold of Latin grammar weakened, and by the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century it became so generally taught that the common term grammar school, formerly applied to the secondary school of the Latin-grammar type, was now by common consent used to designate an intermediate school with English grammar as its central study. After 1825 the prominence of English grammar became gradually more marked, until it reached its height about 1850–1875. Then began a period of decline, continuing until the time of the Committee of Fifteen, which made its report in 1895.¹

The past 25 years have seen a revival of attention to grammar, but of a very much saner type than before. No other study in the curriculum has had a more spectacular rise and a more dramatic fall. Moreover, concerning no other study to-day are educators more in doubt.²

The first purpose of this study is to trace the course of this rise and fall, with the changing educational ideals and theories accompanying it; to analyze the causes of the varied changes of the subject, and to determine when, where, why, and by whom the successive modifications were inaugurated and carried out prior to 1850.

¹ Rept. Com. Fifteen, Jour. Proc., N. E. A., 1895, p. 232. For recommendations concerning grammar see Rept. Com. Fifteen, Educational Review, IX, 234–41.

² The National Council of Teachers of English on Nov. 27, 1915, in Chicago, appointed a committee to consider and recommend a suitable treatment in the schools of formal grammar.

The second purpose of this dissertation is to arrange systematically these varying methods used from 1750 to 1850 and to show how they are interrelated both with the shifting conceptions of the nature and purpose of grammar and with the place given the study in the curriculum.

No effort seems to have been made to develop these two important aspects of English grammar with historical accuracy. Indeed, treatises on the general curriculum, in their infrequent references to this particular branch of the vernacular, are filled with inaccurate statements of fact and with misleading generalizations, particularly in regard to the early periods.³ Only one who has had to deal with such inaccuracies can realize how difficult it is to ascertain the truth concerning English grammar. It is therefore with due reservations that the writer states, as his third purpose, an effort to establish with concrete data a basis of reliable facts, especially in the vague period of English grammar before the American Revolution.

A fourth purpose which this study has been compelled to consider incidentally is to show how grammar was interrelated with declamation, oratory, composition, and literature, as these five branches of instruction in the mother tongue of a higher order than reading, writing, and spelling gradually made their way into the program of American schools.

SOURCES.

This investigation rests primarily upon an intensive examination of early English grammars, with special attention to those in use from 1750 to 1850. The date 1750 has been determined upon as most suitable to mark the beginnings of instruction in formal English grammar in America.⁴

The grammars, then, of the eighteenth century, many of which passed through several editions both in England and America, were

³ Three examples of such errors will suffice to illustrate. One writer affirms: "English Grammar was there (in Caleb Bingham's school, 1790) taught for the first time in Boston." W. B. Fowle, *English Grammar*, C. S. J., XII (1850), 72. Here is an error of at least 23 years (see Ch. II, p. 23, which has been widely accepted as stating the truth. Again, Noah Webster affirmed that "no English grammar was generally taught in common schools when I was young." (1770. *Am. J. of Ed.*, XIII, 124. Letter to Henry Barnard, dated 1840.) This, coming from the author of at least the fifth American grammar (see Chap. II) (not the first, as commonly believed), has been largely influential in misinforming later writers upon the curriculum. Again, so careful a writer as Reeder asserts, concerning Noah Webster's "Grammatical Institutes of the English Language," "these books [a speller, grammar, and reader, 1783-1785] were the first works of the kind published in the United States. They were gradually introduced into most of the schools of the country." Reeder, *Hist. Dev. of Sch. Readers, etc.*, 30. On the contrary, Webster's grammar was not the first American grammar, and it enjoyed neither a long nor an extensive use as a textbook. W. B. Fowle, *op. cit.*, 74 and 203. Reeder's statement is accurate concerning the speller and the reader, but it is quite erroneous concerning Part. II of Webster's series.

⁴ See Chap. II, p. 33.

largely influential in determining school practices of the day. Book learning in the eighteenth century had an even more literal significance than it has to-day in many an ill-conducted classroom. "As the textbook, so the study" is a comparatively safe assumption.

So, too, for primary evidence as to the changes in methods of instruction, beginning about 1823, the writer has turned to the leading texts of the various periods. For example, this dissertation points out that 1850 was the central turning point in the history of methods in grammar.⁵ Greene's "Analysis" of 1847 was the culmination of various influences breaking away from the older conceptions and the forerunner of numerous other textbooks of the next 25 years. Likewise Swinton's *Language Lessons*, of 1873, came as the result of scattered agitation and efforts of the previous quarter century, and in their wide adoption Swinton's *Lessons* fastened upon the schools the new idea of grammar as incidental to exercises in writing and speaking. And, of a more recent period, Swett's *Grammar*, with its imitators, has given the still newer turn of incidental study to the subject of formal grammar.

In addition to the textbooks themselves the educational writings of authors contemporary with the various periods have thrown considerable light upon various advances made in classroom methods. To be sure, a commentator like Comenius, Hoole, Brinsley, Locke, Franklin, or Mann is usually, in his theory, more or less in advance of his time, and the reforms he advocates are indicative of methods which do not become general for a considerable period after his advocacy of them.⁶

In addition, the writer is indebted to Dr. Marcus W. Jernegan, of the University of Chicago, for generous advice and assistance, and especially for permission to use his voluminous data on private schools taken from colonial newspapers. This material has been of invaluable aid, especially in indicating many of the private schools of the eighteenth century whose schoolmasters were pioneers in adding English grammar to their curricula.

⁵ See Chap. VI, p. 133.

⁶ For example, in 1786 Benjamin Rush, of Pennsylvania, advocated, concerning the teaching of English grammar, principles which even in 1920 are very far from being accomplished.

"Let the first eight years of a boy's time be employed in learning to speak, spell, read, and write the English language. For this purpose, let him be committed to the care of a master who speaks correctly at all times, and let the books he reads be written in a simple but correct style. During these years let not an English grammar by any means be put into his hands. It is to most boys under 12 years of age an unintelligible book. As well might we contend that a boy should be taught the names and number of the humors of the eye or the muscles of the tongue, in order to learn to see or to speak, as be taught the English language by means of grammar. Sancho Panza in attempting to learn to read by chewing the four and twenty letters of the alphabet did not exhibit a greater absurdity than a boy of seven or eight years old does in committing grammar rules to memory in order to understand the English language." Wickersham, *Hist. of Ed. in Pa.*, 234. "Between his fourteenth and eighteenth years he should be instructed in grammar, oratory," etc. *Ibid.*, 255.

The history of the actual teaching of English grammar is quite different from a history of the theories of teaching grammar. Throughout this study the author has endeavored to keep strictly to the former point of view—that is, to keep a firm hold upon the actual classroom practices of successive periods. Evidence of an extensive sale of textbooks, for example, is taken as reliable proof as to what constituted the subject matter of schoolroom activities.

More reliable, however, than textbooks or educational writings for determining the exact status of English grammar at any definite period are statutes, curricula, and school reports. Wherever it has been possible, these sources have been utilized to determine how far school practices in any period conformed to the theories of the best educational writers and embodied the innovations of the most progressive textbooks. Incidental to these, information has been derived from town histories, reports of educational commissions, early journals of education, and such other information as may be found in miscellaneous sources, like newspaper advertisements, reminiscences, lives of schoolmasters, and histories of individual institutions.

THE BEGINNINGS OF GRAMMAR, NOT OF THE VERNACULAR INSTRUCTION.

This study has to deal primarily with English grammar in American schools. Main interest therefore centers upon the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Indeed, the year 1750, the date of the first important vernacular school in America to center its instruction around English grammar, is about 200 years too late at which to begin the study of the development of this branch of teaching. But the important fact to bear in mind is that this is a study of English grammar, not of the vernacular. Moreover, it is a study of English grammar in America, not in England. Therefore its treatment plunges in medias res and touches upon the vernacular before the eighteenth century and upon grammar in England only as demanded by the course of the subject in America and as directly inherited from England in theories, textbooks, and schoolroom practices.

BEARING ON MODERN PROBLEMS.

It has apparently been the fate of new branches in vernacular instruction, once introduced into American schools, to be carried to excess. Perhaps this is not true of reading and writing; but of the newer branches, spelling, which began correctly as an incidental study, became a craze in the first quarter of the nineteenth century and came to occupy an undue proportion of attention. Elaborate school instruction was supplemented by evening spelling schools and spelling matches. Webster's blue-backed speller enjoyed a sale

unrivaled in our school annals.⁷ Fifty years after the dominance of spelling English grammar rose to its height, occupying, from 1850 to 1875, three to seven years of the secondary schools and, in addition, a prominent place in the high schools. After 1875, with the subsidence of grammar to its correct place as an incidental study, composition gained in strength, and, together with literature carefully prescribed by college entrance requirements, to-day monopolizes one-fourth of the high-school curriculum, while formal language lessons predominate in the elementary school.

The history of spelling and of grammar suggests that 50 years hence educators will be saying that in the two decades from 1900 to 1920 the school had not yet discovered that language habits are not most advantageously acquired in formal composition; that literature is a present reality, with living poets and prose writers, rather than a dusty contribution from masters who lived centuries ago. The historian of the future may smile at the excess of oral composition when carried into elaborate State declamatory contests. Indeed, in the light of the past one argument for increasing the time given to formal classes in the vernacular is at least questionable. If children can not spell, we are urged, give them more classes in spelling; if they are grammatically inaccurate, give them more grammar; if they can not write, give them more classes in composition; if they can not appreciate the pale heroes of King Arthur's court, give them Milton's minor poems and Carlyle's Essay on Burns. The very questionable logic of this argument led to excess in the time devoted to spelling and to grammar, and it has been a powerful factor in advancing composition and literature to their present status.

There can be little doubt that the period 1900 to 1920 is the heyday of formal composition and of the classics in the English curriculum, just as the date 1825 was the heyday of spelling and that of 1860 the heyday of grammar. And still the cry is that English departments are failures and their product exceedingly imperfect, and English teachers are demanding ever larger appropriations. English is more fortunate than its sister studies in being able to have the value of its product weighed every day in the practical life of its graduates. English welcomes criticism of its deficiency. English is experimenting with conversation lessons, with present-day literature; English is begging other departments to cooperate in establishing correct language habits; English is endeavoring to put oral composition on a sensible basis. Here and there a daring reformer is advocating less time for formal classes in English, their place to be taken by more general and uniform guidance in language habits. Here and there

⁷ "It is computed that more than 80,000,000 copies of this spelling book were sold before 1880." Evans Am. Bibl.; 6, 263.

school officials are even rejecting for other departments teachers whose English is slovenly, just as they reject candidates whose appearance is careless and uncleanly.

History in the teaching of the mother tongue is being made to-day. Therefore the writer feels that any light which may be thrown upon the history of any one branch of English instruction from its very beginning in America may assist modern reformers in securing a better perspective as they advance to more important innovations. The heart of the newer movements in the vernacular is well expressed by Sir Oliver Lodge: "Language should be learned in a pupil's stride—not by years of painful application." This sentiment, moreover, is the direct opposite of the spirit and aims of instruction in formal grammar in America up to 1850.

Chapter I.

EARLY INSTRUCTION IN THE VERNACULAR PRECEDING ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

The history of the educational changes by which instruction in the English vernacular has been grafted upon the classical instruction of the sixteenth century involves two distinct movements. The first occurred after the Reformation; it was led by Comenius, Brinsley, Hoole, and others; it resulted in the addition of reading, writing, and spelling in the mother tongue to the curriculum of elementary schools and to the lower classes of grammar schools.⁸ The second movement may be said to have begun in 1693 with John Locke and his immediate followers; it resulted in the addition of English grammar, composition, both oral and written, and literature to the curriculum of intermediate schools and colleges.⁹

While it is true that these two movements, corresponding roughly to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, respectively, were closely related, they were also quite distinct and involve two different conceptions of education. The seventeenth-century reform demanded the vernacular for two reasons: First, as a necessary preliminary for boys who were to continue their education in the classics; second, as suitable instruction for the masses, not destined for higher schools, but needing to read the Bible in the vernacular, according to the spirit of the Reformation.

The important consideration is that the seventeenth-century reform still regarded education in the classics as of highest worth. On the contrary, the eighteenth-century reform began where the former left off. It found the elementary branches of the vernacular established as the preliminaries of classical instruction. John Locke headed the revolt against the Latin curriculum as the sole content of secondary education. He and his followers insisted that the mother tongue itself is better suited than Latin to serve at once as the end and the vehicle of secondary education. They placed English in the curriculum not as preliminary to but as a substitute for the Latin tongue.¹⁰ It was through this eighteenth-century movement that English gram-

⁸ See Watson, *Beginnings of Mod. Subj.*, 20, for excellent discussion of this earlier movement.

⁹ See Chap. III, p. 55.

¹⁰ Full discussion in Chap. III, p. 55.

mar, composition, and literature entered the curriculum and began the course which has brought them to the dignified place they occupy to-day.

It is obvious that a study which seeks to trace the entrance of English grammar into American pedagogy has to deal primarily with the eighteenth-century reform. In other words, the point of departure in this dissertation may be said to be 1693, the date of John Locke's *Thoughts on Education*. The first movement for the vernacular, with its causes and results, is postulated as having been completed, and the later reform of the eighteenth century begun, by that date.

This thesis shows that English grammar was introduced primarily as the core study of a secondary school curriculum of the English rather than of the Latin type; that the traditions of Latin grammar as the heart of grammar-school instruction pointed at first positively and directly to English grammar as the core of an English program of equal rank with the Latin grammar program. In other words, this dissertation is the story of the process by which the dreary grind of Latin grammar was supplanted, for the great majority of American school children, by the almost equally futile grind of English grammar.

Although we have selected 1693 as the starting point of our discussion, let us now examine briefly the character of the vernacular instruction in England and America from 1620 to the end of the seventeenth century. This is done merely to establish a suitable background for the entrance of English grammar. It is a glance at what vernacular instruction was just before grammar appeared in America.

1. CHARACTER OF VERNACULAR INSTRUCTION IN ENGLAND, 1596-1622.

In 1596 Edmund Coote published in London his famous vernacular textbook for "pettie" schools. The title indicates its nature: "The English School Master, Teaching all his Scholars, of what age soever, the most easy, short, and perfect order of distinct Reading, and true Writing our English-tongue. * * *" ¹¹ Brinsley and Hoole, leading school writers of their day—1600-1650—both speak of Coote's *School Master*, 1596, as a popular text for elementary schools. ¹² Before 1656 the book had passed through 26 editions, proof enough of its popularity. ¹³

An examination of the contents of this text enables one to see early seventeenth-century vernacular instruction in England. Thirty-two

¹¹ Barnard, *Am. J. of Ed.*, I (1856), 309.

¹² Brinsley, *Ludus Literaris*, 18. Hoole, *New Discovery*, 43.

¹³ Watson, *Grammar Schools*, 177.

pages are given to instruction in the alphabet and spelling; about 18 pages to the catechism, prayers, and psalms; five pages to chronology; two to writing copies; two to arithmetic; the remainder to lists of hard words "sensibly explained." The child using this book first learned his letters, then short syllables, next longer ones, then reading by the word method, with spelling incidental to both alphabet and reading. Writing was insignificant.¹⁴

Brinsley's course in the "pettie" school consisted of studies in this order: The alphabet, the A B C (including spelling) taught by the use of Coote's School Master, the primer "twice thro," The Psalms in Meter, The Testament, and the "Schoole of Vertue," together with "The Schoole of good manners."¹⁵

A complete description of vernacular instruction at the end of the sixteenth century is given by Charles Hoole. In 1659 Hoole published "A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School," having been written 23 years before.¹⁶ Hoole, to be sure, was mainly interested in the Latin school, but he also prescribes a "petty schoole" for children between the ages of 4 and 8. Hoole was a practical school man, head master of the Rotherdam Grammar School in Yorkshire, and principal of a private school in London.¹⁷

Hoole based his discussion of methods upon the following arrangement:

1. Preparatory lessons in vocalization before learning the letters.
2. Learning the alphabet with the hornbook.
3. Proceeding from syllables of two letters, various vowels with each consonant, using dice, pictures, charts. In his primer Hoole gives a picture with the letters. "I have published a New Primar. In the first leafe whereof I have set Roman Capitalls . . . and have joyned therewith the pictures or images of some things whose names begins (Hoole's grammar is imperfect) with that letter, by which a childs memory may be helped, . . . as A for an Ape, B for a Bear, etc."
4. Teaching the child to spell distinctly; pronounce the vowels alone; teaching the force of the consonants; syllables of one consonant before a vowel; teaching the diphthongs; then begin spelling of words (learning six rules of spelling).

¹⁴ Watson, 177. It is worth noting that English grammar made its way into America chiefly through Dilworth's "New Guide to the English Tongue," 1740, which was a reader, speller, and grammar combined. A composite textbook was popular when books were scarce. Coote's composite book was an early prototype of such texts, of which Dilworth was the most widely used in America. (See Ch. II, p. 33.)

¹⁵ Brinsley, 14-18. The title of this book is "The Schooles of Vertue and booke of good Nourture for chyldren and youth to learne theyr dutie by," by Francis Seager (earliest edition 1557; one as late as 1677). Reprinted, Early English Text Society, *The Babees Book*, 332-55.

¹⁶ Reprinted in *Am. J. of Ed.*, XVII (1864), 195, 225, 293; more recently by C. W. Bardeen.

¹⁷ "The Petty Schoole" was printed in Paul's Church Yard in 1659. Bardeen's reprint, 27 (title page).

5. Teaching him to read any English book perfectly.

The ordinary way to teach children to read is, after they have got some knowledge of their letters and a smattering of some syllables and words in the horn-book, to turn them into the A B C or Primar, and therein to make them name the letters, and spell the words, till by often use they can pronounce (at least) the shortest words at first sight.

For these books Hoole substitutes the Lord's Prayer, the Creed and the Ten Commandments printed in Roman capitals. He would have the child pronounce the words he can at first sight and "What he can not, to spell them, and to go them often over, till he can tell any tittle in them either in or without the book."

Then Hoole adds reading over "Psalms, Thanksgivings, and Prayers . . . till he have them pretty well by heart." Textbooks are "The Psalter, The Psalms in Meeter, The Schoole of good manners, . . . or such like easy books"; then the Bible, beginning with Genesis. Finally have him "take liberty to exercise himself in any English book." When "he can perfectly read in any place of a book that is offered him . . . I adjudge him fit to enter into a Grammar Schoole, but not before. . . . For thus learning to read English perfectly I allow two or three years time, so that at seven or eight years of age a child may begin Latine."¹⁸

What the curriculum of the average charity school of England was about 1700 may be seen in an account of the Charity Schools of Great Britain and Ireland. Orders which were in effect in many schools were as follows:

Pronunciation: The Master Shall make it his chief Business to Instruct the Children . . . in the Church Catechism; which he shall first teach them to pronounce distinctly and plainly.

Spelling: The Master shall teach them the true spelling of Words and Distinction of Syllables, with the Points and Stops, which is necessary to true and good Reading.

Reading: As soon as the Boys can Read completely well, the Master shall
Writing: teach them to Write a fair legible Hand.

There is presented an account of 100 such schools (1710), with 2,480 boys and 1,381 girls, which had been set up during the preceding 14 years. A common stipulation in many gifts for these schools runs "for teaching them to Read, Write, Cast Account, and Work, and for instructing them to the knowledge of the Christian Religion."¹⁹

On the basis of this examination of Coote, Brinsley, and Hoole we are able to see the nature of vernacular instruction in England in the better "petty" schools from 1569 and continuing until the eighteenth

¹⁸ Bardeen, op. cit., 31-53.

Hoole adds a chapter to his "Petty Schoole" in which he points out how children for whom Latin is thought unnecessary may be employed after they have learned English. *Ibid.*, 54.

¹⁹An account of the Charity Schools of Great Britain and Ireland, 9th ed., 1710, 3-15.

century. If Hoole is correct, "the A. B. C. being now (I may say) generally thrown aside, and the ordinary Primar not printed,"²⁰ the use of these two famous educational instruments was diminishing, together with the hornbook.²¹

We may sum up the English practice at the time the first American colonies were established by saying that vernacular instruction consisted of elementary reading, spelling, and writing; that it retained an intensely religious purpose, involving ability to read the Bible; that it was regarded as preliminary to the study of Latin. We shall see that these characteristics were transferred bodily to the first elementary schools of America.

2. REASONS FOR EARLY EMPHASIS ON VERNACULAR IN AMERICA.

Two major reasons led the English colonists to stress the mother tongue in elementary instruction. As is customary, our consideration begins with the Puritan colony of Massachusetts, the character of the first settlers, their purpose in coming to America, and their major interests in the new land. Only eight years after the settlement of Massachusetts Bay that Colony established a college in Cambridge. Harvard was founded in 1636.²² This highly significant act was due to the fact that a large proportion of the first settlers were thoroughly acquainted with the higher education and educational institutions of the mother country.²³ By 1650, within New England, there had settled at least 90 men, ministers, the leaders of Massachusetts Bay, most of whom were graduates of Oxford and Cambridge. Three-fourths of these were from Cambridge, the hotbed of revolt against Laud and established religious authority. They had been students there between the years 1600 and 1650, contemporaries of Robinson, Cromwell, and Milton. Of this number were John Cotton, John Ward, John Harvard, John Winthrop, Henry Dunster, and many others, not all clergymen. By 1650 the immigration into New England had reached 20,000 of pure English stock, and it is estimated that there was one person of higher education for every 40 families. The proportion for Massachusetts Bay was even larger than the general average for New England. This unusually large proportion of educated men were leaders of groups of immigrants, some of whom had themselves been landed proprietors in England and had enjoyed at least an elementary education in the grammar schools of the mother country.²⁴

It was among such a people, whose actions were directed by such leaders, that an early movement for education might be expected. The colleges and the grammar schools first established were, of course,

²⁰ Bardeen, *op. cit.*, 50.

²¹ The standard work is Tuer, *History of the Horn Book*.

²² *Rec. Co. Mass. Bay*, I, 183.

²³ F. B. Dexter, *Influences of the English Universities in the Development of New England*, *Proc. Mass. Hist. Soc.*, 1879-1880, 340 et seq.

²⁴ See M. W. Jernegan, *The Beginnings of Pub. Ed. in N. E.*, *Sch. Rev.*, XXIII, 326.

classical. They were in response to the ideal of the leaders that the State was responsible for the education of the most promising youth in order to perpetuate an educated leadership. Colleges were to train leaders, and as the college curriculum was entirely made up of classical studies, classical grammar schools were necessary to prepare boys for college.

But the colonists of Massachusetts were actuated by another ideal which grew out of their intensely religious nature and was the very heart of the Protestant movement the world over. This idea, ardent champions of which were Luther and Erasmus, was that the mass of the people should be able to go directly to the fountain head of all religious authority—the Bible itself.²⁵ To this end the Holy Word was brought out of the Latin into the vernacular and the people taught to read. Not all the people were to be educated in grammar school and college; that was reserved for the few destined to become leaders. But the rank and file of the people themselves must be able at least to read the Bible. In Germany, England, and America this ideal was the primary moving force which led to the introduction of universal instruction in the mother tongue.

We have, then, in the desire for educated leadership and in the desire for universal acquaintance with the Scriptures two impelling forces which actuated Puritan New England in her first educational endeavors.²⁶

Evidence on this point may be found in the first two general laws concerning education passed by the General Court of Massachusetts Bay. The act of 1642 ordered selectmen to take account of children, "especiality of their ability to read & undestand the principles of religion and the capital lawes of the country."²⁷ Even more strongly suggestive is the language of the law of 1647, which made compulsory both elementary and secondary education: "It being one chiefe piet (point) of y^tould deluder, Satan, to keepe men from the knowledge of y^e Scriptures, as in form^r times, by keeping y^m in an unknowne tongue."²⁸ This is the expression of the second ideal—that the Scriptures, in the known tongue, are to be accessible to all. "So in these latt^r times, by pswading from y^e use of tongues, y^t so at last y^e

²⁵ Luther translated the Testament in 1522; the entire Bible in 1534. Monroe, *Cyc. of Ed.*, 4, 94.

²⁶ Probably none of the other causes designated by Watson for the seventeenth-century movement for the vernacular in England were operative in America. Watson assigns, first, the growth of a national spirit after the Armada; second, the fact that England took more pride in her national independence of thought, and especially sought to give all people the ability to read the Scriptures; third, the feeling that, as the French tongue now contained the subject matter which had formerly been confined to the Latin, English might also be so utilized; fourth, the newly acquired literary possession in Spencer, Shakespeare, and Milton; and, finally, the increase of textbooks in English, beginning with the authorized prints of 1545, until "by the second half of the seventeenth century every important department of knowledge had been expounded in an English textbook." Watson, *op. cit.*, 531-5.

²⁷ *Rec. Co. Mass. Bay*, II, 9.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 203.

true sence & meaning of y^e originall might be clouded by false glosses of saint seeming deceivers.”²⁹ Here is the expression of the ideal for leadership educated in Latin and Greek. Elementary education in the vernacular and secondary and higher education in the classics were provided for by colony law in Massachusetts Bay in 1647, only 19 years after the original settlement. As we have seen, the ideals and motives were primarily religious. We are safe in saying not only that the American colonists inherited from England the grammar school and the college, but that they endeavored to go beyond the mother country in teaching the vernacular. Vernacular instruction is indissolubly associated with the Reformation, out of which the first New England colonies sprang.

3. CHARACTER OF VERNACULAR INSTRUCTION IN AMERICA, 1620-1720.

Colonial laws of the seventeenth century indicate that vernacular instruction consisted primarily of reading and secondarily of writing. In Massachusetts Bay the law of 1642 prescribed “ability to read & understand the principles of religion;”³⁰ the law of 1647 “to write and read”;³¹ that of 1683 “to wrighting schooles . . . in townes of five hundred families.”³² Reading and writing were similarly the content of vernacular education in Connecticut,³³ in New Haven,³⁴ in New York,³⁵ in New Hampshire,³⁶ in Pennsylvania,³⁷ in Maryland,³⁸ and in South Carolina.³⁹

That reading and writing were the two branches of the vernacular at first stressed in colonial schools is further borne out by examining the practice of various towns. In 1693, Dorchester, Mass., ordered a sum to be paid to Thomas Waterhouse, who “is bound to teach to read it shalbe left to his liberty in that poynt of teaching to write, only to doe what he can conveniently therein.”⁴⁰ Governor Winthrop, under date of 1645, writes: “Divers free schools were erected in Roxbury . . . and in Boston . . . teach to read and write and cipher. . . . Other townes did the like.”⁴¹ Moreover, after the general colony

²⁹ Ibid. The early colony law of Connecticut, 1650, also indicates as a primary purpose of education, teaching children to read the Scriptures. Col. Rec. Conn., I, 555.

³⁰ Rec. Co. Mass. Bay, II, 9.

³¹ Ibid., 203.

³² Ibid., V, 414.

³³ Col. Rec. Conn., I, 521.

³⁴ New Haven Col. Rec. (1653), 65, 583.

³⁵ Ann. of Albany, IV, 15, 16.

³⁶ Bouton, Prov. Papers of N. H., III (1692-1722), 718.

³⁷ Clews, op. cit., 281 and Pa. Col. Rec., I, 91.

³⁸ Steiner, Hist. of Ed. in Maryland, 19; and Clews, op. cit., 416.

³⁹ Ibid., 457.

⁴⁰ Orcott, Nar. Hist. Good Old Dorchester, 292.

⁴¹ Winthrop, Hist. of N. E., Savage, II, 264.

laws of Massachusetts Bay and Connecticut prescribed reading and writing, in 1647 and 1650, respectively, towns began to comply. For example, in Watertown, 1650, "Norcroffe was Chosen Schoole Master, for the teaching of Children to Reed to write & soe much of Lattin as . . . allso y^t teace such as desire to Cast accompt."⁴² Records indicate that other towns employed teachers to teach reading and writing.⁴³ It appears, therefore, that the English teaching of this period was exceedingly elementary. Reading was common in all schools; writing was considered worthy of more advanced teaching in some towns, but usually accompanied reading, taught by the same master; casting accounts and arithmetic began to appear toward the end of the century and were usually classed with the English branches.

In addition to the public schools so far considered, there were many private schools, in one order of which—the "dame" schools—⁴⁴ primary instruction in the mother tongue was the acknowledged purpose. For example, in Malden, Mass., Rebecca Parker kept such a school for several years.⁴⁵ Salem voted £15 to "Widow Catherine Dealland," in 1712, for teaching school among them.⁴⁶ One other typical example will suffice. In Hartford, Conn.,

there were in those times private schools of a lower grade. At least one such school was kept in Hartford, that of Widow Betts, "Goody Betts, the School Dame," who died in 1647. Her pupils were young children, whom she taught the simple lessons of the hornbook.⁴⁷

In short, Judd, in his history of Hadley, sums up the general practice when he says:

There were many cheap private schools . . . in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, kept by "dames" . . . where girls were instructed to read and sew, and in some small boys were taught to read Writing was considered far less important Probably not one woman in a dozen could write her name 150 years ago.⁴⁸

The instruction in these dame schools, which persisted well down into the nineteenth century,⁴⁹ consisted of the simplest elements of the vernacular. The textbooks have been described so often that a mere mention here will suffice. Books chiefly employed were the A B C,⁵⁰ the Horn Book,⁵¹ the New England Primer,⁵² the Bible,⁵³

⁴² Watertown Rec., I, 21.

⁴³ Rec. Town of Dedham, III, 213; *ibid.*, IV, 3; Rec. Town Plymouth, I, 116; Currier, Hist. Newbury, 396 (quotes town record); Nash, Hist. Sketch Weymouth, 126; Corey, Hist. Malden, 603; Felt, *op. cit.*, 439; Bailey, Hist. Andover, 519; Bicknell, Hist. Barrington, 524.

⁴⁴ See discussion in Updegraff, *Orig. Mov. Sch. in Mass.*, 136-49.

⁴⁵ Corey, *op. cit.*, 439.

⁴⁶ Felt, *op. cit.*, I, 442; see also *ibid.*, 445, 9, 50.

⁴⁷ Love, *Col. Hist. Hartford*, 254.

⁴⁸ Judd, *Hist. of Hadley*, 56.

⁴⁹ They continued in Boston at least until 1819, when free primary schools were established. W. B. Fowle, *Barnard, Ed. Blog.*, 129.

⁵⁰ See Eggleston, *Transit of Civilization*, 211.

⁵¹ Tuer, *History of Horn Book*.

⁵² Ford, *The New England Primer*.

⁵³ Felt, *Annals of Salem*, I, 437.

Catechisms,⁵⁴ and the Psalters.⁵⁵ We find, then, that before the appearance of the higher branches of the mother tongue the colonies had provided instruction generally in reading and writing. At first there was little spelling as such, what there was being incidental to reading. Spelling is the logical outcome of the A B C method of learning to read, proceeding from the individual letters to syllables of two letters, then to easy words, and so forward. Littlefield refers to spelling books printed by Stephen Day, in Cambridge, Mass., as early as 1645,⁵⁶ and asserts that Coote's School Master was extensively used in New England.⁵⁷ Other spellers intervened, but not until 1740 and after, when "Dilworth's New Guide to the English Tongue" was published in London, imported, and reprinted in America in enormous quantities,⁵⁸ could formal exercises in spelling be said to have become universal.

The first book printed in America which attained wide popularity was the New England Primer, which was first published in the decade 1680-1690.⁵⁹ Ford estimates the total sale of this book at 3,000,000 copies between 1690 and 1840. One firm, Franklin & Hall, of Philadelphia, sold 37,000 copies between 1749 and 1766.⁶⁰ But the wide sale of the New England Primer did not begin until after 1690; before that time the colony schools had to depend very largely upon books imported from England. Bibles⁶¹ were the universal reading books in the early American schools, convenient textbooks because they were found in almost every home, logical textbooks because knowledge of religion was legally prescribed. For the very earliest instruction in the dame schools, A B C books, hornbooks, and psalters preceded the Testament and Bible. In short, the procedure described by John Locke—"the ordinary road of the Horn Book, Primer,

⁵⁴ Littlefield, *Sch. and Sch. Books*, 105.

⁵⁵ An excellent description of the Primer, the Horn Book, and the Psalter as used in the schools of Salem before 1791 is found in Felt, *op. cit.*, I, 436-7. Isaac Parker, who was one of Dame Rebecca Parker's pupils in Malden, 1786, said that the only book he had was a Psalter, and that he had only a little reading and spelling. Corey, *op. cit.*, 648.

⁵⁶ Littlefield, *op. cit.*, 118.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 119.

⁵⁸ See Chap. II, p. 34.

⁵⁹ Paul Leicester Ford, the historian of the New England Primer, attributed the first edition to Benjamin Harris, printer, between the years 1687-1690, the exact date unknown. Ford, *op. cit.*, 16. Worthington C. Ford has recently found evidence of an earlier New England Primer printed by John Gaine, London, entered in the Stationers Register, under date Oct. 5, 1683. *The Nation*, Jan. 11, 1917, 46.

⁶⁰ P. L. Ford, *op. cit.*, 19.

⁶¹ "The Bible and Psalter and the New England Primer were the only reading books" (before 1770). Burton, *Hist. of Ed. in N. H.*, 1842, 585. The Bible was used for the senior class, John Thelwell's school, Wilmington, Del., before 1775. Powell, *Hist. of Ed. in Del.*, 42. "Bible and Catechism for more than a century after settlement of Newbury were the only reading books used in school." (1634-1734.) Carrier, *Hist. Newbury*, 408.

Psalter, Testament, and Bible"—was the common practice⁶² in America, as in England. Many towns prescribed for their schools Latin masters and either ushers or English masters, together with writing masters or scribes.⁶³ The town school received pupils after they had learned the first elements in dame schools, and, in the absence of the latter, themselves gave elementary instruction in reading, writing, and casting accounts. Such a school, for example, was set up in Hartford, Conn., in 1755. "This society judge necessary that Exclusive of the Grammar School there be . . . two other schools sett up and supported for an English Education only . . . for Reading, Writing and Arithmetic."⁶⁴

Naturally we should not expect to find grammar and composition as distinct studies in this early period, when instruction in the vernacular had for its primary purpose preparing children for the grammar schools and for its secondary purpose teaching them to read the Scriptures, with ability to write even more subordinated, and spelling largely, if not entirely, incidental. How English grammar was grafted upon these more elementary branches is the main subject of the succeeding chapter. When the Latin-grammar school was proved to be ill suited to the majority of pupils and when the demand increased for a type of secondary education to supplant the Latin, English grammar came naturally to the fore. Instruction in vernacular grammar could be imparted by exactly the same methods used in the teaching of Latin grammar. The passing of Latin grammar is contemporaneous with the rise of vernacular grammar. The older order—reading, writing, spelling, and Latin grammar—now became reading, writing, spelling, English grammar, all in the mother tongue. Such a procedure would bear out Eggleston's unsupported assertion that "by slow degrees it came to pass that the English studies at last drove the sacred Latin from the free school founded at first for it alone."⁶⁵

⁶² Locke, *Thoughts Conc. Education*, Quick, 134. See excellent account of such books used in Connecticut schools. "The early schoolbooks of New England were the same as those of Old England. The same books . . . were used in Hadley and other towns. Such books were sold by John Pynchon, of Springfield, from 1656 to 1672 and after, and by Joseph Howley, of Northampton, to his scholars, except hornbooks, from 1674 to 1680, and both sold many Catechisms; . . . neither sold spelling books. . . . They were but little used in the seventeenth century. Samuel Porter, of Hadley, who died in 1722, sold Primers, Psalters, Testaments, and Bibles; also Catechisms, Psalm Books, and Spelling books, chiefly Dilworth's, were not common on the Connecticut River until after 1750." Judd, *op. cit.*, 61.

In 1805 H. K. Oliver was placed at 5 years of age in the Boston school of Mr. Hayslop. "By him I was taught my A B C D E F, my ab, abs, and my eb, ebs." Later young Oliver learned elementary reading and spelling in the school of Dame Tileson. *Barnard's Am. J. of Ed.*, XXVI, 210.

⁶³ Usher provided for John Douglas (1710), master of the grammar school in Charleston, to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic. *Clews, op. cit.*, 457.

Thomas Makin (Meakins) appears to have kept a "free school in the town of Philadelphia" (1693). Makin was afterwards the usher or assistant of George Keith, the first teacher of the William Penn Charter School, 1687. *Wickersham, Hist. of Ed. in Pa.*, 41-43.

⁶⁴ *Col. Rec.*, II. Love, *Col. Hist. Hartford*, I, 153.

⁶⁵ Eggleston, *op. cit.*, 236.

Chapter II.

EARLY APPEARANCES OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR IN AMERICA.

In Chapter I has been discussed the background of vernacular teaching in the American colonies, to which was added during the eighteenth century the formal study of English grammar. The present chapter will seek to establish the facts that a few schools attempted English grammar as such before 1750; that between 1750 and 1760, in the middle colonies at least, considerable headway in the subject was made in private schools; that after 1760 private schools of both the northern and southern colonies fell into line; that by 1775 English grammar was taught with some frequency in many private schools throughout the country.

1. SCHOOLS AND SCHOOLMASTERS TEACHING ENGLISH GRAMMAR BEFORE 1775.

In this section is gathered from various sources, especially from newspaper advertisements,⁶⁶ evidence of instruction in grammar before 1775. This chapter demonstrates that Noah Webster's often-quoted affirmation that "English grammar was not generally taught in common schools" before the Revolution⁶⁷ has been misinterpreted. Webster was right in saying that few common schools gave instruction in English grammar before 1775, but the inference usually drawn from his statement that grammar was not taught at all is misleading. The number of private schools which taught the subject increased rapidly after 1750. Webster evidently was acquainted with the school practices of the New England colonies, which are shown in this chapter apparently to have lagged behind the middle colonies, and somewhat behind the southern, in bringing to the fore instruction in all secondary branches of English, especially grammar.

In the New Jersey series the newspapers cited begin with 1704 and end with 1779. Not all schools which were giving instruction in grammar before the Revolution are here indicated. Colonial newspapers

⁶⁶ Much of the data from colonial newspapers on private schools cited in this section was made available through the courtesy of Prof. Marcus W. Jernegan, of the University of Chicago. His extracts have been supplemented from the series of excerpts from colonial newspapers relating to New Jersey, as published in the New Jersey Archives, and from sundry other sources, to which reference is made in the course of the discussion. However, no pretense is made that all of the data extant in such sources has been used.

⁶⁷ Am. J. of Ed., XXVI, 196.

are preserved in fragmentary form at best. Moreover, the data relate almost exclusively to private schools, many of which may not have advertised; they offer little or no bearing upon the curricula of free public schools of the eighteenth century. The writer has seen very little evidence that public schools were offering English grammar before 1775.⁶⁸ In all likelihood they were to some extent, but no proof to that effect has come to the writer's attention. No English grammar was offered in the public schools of Boston before 1775.⁶⁹

In footnotes are presented data from various colonies. Information is distributed as follows: Date of the school advertisement, name of the schoolmaster, extracts (quoted verbatim from the advertisements) indicating instruction in grammar and, finally, the reference to the newspaper in which the advertisement was published. It was customary for a successful schoolmaster, like Hugh Hughes, 1767, and Thomas Byerley, contemporary, both of New York, to advertise in various papers in succeeding years. With a few exceptions a schoolmaster's name appears but once in the lists below. In some cases, like that of David Dove, the same schoolmaster taught in several different schools in successive periods of service.

One caution should be borne in mind. There is no positive evidence that many of the schools advertised actually convened. Frequently a schoolmaster "prepares to open a school if given sufficient encouragement," meaning if he secured enough pupils to make the project pay. Moreover, it is quite likely that, as with some schools to-day, the prospectus of a curriculum for advertising purposes was somewhat more pretentious than the actual school practices warranted.

The schools here cited are, with very few exceptions, located in cities of importance, and schoolmasters in smaller places, in plantation schools, and in villages throughout each colony could not, or did not, advertise. Hence, schools of smaller communities may have been teaching grammar of which there is no record. This may be true, although a number of the schools cited in the list below were in small communities. Effort here is merely to cite available data upon which to base a reasonably sound inference as to when English grammar made its first appearances. Undoubtedly it was a new subject, presented in very few textbooks, as no American texts in grammar were published in the colonies before Samuel Johnson, of New York, in 1765,⁷⁰ and none of the grammars from England were reprinted in America until Dilworth's, in 1747. That few English grammars were imported before 1750 is likewise almost certain.⁷¹ Now the

⁶⁸ Except in free school in Maryland. See Chap. II, p. 30.

⁶⁹ See discussion of Joseph Ward's school, Chap. II, p. 34.

⁷⁰ See Chap. II, p. 35.

⁷¹ See Chap. II, p. 33.

newness of the subject, the abject ignorance of the village schoolmasters, and the general absence of textbooks⁷² make it appear likely that English grammar did not generally make its way into the public schools until some time after it was taught in the more prosperous private schools of the cities. Upon this basis, then, coupled with the fact that private schools capable of undertaking grammar established themselves usually in cities, credence may be placed in the conclusions reached in the following discussion.

It may be pointed out also that scrupulous care has been taken to select from the advertisements of more than 500 schools only those in which it is reasonably certain that a deliberate attempt was made to "teach the English language grammatically." A large number of schools which may have taught grammar were rejected.⁷³

Moreover, if the term "grammar" appears in the advertisement, with no certain indication that it signifies English, the assumption has been made that it means Latin grammar. Where English branches are announced as the core of the curriculum, with no specific mention of grammar, they have also been rejected.

NEW ENGLAND.

The writer has seen only six references to New England schools which give positive evidence of teaching English grammar before 1775.⁷⁴ It is surprising to find such meager evidence of instruction

⁷² See Chap. II, p. 33.

⁷³ A typical rejected case is William Cheatem's school in Burlington, N. J., where, in 1763, he taught "Latin, French, English, Writing and Arithmetic." *Maryland Gazette*, July 11, 1763. If Cheatem had meant reading, writing, and spelling in the English part of his curriculum, he probably would have said so. Large numbers of advertisements use these terms for English branches.

Reliable evidence that the term "English" in some advertisements, at least, included grammatical treatment is found in the fact that Franklin's Academy, in which it is certain that grammatical instruction was given (see Chap. III, p. 44), announces only "Wherein youth shall be taught the Latin, Greek, English, French, and German languages." Pt. G., Dec. 11, 1750.

Furthermore, schools and schoolmasters' advertising as "capable of teaching grammar," "giving instruction in grammar," "giving instruction in the English language," and the like, have been rejected. Md. G., Aug. 20, 1752; *ibid.*, Dec. 13, 1764.

⁷⁴ 1766, John Griffith, Boston, "Continues to teach English Grammar." *Boston Gazette*, Sept. 20, also *Boston Post Boy*, Sept. 22.

1766, Richard Pateshall, Boston, "English with propriety according to the Rules of Grammar." B. G., Sept. 15; *ibid.*, Sept. 28.

1769, Joseph Ward, Boston, "Understanding the English Grammar." *Boston Chronicle*, Apr. 20. "The last two years of my school life (between 1765 and 1770), nobody taught English grammar (in Boston) but Col. Ward, who was self-taught, and set up a school in Boston; our class studied Lowth in college." Memorandum of an Eminent Clergyman, C. S. J. (1850), 311.

1771, Theodore Foster, Providence, R. I., "English Grammar by Rule." *Providence Gazette*, June 8.

1772, Joseph Ward, Boston, "English Grammar School is now Open." "Those who incline to learn the English Grammar." B. G., Oct. 25.

1773, Wm. Payne, Boston, "English Grammar." *Ibid.*, Nov. 14.

Felt, writing in 1842 of education in Salem, Mass., gives a list of textbooks whose "use appears to have commenced here and in other towns of Massachusetts . . . about the

in grammar in Boston. There may have been other schools teaching grammar during this period, but the internal evidence of the statements of Pateshall and Ward leads to the belief that few, if any, were doing so.

Three successive advertisements show that Pateshall was transforming his school so as to provide a new curriculum in English. In 1754 he taught "Writing, Arithmetic and the English and Latin Tongues."⁷⁵ This is a typical private grammar school of the period, according to the interpretation we have followed, and indicates that no grammar was taught. In 1761 Pateshall gives "Public Notice" of a school "teaching reading and spelling English with propriety, and the Rudiments of the Latin Tongue."⁷⁶ This indicates that his school was turning more extensively to English; "with propriety" is a phrase commonly used in association with teaching grammar. And in 1766 Pateshall's school is announced "where he will teach Writing and Arithmetic, the Latin Tongue, Reading and Spelling English with Propriety, according to the Rules of Grammar."⁷⁷ Therefore during the 12 years covered by these advertisements (1754-1766) this private school was transformed by laying emphasis upon English. The third advertisement, in 1766, clearly indicates that the school offered instruction in grammar.

Ward's announcements throw light on the absence of grammatical instruction in English. In 1769 he announces an—

English Grammar School . . . where he teaches Reading, Spelling, Writing, Arithmetic, The English Grammar. . . . Those who go to the Free Schools and incline to learn the English Grammar he will teach from 11 to 12 o'clock. . . . The Understanding the English Grammar is so necessary for those who have not a liberal education. . . . Such a school is said by the Literati to be very much wanted in this town.⁷⁸

The foregoing is one of the earliest uses of the name "English grammar school," and the rest of Ward's statement indicates that the term is used because of the emphasis on English grammar, the title being derived in an exactly analogous way to the term "Latin grammar school." Here, too, is evidence that the free schools of Boston did not include English grammar in their curricula and evidence, though somewhat less positive, that private schools did not generally teach the subject. Ward evidently does not think that Richard Pateshall

particular years which accompany them. The reference of them as to time and place is more vague than desired. But want of data . . . forbid it to be otherwise. Spelling books, Dilworth's 1750; English grammar, Salmon's, Lily's, 1761. British grammar, printed in Boston 1784, Lowth's, Ash's, Webster's, 1785." *Ann. of Salem*, 385-6.

This is the type of reference so vague as to be of no value for our purposes. The writer has seen no other reference to an English grammar by Salmon. Lily's was not an English grammar. This and many similar references are discarded as worthless.

⁷⁵ Boston News Letter, Dec. 26, 1754.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, May 14, 1761.

⁷⁷ B. G., Sept. 15, 1766.

⁷⁸ B. Chron., Apr. 20, 1769.

(1766) was conducting a school of which the "Literati" approved. Private-school men appear to have often been skeptical of the pretensions of rival schoolmasters.

The announcement of John Griffith, the first evidence available of the time when grammar was introduced in Boston, is highly suggestive of the conclusion we must reach. He affirms, in 1766, that he "continues to teach English Grammar." How long before that date he had carried out this part of his program is uncertain. However, from the discussion of successive advertisements of Pateshall and Ward, considered above, it is concluded that they began their work in grammar soon after 1766.

The conclusion reached, then, is somewhat qualified. In New England a few private schools began to emphasize English grammar in their curricula about the year 1765, one decade before the Revolution. John Griffith, Richard Pateshall, and Joseph Ward were leaders in this movement among the schoolmen of Boston.

NEW YORK.

According to the evidence available upon the numerous attempts to teach declamation, oratory, and grammar, the middle colonies show a much more marked tendency to stress English than did New England. New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania seem to have been at least a decade in advance of their sister colonies to the north. The evidence of schools "teaching English Grammatically" in these three colonies includes 39. In New York at least 12 schools, the first somewhat doubtful, were teaching grammar before 1775.⁷⁹

⁷⁹ 1751, Garrett Noel, New York, "Reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar." New York Gazette revived in the Weekly Post Boy, Sept. 2.

1753, John Lewis, New York, "Speaking, reading, spelling and writing English according to English Grammar." *Ibid.*, June 4.

1761, Elizabeth Wilcocks, New York, "With the Whole English Grammar." New York Mercury, Aug. 31.

1761, W. Rudge, Newtown, "Writing, Arith., Grammar, Bookkeeping." *Ibid.*, June 15.

1763, Wm. Jones, New York, "English Language by Grammatical Rules." *Ibid.*, Apr. 25.

1763, Sam. Giles, New York, "Desire to Learn the English Grammar and write their Mother Tongue." N. Y. M. and W. P. B., Apr. 21.

1766, ———, New York, "The English Grammar Rationally taught." *Ibid.*, June 5.

1771, Thomas Ulrich, New York, "English Language Grammatically." N. Y. G. and W. M., Dec. 31.

1771, Hugh Hughes, New York, "English Language Grammatically." *Ibid.*, Dec. 30.

1773, Thomas Byerley, New York, "Scholars interested in the grammatical institutes." *Ibid.*, Aug. 23.

1774, John Cobb, New York, "English Grammar." N. Y. J. or Gen. Ad., June 1.

1775, John Cobb, Flatbush, "Principles of English Grammar," N. Y. G. and W. M., July 4.

Kemp, speaking of English grammar in the charity schools of the city of New York, says: "Mr. Ball added English grammar to the program . . . when he succeeded Mr. Hildreth. . . . It is the only instance of it to be found save the special instruction in it which Forster introduced for a while." *Sup. Sch. in Col. N. Y.*, by S. P. G., 265. Hildreth retired in 1777. *Ibid.*, 115. Forster was master in West Chester Parish from 1717 to 1745. *Ibid.*, 153. If it is true that the latter was giving special instruction in English grammar before 1745, he deserves to be classed as one of the very earliest in America.

Noel's case is cited as doubtful because it does not specifically indicate instruction in grammar. The remainder of his announcement indicates an elementary program with no mention of Latin; this seems to suggest that the "grammar" of his advertisement means English grammar. The first undoubted case is Lewis's school, opened in 1753 for "speaking, reading, spelling and writing English according to English Grammar."⁸⁰

NEW JERSEY.

In the New Jersey series between 1704 and 1750 there appear to be only six references to schools, all of which are advertisements for teachers. Three of these indicate that the subject matter the master is desired to teach is the elementary curriculum of the ordinary town school, namely, reading, writing, arithmetic, ciphering, spelling, and good behavior. References to 12 schools teaching grammar appear after 1850.⁸¹

Two schools, 1751 and 1753, while they do not specify English grammar, point strongly in that direction. Bartholemew Rowley, of Burlington, "Professes to teach the Latin and English Grammar."⁸² Probably this refers to a Latin grammar, with accident explained in English, after the order of Lily's or Adam's grammar.⁸³ Nevertheless, the very fact that Latin is so advertised indicates a tendency toward the grammar of the vernacular.

In 1753 a lottery for an "English and Grammar-school" is promoted in Trenton "for raising 225 pieces of eight toward building a house to accommodate an English and grammar-school and paying a master."⁸⁴ To be noted here is the slight distinction between an English curriculum and a grammar curriculum in the same school.

⁸⁰ N. Y. G. Rev. in W. P. B., June 4, 1753.

⁸¹ 1751, Bartholemew Rowley, Burlington, "Latin and English Grammar." Pa. G., Sept. 19; also Sept. 26.

1753, ———, Trenton, "English and Grammar-school." Ibid., Apr. 26.

1762, Cather Robert, Elizabeth Town, "English Tongue Taught as a Language." Pa. J., Apr. 1, also N. Y. M., Jan. 18.

1763, S. Finley, Princeton, "English Language Grammatically." Ibid., Nov. 10.

1764, John Reid, Trenton, "English Grammar, Reading, Grammatically." Pa. G., Sept. 13.

1764, ———, Moores Town, "Wanted a schoolmaster to teach the English language grammatically." Ibid., Aug. 3.

1764, Joseph Periam, Princetown, "English Language grammatically." Pa. J., May 31.

1769, J. Witherspoon, Princeton, "Remarks on the grammar and spelling of the English Tongue." Ibid., Mar. 2.

1769, Princeton College, Princeton, "Scholars desiring admission should be well acquainted with Reading English with propriety, spelling the English language, and writing it without grammatical errors." N. Y. J. and W. M., May 1.

1771, Grammar School, Queen's College. "Mr. Frederick Frelinghousen . . . teach the English Language grammatically." N. Y. J. or Gen. Ad., Oct. 24.

1771, James Conn, Elizabeth Town, "Teach English Grammar." N. Y. G. or W. P. B., Oct. 21.

1775, Newark Academy, Newark, "English Language." N. Y. G. and W. M., Mar. 27.

⁸² Pa. G., Sept. 19, 1751; N. J. Arc., XIX, 99.

⁸³ See Appendix B.

⁸⁴ Pa. G., Apr. 26, 1753; N. J. Arc., XIX, 245.

The step to an English-grammar school is easy and natural and throws light upon the shifting of emphasis from the Latin grammar to English grammar in the last quarter of the century.

Not until 1762, when Robert Cather, of Elizabeth Town, East New Jersey, opened a boarding school, do we have an undoubted case in point. Cather speaks in no doubtful terms:

As also, Boys to be instructed in the Beauty and Propriety of the English Tongue, which shall be taught as a Language; the best English Authors shall be read & explain'd; the Art Rhetoric or Oratory, shall be taught with Care and Exactness; Specimens of the Boys' Proficiency therein shall be given every Quarter. . . . It's hoped the undertaking will meet with due encouragement especially from such who know the importance of a Proper English Education.⁸⁵

Significant is the fact that S. Finley, president of the college in Princeton, is second on the list, announcing that in the English school connected with the college "is proposed to be taught the English Language grammatically, and that Boys, when found capable, be exercised in Compositions, as well as in pronouncing Orations publically."⁸⁶ The teacher in this academy was Joseph Periam, a young graduate of the college, who, at the commencement of 1762, "to relax the attention of the audience," delivered "an English Oration on Politeness, which gave universal satisfaction for the justness of the sentiments, the elegance of the composition, and the propriety with which it was delivered."⁸⁷

Here is an eighteenth-century college, whose curriculum was very largely classical, announcing an English school with English grammar as its central study. The academy is "An Appendage" of New Jersey College, according to the announcement. This fact makes it unlikely that the academy was a private venture. We are led to conclude that the president, for popularity in advertising,⁸⁸ stresses English. The Philadelphia Academy, afterward the University of Pennsylvania, a near rival, was doing so very successfully in this decade.⁸⁹

The Moores Town advertisement, in 1764, throws an amusing light upon the relative place of the vernacular and the classics. The advertisement reads: "Wanted, a schoolmaster, to teach the English language grammatically, write a genteel hand, Arithmetic, and the useful branches of Mathematics"; then it adds, "and if he could teach the Latin, it would be more agreeable to some of his Employers. . . ."⁹⁰

⁸⁵ Pa. J., Apr. 1, 1762; N. J. Arc., XXIV, 21; also N. Y. M., Jan. 18, 1762.

This much resembles the plan of Franklin's English Academy, 1750, and is cited in a later chapter as evidence of the supreme influence of Franklin's experiment with the English curriculum. See Chap. III, p. 44.

⁸⁶ Ibid., Nov. 10, 1763, N. J. Arc., XXIV, 266.

⁸⁷ Pa. G., Oct. 21, 1762. Quoted, MacLean, Hist. of Col. of N. J., I, 154.

⁸⁸ In 1762 the profits from the grammar school connected with the college were added to President Finley's salary. This, and the presence of young Periam, may have been the cause of the new emphasis on English. MacLean, op. cit., 355.

⁸⁹ See Chap. III, p. 46.

⁹⁰ Pa. G., Aug. 2, 1764.

Evidently a minority of this Moores Town committee still clung to the Latin, but the majority, making courteous allusions to their colleagues, insist upon the primary importance of the mother tongue, with English grammar as the basis.

Differences of opinion in regard to the new subject did not trouble the school committees alone. That the school officers often reflected the conflicting opinions of school constituents is evidenced by resolutions of the Germantown (Pa.) Union (English) School, March 3, 1764. Dove, formerly of Philadelphia Academy, was master.

Whether the Mode of instruction generally should be taught Grammatically, attended with lectures. . . . The Board having deliberated . . . Resolved, That the instructions of the youth in the Languages Grammatically, and with Suitable lectures at the same time . . . will undoubtedly tend to the most effectual Advancement of the Knowledge of the Scholars. . . . But the Board is nevertheless of the opinion, that every parent and guardian should have in his election to direct whether his child or ward shall be taught in the above manner, or in the usual mode taught in common schools. . . . Many parents and guardians may not incline to have their children or wards taught in any other manner than what has been hitherto practiced in this school. The . . . English Master . . . shall be obliged himself to hear each scholar three times a week, who is taught reading, writing and arithmetic, in the said common mode.⁹¹

The suggestion is that Dove's new "English Language Grammatically" methods were not entirely popular. This resolution is also indicative of what "the usual mode in the school" was. The school committee orders that the English master shall "hear" the scholar; that is, hear him recite the lessons which he has memorized from the textbook.

In many of these eighteenth-century communities with their highly emphasized democracy this dual struggle among school patrons may have taken place. In Moores Town part of the public clung tenaciously to the Latin and the old curriculum; in Germantown part of the school patrons fought innovations in methods of teaching. Thus did "the road their fathers trod" diverge from the path of progress. Against just such traditionalism, in practically every colony, did instruction in the mother tongue have to fight its way.⁹²

⁹¹ Travis, Germantown Academy, 24-25.

⁹² An advertisement of an Elizabeth Town school, in 1769, shows that a writing master used what is almost the modern method of teaching composition. To be sure, the emphasis is still on writing and spelling. However, the original compositions of the upper class are to be reviewed and errors pointed out. In many of the advertisements cited in this thesis some form of composition is added to the teaching of grammar.

The teacher is the same Joseph Periam whom we saw above as the first teacher in the English school of Princeton college. He is now resigning to take this school.

"As this gentleman is skilled in penmanship, a particular attention will be paid, if desired by the parents . . . pupils according to their capacities. . . . Some in writing the usual copies; others in transcribing . . . from approved authors, either letters to acquire a taste for the epistolary style or select pieces to be committed to memory, which they will be taught to pronounce with grace and propriety. Those of riper judgments will be required to write their own thoughts in the form of letters, descriptions, &c. These transcripts and letters will be carefully reviewed and errors pointed out in such a manner as will be most likely to make them accurate in writing and spelling." N. Y. G. and W. M., July 24, 1769; N. J. Arc., XXVI, 474. It will be noted that Franklin also insists upon careful criticism of the pupils by the English master. See Chap. III, p. 44.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Pennsylvania appears to stand ahead of all her sister colonies in championing thorough instruction in the mother tongue. The reasons for this, under Franklin's leadership, are discussed elsewhere.⁹³ In 1743, at least 20 years earlier than any record found of English grammar in Massachusetts and 10 years before any in New Jersey, one Charles Fortesque announced:

To be taught by Charles Fortesque, late Free-School Master of Chester, at his home, in the alley commonly called Mr. Taylor; the latin Tongue, English in a grammatical manner, navigation, surveying, mensuration, geography," etc.⁹⁴

This school of Fortesque's, with one other,⁹⁵ are the only undoubted cases the writer has seen of attempts formally to teach English grammar in America before 1750.

Next on the list is Franklin's English Academy, Philadelphia.⁹⁶ For reasons elaborated in the succeeding chapter the evidence seems to show that Franklin's Academy, because of its prominence, may be said to mark the beginning of formal instruction in English grammar in American schools. Due appreciation of the priority of Waterland and Fortesque in obscure schools is here acknowledged.

Of great significance is the fact that at least eight schools in Philadelphia were teaching, or had been teaching, grammar before 1760,⁹⁷ and 13 schools before 1766, when we are positive that Griffith and Pateshall were teaching in Boston. Philadelphia had at least 12

⁹³ See Chap. III, p. 43.

⁹⁴ Pa. G., Dec. I, 1743.

⁹⁵ William Waterland, Wassamacaw, S. C., 1734, see p. 31.

⁹⁶ Pa. G., Dec. 2, 1750, quoted in Montgomery, Hist. of U. of P., 139.

⁹⁷ 1743, Charles Fortesque, Philadelphia, "English in a Grammatical Manner." Pa. G., Dec. 1.

1750, Franklin Academy, Philadelphia, "English Language." Ibid., Dec. 2.

1751, Gabriel Nesman, Philadelphia, "English by daily practice, after the choicest and correct grammars." Ibid., Jan. 1.

1751, David Dove, Philadelphia, "English Grammar." Ibid., Aug. 29.

1754, John Jones, Philadelphia, "English as a Language." Ibid., Oct. 24.

1755, Robert Coe, Philadelphia, "Teaches reading grammatically." Ibid., Apr. 24.

1758, Messrs. Dove and Riley, Philadelphia, "English Language, according to the most exact Rules of Grammar." Ibid., Jan. 12.

1759, Dove and Williams, Philadelphia, "Grammatical knowledge of their mother tongue as it is laid down in Greenwoods English Grammar." Ibid., Aug. 9.

1761, Joseph Garner, Philadelphia, "English Grammatically, according to the most modern and familiar Method." Ibid., July 3.

1764, Subscriber, Philadelphia, "the Reading, Speaking, etc., will be taught grammatically." Ibid., Sept. 1.

1761, David Dove, Germantown, "English as a Language." Ibid., Nov. 19.

1765, Alexander Power, Philadelphia, "English Grammatically." Ibid., June 13.

1766, John Downey, Philadelphia, "English Tongue grammatically." Ibid., June 5.

1767, Mary M'Allister, Philadelphia, "English Language with proper Accent and Emphasis." Ibid., June 4.

1767, Mr. Dove, Philadelphia, "Own Language according to the exact Rules of grammar." Ibid., Oct. 29.

1769, Henry Moore, Potts Town, "English Language grammatically." Ibid., Sept. 28.

1767, Lazarus Pine, Philadelphia, "English Language Grammatically." Ibid., Jan. 29.

1772, John Hefferman, Philadelphia, "Grammatical English." Ibid., Sept. 14.

schools teaching grammar before the first authentic case we have seen in Massachusetts and 11 before the first case found in New Jersey. In comparison with the South we shall see that Pennsylvania schools, with two exceptions, appear to antedate them in adding grammar. These exceptions are William Waterland's school in Wassamacaw, S. C., and the doubtful instance of William Gough's plantation school in the same colony. These exceptions indicate that there were in the southern colonies, and probably in all, schools teaching grammar which are not here recorded.

MARYLAND.

In Maryland the first record we have seen—the announcement of William Clajon⁹⁸—has considerable interest. Clajon was a Frenchman who had immigrated in 1754 and under the patronage of a prominent clergyman in Annapolis began teaching French, Latin, and English in that year.⁹⁹ He paid little attention to English grammar. At least he did not at first advertise it. But three years later, when he may be supposed to have become fairly well established in his profession, he announces:

The subscriber having by great application acquired a reasonable knowledge of the English Grammar, he proposes to teach the same at the Free School of Annapolis. Those Parents, who can not afford their children spending several years in the Learning of Greek and Latin, may, by this proposal, procure to them the only benefit commonly expected from these languages, THE LEARNING OF THEIR OWN. Besides their daughters can as easily enjoy the same advantage.¹⁰⁰

Can it be that Clajon had read the signs of the times as pointing to an English education and had during his three years' residence in America prepared himself to teach the English grammar?¹ At any rate he voices the argument which, after Franklin's proposals for an English school, seems to have seized firm hold upon an increasing proportion of the constituency of the schools—Latin of no practical benefit; English a suitable substitute.²

⁹⁸ 1757, William Clajon, Annapolis, "Knowledge of English Grammar. . . . The Learning of their Own." Md. G., Apr. 28.

1764, Jacob Giles, Mount Pleasant, "The English Language Grammatically." Ibid., July 19.

1765, Joseph Condon, Cecil County Free School, "English by Good Methods and Grammatically." Pa. G., Mar. 14.

1769, Somerset Academy, Somerset County, "Rudiments of English Grammar." Va. G., Feb. 23.

1772, Daniel Melville, Annapolis, "Teacher of a Practical English Grammar." Md. G., Dec. 17.

⁹⁹ Md. G., Nov. 4, 1754.

¹⁰⁰ Md. G., Apr. 28, 1757.

¹ Col. Joseph Ward, one of the first to teach grammar and geography in Boston, was "self-taught." Memorandum of an eminent clergyman, Am. J. of Ed., 13, 746.

² See Chap. III, p. 56.

VIRGINIA.

To Virginia credit must be given for the first textbook in English grammar written by an American. Hugh Jones, professor of mathematics in William and Mary College, wrote "A Short English Grammar," published in England in 1724.³ It seems reasonable to believe that while Jones was teaching in William and Mary some attention to the subject may have been paid, though direct evidence is lacking. But this book was published, so far as we have been able to discover, 10 years before any record of a school or schoolmaster outlining a program which included grammar. Simple justice therefore awards Jones, of Virginia, the place of honor in point of time.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

To South Carolina belongs the distinction of having the first school of which we have seen any record as teaching English grammatically.⁴ In 1734—

William Waterland of Wassamacaw School . . . gives notice that any Gentleman Planter or others, who want to send their Children to School, may be provided with good conveniency for boarding. . . . Writing and Arithmetick in all its most useful Parts, and the Rudiments of Grammar are taught, but more particularly English, of which great care is taken, and by such methods as few Masters care to take the Trouble of, being taught Grammatically.⁵

Waterland's school antedates Franklin's in Philadelphia by 16 years. Another school, in 1742—that of William Gough—ought to be classed as doubtful.

He is now settled entirely at the Plantation of Mr. James Taylor, and continues to teach the several and most useful Branches of Learning (in the English Tongue) according to the London Method, whereby youth may be qualified for Business by Land or Sea.⁶

³ A full description in Meriwether, *Colonial Curriculum*, 151-3.

⁴ 1734, William Waterland, Wassamacaw, "English being taught grammatically." *South Carolina Gazette*, Nov. 16.

1742, William Gough, Plantation School, "Most useful branches of the Mother Tongue." *Ibid.*, Feb. 13.

1755, Beresford County, "Wanted, a Master to teach the English Language." *Ibid.*, Nov. 6.

1766, John Emmet, Charlestown, "With the English Grammar, to explain, parse, and sketch the English Tongue." *Ibid.*, Sept. 28.

1766, Andrew D'Ellicent, Charlestown, "English Language Grammatically." *Ibid.*, May 20.

1767, William Johnson, Charlestown, "Principles of English Grammar." *Ibid.*, June 15.

1769, Alexander Alexander, Charlestown, "Together with the leading English Grammar." *Ibid.*, Sept. 7.

1769, William Watson, Charlestown, "Taught to write grammatically." *Ibid.*, June 29.

1770, James Oliver, Charlestown, "English Grammar." *Ibid.*, Oct. 30.

1770, Elizabeth Duneau, Charlestown, "Grammatically the English Language." *Ibid.*, May 17.

1771, William Walton, Charlestown, "English Language grammatically." *Ibid.*, Oct. 20.

1772, James Thompson, Charlestown, "Also grammatical use of their own." *Ibid.*, Dec. 10.

⁵ S. C. G., Nov. 16, 1734.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Feb. 13, 1742.

One especially clear-cut statement—that of William Johnson, Charlestown, 1767—announces:

As soon as they begin to read and write, he proposes to initiate them into the principles of English Grammar, in a manner much more easy than that which is generally practiced, and without much interfering with the work of the school.⁷

The obvious interpretation is that grammar is frequently taught in a difficult manner, which interferes with the work of the school. But the first part of Johnson's statement is evidently not intended to convey that impression. He prefaces it with these remarks:

It is a common, but too well grounded a complaint that a grammatical study of our own language seldom makes any part of the ordinary method of instructing youth in our school.⁸

Johnson's first statement, as interpreted in the foregoing, would be grossly inconsistent with the plain assertion of his prefatory remarks. In short, Johnson's testimony bears out the conclusion reached in this section, that grammatical instruction in English before 1750 was taught only in an occasional school.

GEORGIA.

We have seen/recorded two schools in Georgia as teaching grammar before 1775.⁹

CONCLUSIONS.

A number of private schools gave instruction in English grammar before the Revolution. The three-score schools which we have named include not more than one-tenth of the advertisements of schools available for examination; about one private school in 10 for the entire 50 years (1725–1775) seems to have been turning in the direction of grammar. However, the showing for the subject is better than at first appears, for the advertisements cover many schools which would not have been found teaching grammar even a half century later, when English grammar had come into its own in the curriculum. Only an occasional private school of the secondary grade taught English grammar in the American colonies between 1750 and 1775.

There is evidence of only two schools—Waterland's in South Carolina in 1734 and Fortesque's in Philadelphia in 1743—which were without question teaching the subject before 1750. No further information is available concerning the masters of these schools. This excludes the possibility that, under the influence of Hugh Jones,

⁷ Ibid., June 15, 1767.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ 1763, John Portrees, Savannah, "Writing and English Grammar." Ga. G., June 30.

1774, Stephen Biddurph, Savannah, "Latin, English, French, and Celtic Languages grammatically." Ibid., Mar. 2.

who wrote a grammar in 1724, after he had severed his relations with William and Mary, some attention may have been paid to grammatical instruction in Virginia.

The decade 1750-1760 in the middle colonies marks for America the serious beginnings of instruction in English grammar. The northern and southern colonies seem to have commenced one to two decades later. After 1750 the middle colonies, under the leadership of Benjamin Franklin in Pennsylvania, began to emphasize the English curriculum, with grammar as the basic study. It received steadily increasing attention from persons starting private schools. Therefore the year 1750 is taken as the most fitting date to mark the beginning of formal English-grammar teaching in America, especially as it coincides exactly with the establishment of Franklin's English School, itself the progenitor of a long line of schools of the middle colonies which based vernacular instruction upon English grammar.

2. ENGLISH GRAMMARS IN AMERICA BEFORE 1784.¹⁰

The first English grammar by an American of which the writer has learned was written in 1724 by Hugh Jones, professor of mathematics in William and Mary College.¹¹ This book was published in London. So far as is known only one copy is extant, that in the British Museum. No indication concerning its use has come to light.

The earliest instruction in English grammar in the colonies was conducted either without textbooks or with books imported from England. Wickersham, speaking for Pennsylvania, represents a condition which was prevalent in regard to the importations of grammars:

Whether any more than a few straggling copies of the old English grammars . . . ever found their way from England to Pennsylvania is unknown; several of them, however, were reprinted in Philadelphia . . . and may have been used to some extent, but the first works generally taught in the schools were the Philadelphia editions of Webster, Harrison, Murray, and Comly, mainly the last two.¹²

Evidence is available that at least 12 grammatical texts of England were imported or reprinted in America before 1784.¹³ Of these, Thomas Dilworth's "A New Guide to the English Tongue," London, 1740, appears to have been the most widely used. Dilworth's book was primarily a speller, and probably introduced as such; but it contained also a "Brief but Comprehensive English Grammar" and a

¹⁰ 1784 is the date of Noah Webster's Grammar, Part II of his Grammatical Institutes of the English Languages, usually considered the first grammar by an American author.

¹¹ Full description in Meriwether, *Colonial Curriculum*, 151-3.

¹² Wickersham, *Hist. of Ed. in Pa.*, 202.

¹³ Appendix A, p. 155.

reader. Its popularity was widespread.¹⁴ Another book, published first in England three decades earlier than Dilworth's, was also imported to a limited extent. This was James Greenwood's "An Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar," London, 1711. Barnard gives the date of the edition probably best known in the colonies as 1753.¹⁵ The book of James Harris—"Hermes, or a Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Grammar," London, 1751, which Wickersham says was reprinted in Philadelphia¹⁶ and reached its seventh edition in 1825¹⁷—was influential in shaping grammars used in America. A. Fisher's "Practical New Grammar," London, 1763, reached its twenty-eighth edition in America by 1795.¹⁸ Gould Brown used a "New Edition, Enlarged, Improved, and Corrected," 1800.¹⁹

One of the most popular grammars imported and printed here was "The British Grammar," anonymous, London, 1760. An early student of the history of grammar in America asserts that it was probably the first English grammar reprinted on this side of the Atlantic.²⁰ This is an error. Lowth was reprinted in 1775;²¹ the first reprint of Dilworth's was 1747,²² while "The British Grammar" was first reprinted in Boston, 1784.²³

If Dilworth's "New Guide" was the most extensively used, it was because the book was primarily a speller, grammar, and reader combined. The text, considered strictly as a grammar, of most extensive use and influence in the colonies was Lowth's "A Short Introduction to English Grammar," London, 1758. Harvard used Lowth as early as 1774²⁴ and as late as 1841.²⁵ Meanwhile other colleges introduced it into their curricula.²⁶ Wells says that Lowth was "first published anonymously . . . soon came into general notice, and has probably exerted more influence than any other treatise in forming the character of the numerous grammars that have since been used as school books, in Great Britain and the United States." Lowth's greatest

¹⁴ The first American reprint seems to have been the edition of Franklin, in Philadelphia, 1747. Evans, *Am. Bibl.*, 3, 76. Evans omitted the 1747 edition from his second volume. He lists 73 different American editions between 1747 and 1792. Ten thousand copies printed in one edition seems to have been a popular number. *Ibid.*, 4, 314 and 7, 111.

The Lancaster, Pa., edition of 1778 omitted the grammar until (as the publication said) "peace and commerce shall again smile on us, and when in spite of Britain and a certain one named Beelzebub, we shall have paper and books of every kind in abundance." Wickersham, *op. cit.*, 198.

¹⁵ *Am. J. of Ed.*, XIII, 639.

¹⁶ Wickersham, *op. cit.*, 202.

¹⁷ *C. S. J.*, 3, 209.

¹⁸ Barnard, *op. cit.*, 13, 633.

¹⁹ Brown, *Gram. of Gram.*, XV.

²⁰ Wallis (W. B. Fowle), *C. S. J.*, 12, 20.

²¹ Evans, *op. cit.*, 5, 150.

²² *Ibid.*, 3, 76 footnote.

²³ *Ibid.*, 6, 274.

²⁴ *C. S. J.*, 11 (1849), 257.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 3 (1841), 230.

²⁶ Discussion in the following section.

significance is that most of his rules have been copied verbatim by Lindley Murray and again from him by many compilers of lesser note.²⁷ Webster says that "Wallis and Lowth are the two ablest writers on English Grammar."²⁸ Lowth enjoyed numerous American reprints.²⁹

One other important book was Ash's "Grammatical Institutes," first published in London, 1763, and enjoying four other editions there before 1795.³⁰ Its subtitle was "An Easy Introduction to Dr. Lowth's English Grammar" and was based on Lowth's seventh London edition.³¹ Ash was reprinted and sold in New York in 1774 by High Gain.³²

In addition to the books named, there were numerous other English publications which contained grammars, not strictly textbooks, circulating in America before 1784. In this list are McTurner's "Spelling Book and English Grammar," Fenning's Dictionary, Buchanan's Dictionary, Johnson's Dictionary, all of which contained brief grammars. In the advertisements of colonial booksellers we see indications that other grammars of which we have found no definite trace made their way from England. Numerous advertisements announce "Spelling Books by the dozen," "English Grammars," etc.³³ This is indicative of the conclusion that must be reached: Before grammars were widely printed in America the circulation of popular books imported was quite common. Reprints began to appear frequently after 1747.

Finally, more interesting, if not so significant, is the fact that several other Americans besides Hugh Jones antedated Noah Webster in publishing English grammars. In 1765 Samuel Johnson, the first president of King's College, published in New York "The First Easy Rudiments of Grammar, applied to the English Tongue. By one who is extremely desirous to promote good literature in America, and especially a right English education. For the use of Schools."³⁴ This volume of 36 pages appears to have been the first grammar prepared by an American and published in America. It was printed by

²⁷ Wells, C. S. J., 3, 230.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ First reprint, 1775, Philadelphia, Evans, op. cit., 5, 150.

³⁰ Brown, Gram. of Gram., XII.

³¹ Evans, op. cit., 5, 5.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Pa. G., Jan. 6, 1742; S. C. G., Oct. 3, 1748; B. N. L., Sept. 5, 1750, etc.

³⁴ Evans, op. cit., 4, 18.

Johnson wrote his English grammar for use in the preliminary education of his two grandsons. He prepared also a Hebrew grammar to go side by side with his English grammar, the structure of the two languages bearing in his view a close resemblance. He said: "I am still pursuing the same design of promoting the study of the Hebrew Scriptures . . . and I think of no better project than to get the grammar of it studied with a grammar of our own excellent language as the best introduction to what is called a liberal education. . . . Beardsley, Life and Correspondence of Samuel Johnson, 306-7.

Beardsley affirms that Johnson's book was printed by W. Faden, London, in 1767, and four years afterwards a second edition was published by the same printer, *Ibid.*, 307.

J. Holt, near Exchange, in Broad Street, New York.³⁵ Johnson was followed, in 1773, by Thomas Byerley, also a schoolmaster of New York, who published "A Plain and Easy Introduction to English Grammar."³⁶ Byerley has an elaborate description of the methods used in his school, a discussion of which appears in a later chapter.³⁷

In 1779 Abel Curtis, of Dartmouth College, published "A Compend of English Grammar: Being an Attempt to point out the Fundamental Principles of the English Language."³⁸

We have, then, the undoubted cases of Jones, 1724; Johnson, 1765; Byerley, 1773; and Curtis, 1779, to cite as American writers publishing grammars before Noah Webster in 1784. We conclude that Hugh Jones was the first American author to write a textbook in English grammar; that Samuel Johnson was the first to write a grammar published in America; that the books of these two men, together with those of Byerley and Curtis, precede Webster's book in point of time. The latter was, then, the author of at least the fifth, not the first, English grammar by an American. To be sure, the writer has seen no evidence that any of the earlier books were widely used in the schools or were influential in directing the new tendency in America to stress grammatical instruction. In one sense Webster retains the place usually assigned him as the first American grammarian. He yields to the others only in the matter of chronological priority.

3. EARLY INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH GRAMMAR IN AMERICAN COLLEGES.

When King's College was founded, President Samuel Johnson, a Yale graduate, made this significant announcement: "It is the further Design of this college, to instruct and perfect the Youth in the Learned Languages, and in the arts of *reasoning* exactly, of *writing* correctly, and *speaking* eloquently."³⁹ This was stated in the first public prospectus of the college work.⁴⁰ To Johnson⁴¹ has been assigned the honor of being the first American author of a textbook in English grammar published on this side of the Atlantic. His book was entitled "An English Grammar. The First Easy Rudiments of Grammar applied to the English Tongue. By one who is extremely desirous to promote good literature in America, and especially a Right English Education. For the use of Schools."⁴² This book was published in 1765, more than a decade after he became president of King's

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Evans, op. cit., 4, 353.

³⁷ See Chap. V, p. 129.

³⁸ Printed by Spooner, Dresden (Dartmouth College), Evans, 6, 10.

³⁹ Pine, Columbia Col. Charters and Acts, 70.

⁴⁰ N. Y. G. or W. P. B., July 3, 1754.

⁴¹ See Chap. II, p. 35.

⁴² Evans, Am. Bibl., 4, 18.

College. Obviously the book was not of college grade. His early authorship is cited here to indicate the genesis of the Columbia plan of education promulgated by his son, William Samuel Johnson, president of Columbia in 1785.

In this plan emphasis was laid upon English that was quite in keeping with the ideal set forth at the founding by the father and with the earlier interests of the son. The plan has several features which, taken all in all, make it an innovation in college curricula. We concern ourselves here only with the striking emphasis on instruction in the vernacular.⁴³

A few years later, 1792, a pamphlet "Present State of Learning in Columbia College" shows that the English part of the 1785 program was thoroughly carried out.⁴⁴ In fine, the King's College and Columbia curricula show a steady growth in popularity of instruction in the mother tongue. This is in startling contrast to the "starving," as Franklin called it, of English in the academy in which the University of Pennsylvania had its beginnings.⁴⁵

The experience of both Pennsylvania and Harvard shows that, as in the case of Columbia, the first impetus in colleges toward instruction in the mother tongue came through the desire for better elocution and oratory. In Harvard, disputations, heretofore carried on in Latin, after the middle of the eighteenth century came to be given in the vernacular. President Quincy, after saying that for nearly a

⁴³ The Plan of Education, 1785 :

Freshman Class. English Grammar, together with the art of reading and speaking English with propriety and elegance. Once a week . . . translation out of Latin into English ; . . . this to be considered as English rather than a Latin exercise.

Sophomore Class. Once a week deliver to the President an English composition upon a subject to be assigned.

Junior Class. Once a week, to the President, an English or Latin composition, upon a subject to be assigned, which compositions are expected to be longer and more correct as the students advance.

Senior Class. To deliver, once a week, an English or Latin Composition to the President upon a subject of their own-choosing.

The written exercises of each class are to be subscribed with the author's name, and after having undergone the President's criticism are to be filed and produced at the monthly visitations for the inspection of the Regents and Professors. So many of each of the three senior classes as will bring it to each student's turn in a month are once a week to repeat in the Hall . . . some proper piece of English or Latin, which the President is to direct, and which, at the monthly visitation, may be such of their weekly exercises as the President may think have most merit.

Plan cited in full, Snow, Col. Cur. in U. S., 93-6.

⁴⁴ "The President, William Samuel Johnson, LL.D., is Lecturing in Rhetoric and Belles Lettres, and instructs the students in the Grammar and proper pronunciation of the English Language, on the plan of Webster's and Lowth's Grammars, and Sheridan's Rhetorical Grammar. In Rhetoric, on the plan of Holme's and Stirling's Rhetoric . . . a complete course of instruction in . . . the English Language in particular ; in the art of writing and speaking it with propriety, elegance and force."

"Each student is obliged, every Saturday, to deliver him (President Johnson) a composition, in which he corrects the errors either in orthography, grammar, style or sentiment, and makes the necessary observations on them when he returns the composition to the writers." Ibid., 98-102.

⁴⁵ Smyth, Life and Writings, B. Franklin, X, 16. See Chap. III, p. 48.

century (1650–1750) the Harvard curriculum had resisted innovations, points out that in 1754 the overseers raised a committee “to project some new method to promote oratory.” The result was a system of disputations in English, apparently a radical innovation.⁴⁶ But it was not until 1766 that a committee of the board proposes there should be a “distinct Tutor in elocution, composition in English Rhetoric, and other parts of Belles Lettres.”⁴⁷

About the time that this new turn toward vernacular instruction was coming in Harvard (1754–1766) the University of Pennsylvania was being started in the Academy and Charity School of Philadelphia (1750–1756). Chapter III of this study is devoted to an examination of the character of this school and its influence in spreading vernacular education in secondary schools. The point to be anticipated here from that discussion is that good speaking and good writing in English were the primary motives lying back of the English program, with grammar as the central study.⁴⁸

That Princeton was the first college to require grammar as an entrance requirement, in 1819, is the statement of Broome.⁴⁹ Murray, in a study of the first-mentioned texts in the College of New Jersey (Princeton), based upon catalogues of the institution, finds Lowth’s Grammar first in 1793, and adds that not until 1840 does grammar appear in the catalogues as an admission requirement.⁵⁰ The statements of Broome and Murray do not tally by 21 years; the difference is entirely consistent with the extreme difficulty of assigning definite dates for the first appearance of any subject. It is not at all certain that statutory provisions indicate the earliest date. As a matter of fact, both Broome and Murray are incorrect in assigning to Princeton the first admission requirements in grammar.⁵¹

If it were true that Princeton was the first, that fact would be consistent with others which can be positively stated. That the year assigned for grammar should be so late is, however, a matter of some wonder. From the year 1763 forward the College of New Jersey was intimately associated with a preparatory school called by President Finley “an Appendage” of the college. Announcement of the academy appeared in 1763.⁵² In 1764 the school was opened.

⁴⁶ Quincy, *Hist. Har. Univ.*, 1840, II, 124–5.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 498, Resolutions in full.

⁴⁸ See Chap. III, p. 43.

⁴⁹ Broome gives the dates at which various new subjects at the beginning of the nineteenth century were definitely placed in the college entrance requirements as follows: Up to 1800 the requirements were Latin, Greek, and arithmetic. Geography was added in 1807; English grammar, 1819; algebra, 1820; geometry, 1844; ancient history, 1847. Broome affirms that all of these were first required by Harvard, except English grammar, in which Princeton took the lead, and adds that the ambiguous term “grammar” appears in the Williams College catalogue for 1795. A *Hist. and Crit. discussion of Col. Adm. Req.*, Columbia Univ. Cont., XI, 30–62.

⁵⁰ Murray, *Hist. of Ed. in N. J.*, 57, Murray’s statement is “South English Grammar.”

⁵¹ See discussion (p. 40) of the requirements of the University of North Carolina.

⁵² *Pa. J.*, Nov. 10, 1763; *N. J. Arc.*, XXIV, 266.

The Publick is hereby notified, that as soon as a competent Number of Scholars, offer themselves, an English School will be opened, under the Inspection of the President of the New-Jersey College, as an Appendage to the same: In which is proposed to be taught the English Language grammatically, and that the Boys, when found capable, be exercised in Compositions, as well as in pronouncing Orations publickly.⁵³

In 1769 another extremely suggestive advertisement of Princeton appears. President Witherspoon not only advertises that the college course gives "Remarks in the Grammar and spelling of the English Tongue"⁵⁴ but he also adds, speaking of candidates for admission, "Scholars should also be well acquainted with . . . spelling in English Language and writing it without grammatical errors."⁵⁵ While, of course, this is not a definite entrance requirement, with examination, it is an indication that the president of Princeton as early as 1769 was pointing the way to such a requirement. Parenthetically it may be remarked that Witherspoon states almost exactly the proper test of grammatical accuracy, the test to which colleges did not officially arrive until one hundred years later, when, in 1873, Harvard's new admission requirements were formulated. For all the intervening time the entrance test consisted of examinations in formal English grammar, which, for a large part of that century, meant the slavish repetition of pages and pages of rules.⁵⁶ The point of present interest, however, is that in this statement of President Witherspoon, in 1769, we see in embryo, at least, the college-entrance requirement of 1819; indeed, that of the present-day requirements. Princeton, like Columbia and Pennsylvania, had been in touch with English as a language study for nearly 25 years before the Revolution.

The diary of Solomon Droune, of the class of 1773 in Rhode Island College (Brown), testifies that he began the study of English grammar in 1771: "Commenced Hammond's Algebra and British Grammar in December,"⁵⁷ his sophomore year. The inference is strong that his class was studying "The British Grammar," but, unfortunately, we have discovered no corroborating testimony. The college laws of 1783 show that in the sophomore year were studied Lowth's Vernacular Grammar, Rhetoric, Ward's Oratory, and Sheridan's Lectures on Elocution,⁵⁸ and an extract from a letter of the president the following year advises a Mr. Wood, if he desires to enter the sophomore class, "to study with great attention Lowth's English Grammar,

⁵³ *Ibid.*, May 31, 1764; N. J. Arc., XXIV, 370.

A grammar school "as a nursery for the college" had been established under President Burr, but not until 1764 was "it judged proper that an English school should be also established for the sole intention of teaching young lads to write well, to cipher, and to pronounce and read the English tongue with accuracy and precision." Order of trustees, quoted, McLean, *op. cit.*, 529.

⁵⁴ Pa. J., Mar. 2, 1769.

⁵⁵ N. Y. J. or W. M., May 1, 1769.

⁵⁶ See Chap. V.

⁵⁷ Quoted by Bronson, *Hist. Brown Univ.*, 102.

⁵⁸ Laws in full, *Ibid.*, 508-18.

& Sterling's, or Turner's Rhetoric as preparatory to Ward's Oratory & accustom himself to compose in English." ⁵⁹

In the charter of Queen's College (which became Rutgers in 1823), first drafted by Dutch Reformed ministers in 1766 and finally granted in 1770, we find positive indications of the trend of the time toward grammatical instruction in English. It is especially significant as coming from a body of men who might have been supposed to favor a language other than English. The charter provides—

There shall always be, residing at or near the college, at least one professor, or teacher well versed in the English language, elected . . . from time to time, and at all times hereafter grammatically to instruct the students of the said college in the knowledge of the English language; . . . provided also that all records shall be in the English language and no other: ⁶⁰

The grammar school of Queen's, in the first announcement in 1771, advertised that "Mr. Frederick Frelinghausen . . . teaches the English Language grammatically." ⁶¹

In all the preceding discussion there is one State which has not been mentioned—North Carolina. In 1794 the University of North Carolina was opened with a program of English studies very far in advance of any college in the country before 1800. ⁶² In 1794 the charges for tuition were as follows:

For Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Book-keeping, \$8.00 per annum. For Latin, Greek, French, English Grammar, Geography, History and Belles Lettres, \$12.50 per annum. . . .

Here is an institution starting up in a sparsely settled and largely unlettered frontier district. As the historian says, half of those who presented themselves were unprepared for college classes. ⁶³ Therefore after the first year the institution was divided into the preparatory school and the university proper.

In 1795, according to the statutes, the course of study in the preparatory school was as follows:

(a) The English Language, to be taught grammatically on the basis of Webster's and South's Grammar. ⁶⁴ (b) Writing in a neat and correct manner. (c) Arithmetic, with the four first rules, with the Rule of Three. (d) Reading and Pronouncing select passages from the Purest English authors. (e) Copying in a fair and correct manner select pages from the purest English authors. (f) The English Language shall be regularly continued, it being considered the primary object, and the other languages but auxiliaries. Any language except English may be omitted at the request of the Parents.

Under the professorships in the university, English was continued. "Rhetoric on the plan of Sheridan, . . . The English Language, Extracts in Prose and Verse. Scott's Collections."

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 103.

⁶⁰ Clews, *op. cit.*, 343.

⁶¹ *N. Y. J. or G. A.*, Oct. 24, 1771.

⁶² Battle, *History of the Univ. of N. C.*, Vol. I, 50 et seq.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 65.

⁶⁴ Means Lowth's Grammar.

Here is a college which in 1795 dares to proclaim that English is "the primary object," that "other languages are auxiliaries," and that "any language, except English, may be omitted." The college did not grant the A. B. degree, however, except for Latin and Greek, and the historian tells us that afterwards the university "degenerated into the purely classical type." But the important point is yet to be noted. In 1795, when the English program for the academy was inaugurated, a statute of admission to the college seemed to prescribe English; it is thus cited by Battle:

The Students who passed approved examinations on the studies of the preparatory school were admitted upon the general establishment of the University. There was also an entrance examination in Latin, but the candidates were not required to translate English into Latin.⁶⁵

English grammar, on the basis of Lowth and Webster, was the first study of the preparatory school. A university statute prescribing entrance examinations in the preparatory subjects was passed in 1795. This appears to be a clear case of an entrance examination in English grammar 24 years before 1819, the date which Broome assigns to Princeton. An error of a quarter of a century shows how dangerous it is to generalize on data derived only from a few well-known institutions.

One further point as to the relations of colleges to English grammar needs is noted. We have seen that Hugh Jones, professor of mathematics in William and Mary, published the first grammar on record, written in America but printed in London in 1724. That book was called "A Short English Grammar, An Accidence to the English Tongue." The description of the contents of the book⁶⁶ seems to indicate that it was deficient in syntax and was devoted largely to preparation for oral work. This, too, would certainly be in keeping with the early date at which it was published. The entire discussion of this chapter and of the following chapter indicates that grammar, as well as written composition and literature, grew up with and possibly out of declamation, oratory, disputations, and the various branches of oral composition. Hugh Jones's "English Grammar" is in strict accord with this hypothesis.

Students of the history of education know that the colleges of America have usually been compelled to emphasize curricula of a more elementary grade in their early years. It was not true of Harvard, perhaps, because the founders of Harvard were the men who dictated the laws of 1642 and 1647 requiring a fitting school in every town of 100 families. Moreover, these schools existed before the law of 1647. We have just seen Princeton under the necessity of establishing a

⁶⁵ Battle, *History of the Univ. of N. C.*, Vol. I, 96.

⁶⁶ Meriwether, *Col. Cur.*, 151-3.

school of lower grade than the college itself and that the new University of North Carolina felt compelled to do so. In the following chapter we shall see the University of Pennsylvania grow from an academy and maintain that academy as a fitting school until well into the nineteenth century. Western colleges growing up amid frontier conditions in the past 75 years also labored under this necessity.

The fact that between 1775 and 1825 the older colleges of the East felt called upon to give instruction in the freshman or sophomore years in English grammar⁶⁷ carries with it several inferences: First, that there was a growing interest in the mother tongue, which compelled colleges established under the exclusive classical régime to enlarge their curricula, and, further, induced colleges founded in the last quarter of the eighteenth century to incorporate English as a language from the very beginning; second, that, as college students were entering without the ability to speak and write grammatical English, that subject was not adequately taught in the lower schools. In short, the attitude of colleges toward grammar before 1800 shows that there was need for the new subject; that the call for it was positive; that this must have been in order that the subject might be introduced into the older institutions; and that the lower schools were not meeting the need.

⁶⁷ Princeton used Lowth in 1793. Snow, *op. cit.*, 109. Yale used Lowth, 1774-1784, Webster, 1792, and Murray in succession before 1800. *Ibid.*, 79, 91, 128. The College of Rhode Island used the same texts in the same order. *Ibid.*, 109, 111, 113.

Chapter III.

INFLUENCES ADDING GRAMMAR TO THE CURRICULUM.

So customary is it to look to Massachusetts, and New England generally, for pioneer movements in American colonial education that it is refreshing to find other colonies taking lead in giving to the vernacular a prominent place in the curriculum. We have seen that the first American writer of a textbook in grammar was the Virginian, Hugh Jones, who published his book in London in 1724; that Noah Webster was also antedated by Johnson, 1765, and by Byerley, 1773, both of New York, and by Curtis, 1778, of New Hampshire. The first school of authentic record we have found teaching the mother tongue "grammatically" was in Wassamacaw, S. C., taught by William Waterland. Moreover, the middle colonies, headed by Pennsylvania, were apparently two decades in advance of New England in having a respectable number of private schools placing grammar on a secondary-school footing. To New York (King's College and Columbia) belongs credit for the first thorough devotion to the mother tongue before 1800, and to North Carolina for the first entrance examination in the subject.

New England, finally, can not claim the first secondary school using English curricula to exert the widest influence in advancing vernacular instruction throughout the colonies. To Pennsylvania, to the Philadelphia Academy, and to Benjamin Franklin, belong this honor, the greatest of all. The present chapter gives an account of this institution, with special reference to what it taught, the influence it exerted, and the motives which prompted it.

1. FRANKLIN'S ENGLISH SCHOOL, 1750.

The story of this institution begins with the year 1739. The evangelist, George Whitefield, preached in Philadelphia to enormous crowds but was excluded from most of the churches of the city.⁶⁸ Opposition of religious sects met him on every side. The hostility naturally drew to his support inhabitants who were free from narrower religious prejudice, among them Benjamin Franklin. Whitefield's avowed mission—the founding of an orphanage—tinctured his

⁶⁸ He did preach in Christ Church, but was opposed by other churches. Wood, *Hist. of U. of P.* (1834), in *Mem. Hist. So. of Pa.*, III, 178.

fervid discussions and turned the attention of his listeners to the unsatisfactory status of education for the unfortunates of the city.⁶⁹ In 1743, amid the fervor of Whitefield's agitation, Franklin drew up a "scheme" for a new school in Philadelphia.⁷⁰ The scheme was not further promulgated for six years, danger of war with France and Spain and other troubles having intervened.⁷¹ But in 1749 Franklin's scheme became the "Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Philadelphia." Interest here centers in the English curriculum proposed by the author and inaugurated by the trustees. Extracts from the proposals, together with the constitutions and the program of the English school, furnish evidence as to what really was the curriculum which dared to lift its head among the Latin-grammar schools of the period.

PROPOSALS.⁷²

The proposals state that the rector should be—

a man of good Understanding, good Morals, diligent and patient, learn'd in the Languages and Sciences, and a correct pure Speaker and Writer of the *English*⁷³ Tongue. . . .

All should be taught to write a *fair Hand*, and swift, as that is useful to All. . . .

The English Language might be taught by Grammar; in which some of our best Writers, as *Tillotson, Addison, Pope, Algernon Sidney, Cato's Letters, &c.* should be Classicks: the Stiles principally to be cultivated, being the clear and concise. Reading should also be taught, and pronouncing, properly, distinctly, emphatically; not with an even Tone, which *under-does*, nor a theatrical, which *over-does* Nature.⁷⁴

To form their Stile they should be put to writing Letters to each other, making Abstracts of what they read; or writing the same Things in their own Words: telling or writing Stories lately read, in their own Expressions. All to be revised and corrected by the Tutor, who should give his Reasons, and explain the Force and Import of Words, &c.

⁶⁹ In April, 1740, Franklin attended a meeting in which Whitefield preached of the orphanage he intended to found. Franklin advised the founding of the institution in Philadelphia, urging that materials and workmen would be lacking in the wilds of Georgia. This was the occasion on which, Franklin tells us, after taking out various smaller sums, "I finally empty'd my pocket wholly into the collector's bowl, gold and all." (Autobiography, Griffin ed., 173.)

To the preaching of Whitefield may be ascribed part of the emphasis in earlier Pennsylvania legislation upon charity schools. This, together with the wide divergence of religious beliefs, caused Pennsylvania to be one of the last States to establish a free system of schools, in 1833.

⁷⁰ 1743 was the year that Charles Fostesque advertised his private school in Philadelphia, teaching "English in a grammatical manner." Pa. G., Dec. 1, 1743.

⁷¹ Autobiography, op. cit., 178-89.

⁷² Proposals given in Smyth, *Life and Writ. of Benjamin Franklin*, II, 386 et seq.

⁷³ All words italicized are so written in the proposals as printed in Smyth.

⁷⁴ This savors so strongly of Hamlet's speech to the players that we are surprised not to find Shakespeare in the list of "Classicks."

To form their Pronunciation, they may be put on Declamations, repeating Speeches, delivering Orations &c.; the Tutor assisting at the Rehearsals, teaching, advising, correcting their Accent, &c.⁷⁵

THE CONSTITUTIONS.

These were drawn up by a committee of two, consisting of Tench Francis, attorney general, and Franklin. The constitutions stipulate for instruction "in the dead and living Languages, particularly their Mother Tongue, and all useful Branches of liberal Arts and Science"⁷⁶ and provide:

An ACADEMY for teaching the *Latin* and *Greek* Languages, the *English Tongue* grammatically, and as a Language, the most useful living foreign Languages, *French*, *German* and *Spanish*: As matters of Erudition naturally flowing from the Languages . . . (The subjects named in the Proposals.)

The *English Master* shall be obliged, without the Assistance of any Tutor, to teach Forty Scholars the *English Tongue* grammatically, and as a Language.⁷⁷

Concerning this plan, remarkable for its emphasis upon the English, Franklin states that his desires "went no further than to procure a good English education."⁷⁸ But his friends insisted upon a classical school. In both the documents just cited the sections dealing with the classics are distinctly subordinated and have the appearance of an afterthought, inserted after the original draft to appease Franklin's coworkers. For himself, the founder was resolved "to nourish the English school by every means in my power."⁷⁹

PROGRAM OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOL.

The Academy and Charity School, with Franklin as the first president of the trustees, was established in 1750,⁸⁰ with the following vernacular program in the English school:

First Class:

English Grammar, rules.

Orthography.

Short Pieces, such as Craxall's Fables.

⁷⁵ To this vernacular instruction are added geography, chronology, ancient customs, morality, history, natural history, history of commerce, mathematics. Also, "All intended for Divinity should be taught the *Latin* and *Greek*; for Physick, the *Latin*, *Greek* and *French*; for Law, the *Latin* and *French*; Merchants, the *French*, *German* and *Spanish*; and though all should not be compell'd to learn *Latin*, *Greek* or the modern foreign Languages; yet none that have an ardent Desire to learn them should be refused; their *English*, *Arithmetick*, and other studies absolutely necessary being at the same time not neglected." Smyth, op. cit., 394.

⁷⁶ Montgomery, Hist. of U. of P., 46.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 47, 48.

⁷⁸ Sparks, Works of Benjamin Franklin, II, 133.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 134.

⁸⁰ Franklin, writing from memory, in 1789, gives the date as 1749, but the date of conveyance of "The New Building" was Feb. 1, 1750. Advertisement of the Academy in Pa. G., Dec. 11, 1750,

Second Class :

Expressive Reading.

Grammar, parts of speech and sentence structure.

The Spectator.

Third Class :

Speaking.

Elements of Rhetoric, Grammatical errors corrected.

Fourth Class :

Composition, Letter writing, little stories, accounts of reading.

Letters, Temple and Pope.

Speaking and Oral Reading.

Fifth Class :

Composition, Essays in Prose and Verse.

Oral Reading and Speaking.

Sixth Class :

English Authors, Tillotson, Milton, Locke, Addison, Pope, Swift, Spectator and Guardian.

Some classes always to be with the writing master and with the Arithmetick master, while the rest are in the English school.⁸¹

THE CAREER OF THE ENGLISH PROGRAM.

Study of the proposals, the constitutions, and the program indicates a secondary school, with the vernacular as its central study, as pretentious as any of the Latin schools of the period.⁸² The phrases "English Tongue grammatically" and "as a Language," many times repeated, are eloquent with that purpose. Franklin was no advocate of the classics as the backbone of public instruction. He affirmed "the still prevailing custom of . . . teaching the Latin and Greek languages . . . I consider . . . in no other light than as the *chapeau bras* of modern literature."⁸³ Indeed, the English program contains almost every element of the best modern secondary-school practice in the vernacular: Grammar; composition, both oral and written; declamation; and literature in the form of the classics of the mother tongue. Other studies are grouped around the English. It seems safe to believe that never before in America, and not for quite half a century later, was any such complete English program projected. It was almost 100 years in advance of its time. Like the leaders of most reforms, Franklin as champion of the mother tongue in secondary education seems to stand alone. The institution he founded was solitary. He was as distinctly a pioneer in education as he was in science.

At first the English school prospered. In the opening year the English and the Latin schools together numbered more than 100

⁸¹ The English program is compiled from Franklin's Works, Sparks, op. cit., II, 125-32.

⁸² It may be safer to say that the English school was intended to be on an equal footing with the Latin. In reality, it never was. In the very beginning the Latin master received a salary of £200, the English master £100. The former had more assistance than the latter. The time of the English master was often employed in the Latin school. Smyth, op. cit., X, 12.

⁸³ Smyth, op. cit., II, 159.

pupils.⁸⁴ In 1752 there were above 90 scholars in the English school alone, according to a minute of the trustees.⁸⁵ The first English master was David James Dove, who had taught grammar in Chichester, England, for 16 years and who was in Franklin's estimation "a clean, pure Speaker and Writer of English."⁸⁶ Commenting on the early success of the English program, Franklin says:

He (Mr. Dove) had a good Voice, read perfectly well, with proper Accent and just Pronunciation, and his Method of communicating Habits of the same kind to his Pupils was this. When he gave a Lesson to one of them, he always first read it to him aloud, with all the different Modulutions of the Voice that the Subject and the Sense required. These the Scholars, in studying and repeating the Lesson, naturally endeavour'd to imitate;⁸⁷ and it was really surprizing to see how soon they caught his Manner. . . . In a few Weeks after opening his School, the Trustees were invited to hear the Scholars read and recite. . . . The Performances were surprizingly good . . . and the English School thereby acquired such Reputation, that the Number of Mr. Dove's pupils soon mounted to upwards of Ninety, which Number did not diminish as long as he continued Master, viz., upwards of two years.⁸⁸

Unfortunately the high-water mark of the English school's prosperity was reached only two years after its founding. In 1753 Ebenezer Kinnersley was elected successor to Dove, who devoted himself to a private school in Philadelphia which he had begun while still active in the Academy.⁸⁹ Kinnersley, who had collaborated with Franklin in experimenting with electricity,⁹⁰ was evidently more proficient in science than in teaching English, for under him the English school began a rapid decline. In the words of Franklin, "the Trustees provided another Master . . . not possessing the Talents of an English School Master in the same Perfection with Mr. Dove," whereupon "the school diminished daily and soon was found to have about forty scholars left.⁹¹ The Performances . . . in Reading and Speaking

⁸⁴ Quoted from sermon on education by Rev. Richard Peters, 1750, preached at the opening of the Academy, Montgomery, op. cit., 141.

⁸⁵ "There being above ninety Scholars in the English School, and Mr. Dove having declared he found it impossible duly to instruct so great a number without another assistant." . . . Quoted from the minutes, Dec. 10, 1751, *ibid.*, 144.

⁸⁶ Letter to Samuel Johnson, Dec. 4, 1751. *Ibid.*, 513.

It is significant that Franklin endeavored by every means in his power to secure Samuel Johnson to become the English master. *Ibid.*, 508.

⁸⁷ This is to-day considered extremely bad practice in teaching oral English. "Imitate me," "this is the way to speak the passage," is indeed the quickest way to secure results and doubtless enabled Dove to give public exhibitions within a few weeks after beginning his work. But direct imitation is bad pedagogy.

⁸⁸ Smyth, op. cit., X, 14, 15.

⁸⁹ Pa. G., Aug. 29, 1751.

⁹⁰ Kinnersley is said by Provost Smith to have been "the chief inventor of the electrical apparatus, as well as the author of a considerable part of those discoveries in electricity published by Mr. Franklin, to whom he communicated them." *Amer. Mag.*, Oct., 1758; cited, Wood, *Mem. Hist. Soc. Pa.*, III, 191. Kinnersley published "Experiments in Electricity," 1764, in Philadelphia. *Cat. of Public. Prior to 1775*, in *Trans. of Am. Antiq. Soc.*, II, 570. Evans, op. cit., 3, 390.

⁹¹ The trustees' minutes, Mar. 5, 1757, give the number of students: Philosophy school, 12; Latin, 60; Mathematical, 22; English, 31. Montgomery, op. cit., 282-4.

... discontinued and the English School has never since recovered its original Reputation."⁹²

The retrogression of the English school and the prosperity of the Latin school receives Franklin's bitter condemnation. He himself was absent from Philadelphia much of the time for nearly 30 years, and, as he says, "in the course of 14 years several of the original Trustees, who had been disposed to favour the English School, deceased, and others not so favorable were chosen to supply their places."⁹³ The whole story of the process by which, to use his words, English "was starved out of the Scheme of Education" is set forth by him in "Observations Relative to the Intentions of the Original Founders of the Academy in Philadelphia," published near the end of his life, in the year 1789.⁹⁴

Almost pathetically he bemoans the failure of the English school:

I am the only one of the original Trustees now living, and I am just stepping into the grave myself. . . . I seem here to be surrounded by the Ghosts of my dear departed Friends, beckoning and urging me to use the only Tongue now left us, in demanding That Justice to our Grandchildren that our Children has [Franklin's defective grammar] been denied.⁹⁵

He cites numerous instances of prejudice on the part of the "Latinists" to kill the English curriculum, running it down until in 1763 "Mr. Kinnersley's time was entirely taken up in teaching little boys the elements of the English Language (that is, it was dwindled into a School similar to those kept by old Women, who teach Children Letters)."⁹⁶ In another connection Franklin asserts:

The Latinists were combin'd to deny the English School as useless. It was without Example, they said, as indeed they still say (1789), that a School for teaching the Vulgar Tongue, and the Sciences in that Tongue, was ever formed with a Colledge, and that the Latin Masters were fully competent to teach English.⁹⁷ . . . Thus by our injudiciously starving the English Part out of our Scheme of Education, we only saved £50 a year. . . . We lost Fifty Scholars which would have been £200 a year, and defeated, besides, one great End of the Institution.⁹⁸

In spite of "Neglect, Slights, Discouragements, and Injustice" (Franklin's words)⁹⁹ the English program never entirely died. On July 23, 1769, a resolution passed the board that "after the 17th of

⁹² Smyth, op. cit., X, 15.

⁹³ Ibid., 16.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 9-31.

⁹⁵ Smyth, op. cit., X, 29.

⁹⁶ "The State of the English School was taken into consideration and it was observed that Mr. Kinnersley's Time was entirely taken up with Teaching little Boys the Elements of the English Language." Min. trustees, Feb. 3, 1763. Montgomery, op. cit., 247.

⁹⁷ Smyth, op. cit., X, 16, 19.

⁹⁸ Franklin appears to overstate the opposition. About the only part of the English program actually starved out was the public exhibitions, of which Mr. Dove had made so popular a showing. It is interesting to note that the branch which hung on most tenaciously was English grammar.

⁹⁹ Smyth, op. cit., 27.

October next, Mr. Kinnersley's present Salary do cease, and that from that time the said School . . . shall be on the following Footing, viz . . ." (the fees of the pupils to go directly to the English master, who is guaranteed no salary.¹ But on August 1, 1769, this action was reconsidered, and on July 21, 1771, "the Provost was desired to advertise for a Master able to teach English Grammatically, which seems was all the English Master was now required to teach, the other Branches originally promised being dropt entirely."² So the hard struggle for English went on. Franklin's protest of 1789 did very little good, and in 1810 Dr. John Andrews, provost of the University of Pennsylvania, affirmed that the principal master of English was not called professor, but master; that this work was considered below college grade and subordinate to it. The provost thought that on the death of the then incumbent at the head of the English school it would be abolished altogether.³

In the preceding chapter has been described the course of the English program in King's College and Columbia, under the leadership of Samuel Johnson and of William Samuel Johnson. In strange contrast to the "starving" process which well-nigh killed English instruction in the College and Academy of Philadelphia we find the admirable courses offered in 1792 by the president of the New York institution. The writer feels that the main cause of this startling contrast was due to the influence of Provost Smith, a Latinist, in Pennsylvania, as contrasted with the influence of the Johnsons, moderns, in King's College. But an even more important cause may have been the difference in the internal organization of the two institutions. In Columbia the college curriculum was organized by departments on an equal footing. In Pennsylvania there was a philosophical, an English classical, and a mathematical school, each with its almost distinct program, attempting to grow up side by side. The Columbia organization seems to give each department a better opportunity to demonstrate its worth, being essentially a college, rather than a university, organization. Obviously, English had a better chance to raise itself to independent dignity in Columbia. It would be interesting to speculate as to the course in the vernacular in Pennsylvania had Franklin been able to continue his personal supervision.

2. THE INFLUENCE OF THE PHILADELPHIA ENGLISH SCHOOL.

Such, then, was the precarious and inglorious career of English in Franklin's school, a career which belied the purpose of the founder and was entirely inconsistent with the success of the first few years. To

¹ *Ibid.*, 23.

² *Ibid.*, 27.

³ Battle, *Hist. Univ. N. Car.*, I, 50.

affirm that this institution, prematurely attempting to raise vernacular instruction to the dignity of the Latin, was an influential leader of that movement may seem foolhardy.

At the outset we face the fact that the Philadelphia Academy stands, in point of time, at the head of a list of private schools which, between 1750 and 1765 in Pennsylvania and adjoining colonies, proposed to teach the English language. This fact, taken alone, may have been merely a coincidence. Indeed, from the viewpoint of chronological priority, Fortesque's school in Philadelphia (1743) itself precedes Franklin's. Only in connection with facts cited below is the Philadelphia Academy to be accorded the position of leadership.

Next may be cited the striking fact that the distinctive phrases describing the central purpose of the new venture—"English Tongue grammatically" and "English as a language"—many times repeated in the published announcements and documents of the Franklin school, were used verbatim, or nearly so, by many schools immediately succeeding it in the colonies. This also, considered alone, may not be significant of leadership. It may be said with justice that in 1743 Fortesque, in Benjamin Franklin's own paper, used the equivalent phrase—"English in a grammatical manner"⁴—and that Waterland in South Carolina, in 1734, used almost the equivalent phrase—"English being taught grammatically."⁵ There is no attempt to ascribe to Franklin the authorship of these phrases or of the ideas back of them;⁶ but both schools were obscure and private ventures, without the direct advocacy of a powerful publication like Franklin's Philadelphia Gazette. Moreover, the auspices of the Franklin school, warmly supported as it was by such men as Attorney General Francis and various colony officials, with a board of 24 trustees of leading men of the city, were likely to secure all publicity possible in 1750-1760.

The place to look first for the academy's direct influence on other schools is in Philadelphia, its immediate environs, and in towns of close proximity. Within 10 years several other schools in Philadelphia were teaching English grammatically.⁷ Three of these were

⁴ Pa. G., Dec. 1, 1743.

Charles Hoole, 1660, may have been the inventor of the phrase. He says: "He that would be further instructed how by teaching English more Grammatically, to prepare his Scholars for Latine, let him consult Mr. Poole's English Accidents, and Mr. Wharton's English Grammar; as the best books that I know at present." Bardeen's reprint, 80.

⁵ S. Car. G., Nov. 16, 1734.

⁶ The comment might also be made that the phrases cited are the natural expressions of any schoolman desiring to emphasize English grammar in his curriculum. This comment has a certain validity; but "English tongue grammatically" and "English as a language" are truly distinctive phrases. The New England schoolmasters employed much more prosaic expressions, such as "according to the Rules of Grammar," "understanding the English Grammar, "learn the English Grammar," and the like. See Chap. II.

⁷ In 1759 the number of dwelling houses in Philadelphia was 4,474, indicating a population of between 20,000 and 30,000. R. Proud, Hist. Pa. in N. A., 1770, 279.

established by David James Dove, the first English master of the academy. The first was a girl's school, in 1751, in which English grammar was taught. For devotion to this school and neglect of his duties in the academy Dove was dismissed in 1753.⁸ The second was in 1758, when Dove and Riley professed to teach "English Language according to the most exact rules of grammar."⁹ The third may have been a continuation of the second, when in 1759 Dove and Williams announced "Grammatical Knowledge of their (the pupils') mother tongue, as is laid down in Greenwood's Grammar."¹⁰ Two years later Dove became master in Germantown Academy, where he taught "English as a Language."¹¹ Dove had taught English grammar 16 years in England; it might therefore be fairer to attribute the credit for the teaching of English to direct influence from the mother country. There can be little doubt that Dove in these schools was endeavoring to make capital of the popularity he had enjoyed at the academy.

In 1754 another Philadelphia school was projected by one John Jones, "late assistant to Mr. Dove in the Academy."

[He] has opened his new School-House where . . . the English Tongue will be taught . . . to those, whose Parents request it, as a Language, and delivery in the method pursued by that worthy Professor, Mr. Dove when in the Academy, by which his Scholars made such a wonderful Proficiency, and he gained so great a favor deservedly.¹²

Referring to schools like Jones's and Dove's, we have also Franklin's own testimony that the very failure of his plans in the academy spread the instruction of English as a language. He says:

Parents, indeed, despairing of any reformation, withdrew their children, and placed them in private schools, of which several now appeared in the city, professing to teach what had been promised to be taught in the Academy; and they have since flourished and increased by the scholars the Academy might have had, if it had performed its engagements.¹³

Evidence is not lacking that the neighboring colonies were aware of the success of Franklin's school. For example, in 1754, while the English school was still flourishing, an interesting communication appeared in the Maryland Gazette, written by one who signed himself "Philo Merilandicus," to this effect: "On inquiry it has been found that there are (at least) 100 Marylanders in the academy in Philadelphia. . . ." ¹⁴ The writer laments the loss to Maryland of £5,000 sterling a year. He says also: "Vast sums are every year transmitted to France, etc., for the Education of Young Gentlemen. . . ." He

⁸ Pa. G., Aug. 29, 1751.

⁹ Ibid., Jan. 12, 1758.

¹⁰ Ibid., Aug. 9, 1759.

¹¹ Ibid., Nov. 19, 1761.

¹² Pa. G., Oct. 24, 1754.

¹³ Sparks, Franklin's Works, II, 149.

¹⁴ In 1755 the academy had 300 students. Wickersham, Hist. of Ed. in Pa., 62.

expresses a wish to establish a college on the East Shore, and conceives ways and means for keeping within Maryland the money advanced as aforesaid for the use of Pennsylvania.¹⁵ Here is positive evidence that the academy in Philadelphia, which had the distinction of an English program, was attracting attention.

Suggestion to the same effect is found in the will of one James Van Horn, of Dover, East New Jersey, in 1761. He gives all his estate to his sons John and James, "James to be given the best education the Province of Pennsylvania affords, either at the Academy, or Mr. Dove's English School."¹⁶

If the Philadelphia College and Academy was attracting numerous students from other colonies,¹⁷ there may be found in this fact a motive for the action taken in 1763 by the College of New Jersey, a near rival. President S. Finley in that year announced the opening of an English school as an appendage of the college, with an English program almost identical with the academy's.¹⁸

The College of New Jersey, which thus seems to have followed the lead of the Philadelphia Academy in establishing an English school, was itself influential in spreading grammatical instruction in the mother tongue. It, too, was a cosmopolitan institution, drawing students from the South, from Maryland and Virginia especially.

The influence of Princeton men who became teachers may be illustrated by the experience of Philip Fithian (Princeton, 1770-1772), who became tutor in the family (plantation school) of the famous Col. Carter, of Westmoreland County, Va. In his *Journal and Letters* we find four entries relating to instruction in grammar. "The Second Son is reading English Grammar;" "Mr. Carter put into my hands for the use of the School *The British Grammar*."¹⁹ Fithian evidently felt the need of renewing this subject, for we find this entry a few days later in his journal: "I read *Pictete, The Spectator, Lambert, History of England, English Grammar, Arithmetic and Magazines* by turns."²⁰ The final entry perhaps indicates why Fithian was so industrious in teaching Carter's children grammar: "Mr. Carter is a remarkable man in English Grammar."²¹

¹⁵ Letter to Jonas Greene, Md. G., Mar. 21, 1754. Reprinted, Steiner, *Hist. of Ed. in Md.*, 29.

¹⁶ N. Y. M., Mar. 9, 1761; N. J. Arc., XX, 541.

¹⁷ George B. Wood, writing in 1834, attests to the celebrity of the academy. "From this period, 1757, the institution rose rapidly in importance. The extent and liberality of its plan, conjoined with the excellence of its management, secured it the patronage of the neighboring population; and it soon acquired a celebrity which attracted numerous students from distant colonies. From Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas it received much support . . . many planters preferred it, for the education of their children, to the schools of England." Wood, *Hist. of Univ. of Pa.*, Pa. Hist. Soc., III, 185.

¹⁸ Pa. J., Nov. 10, 1763; N. J. Arc., XXIV, 266. See Chap. II, p. 27.

¹⁹ Fithian, *Jour. and Let.*, 55, 56.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 66.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 97.

Robert Cather's School of Elizabeth Town, East New Jersey, in 1762, was modeled on exactly the same English plan as the Philadelphia Academy. He opened a boarding school with a varied curriculum:

as also, Boys to be instructed in the Beauty and Propriety of the English Tongue, which shall be taught as a Language; the best English Authors shall be read and explained; the Art of Rhetoric, or Oratory, shall be taught with Care and Exactness, Specimens of the Boys' Proficiency therein shall be given every Quarter.²²

This is the exact Philadelphia scheme.

In 1767 a school called the Somerset Academy was founded in Somerset County, Md., whose curriculum also bears a striking resemblance to the Franklin institution. The following reference is found in a letter written by a "Gentleman on his Travels" (Wm. Rind), who had visited the Philadelphia Academy in 1769:

Erected about two years ago, . . . in the county of Somerset, Maryland, . . . a house sixty-two feet in length and twenty feet in breadth; . . . employs two Masters of Liberal Education [who teach] . . . the rudiments of English Grammar, . . . Spelling, . . . writing, . . . Latin and Greek, . . . and various branches of the Arts and Sciences. . . . Great pains are taken to cultivate the Art of Speaking, which is necessary in order to shine in the Senate, at the bar, and in the pulpit.²³

The last sentence of the foregoing quotation, with its stress upon speaking, is highly suggestive of the Franklin curriculum. That seems to have been the most popular part of Dove's work, Franklin especially commending the excellence of the public programs given by Dove's pupils.

Similar stress is placed upon speaking in several notices of schools included in this section. It may not be out of place to note again that the original "scheme" was drawn up in Philadelphia in 1743, while the city was still under the spell of Whitefield's eloquence. Franklin, himself a modest speaker, may have had in mind the power of Whitefield when he prescribed in his first paragraph that the rector of his school must be a "correct pure Speaker and Writer of the English Tongue," and directed "making Declamations, repeating Speeches and delivering Orations." Indeed, in regard to grammar, his scheme says merely: "The English Language might be taught by Grammar." Perhaps at that time he was not convinced that English could be taught "as a language"; he certainly was so convinced before the proposals and the constitutions appeared in 1749.

The direct influence of the academy spread to a marked degree through the efforts of students who became teachers in other colonies. This is indicated by the evidence of Philo Merilandicus cited above.

²² Pa. J., Apr. 1, 1762; N. J. Arc., XXIV, 21.

²³ Va. G., Feb. 23, 1769.

Influence spread in this way certainly in the case of Andrew D'Ellicent and Alexander Alexander, who in 1766 announced a school in Charleston, S. C., as follows:

Andrew D'Ellicent and Alexander Alexander, late from the College of Philadelphia, beg leave to inform the Publick that they intend to open a School . . . where will be taught the English, French, Latin and Greek Languages grammatically, likewise writing, etc. . . . Young ladies may be instructed in the English Grammar as to be enabled to speak and write their native tongue with . . . Propriety. Boys who have a taste and talents for Oratory may be taught rhetoric, and to pronounce Orations with due action and diction.²⁴

In 1757, a list of all the pupils enrolled in the Philadelphia Academy the preceding year includes the name of one Lindley Murray in the English school.²⁵ Wood, a University of Pennsylvania professor, in his history of that institution, written in 1834, asserts that he has no doubt that this is the Murray who wrote the famous Murray grammars.²⁶ Murray, who wrote in England, we know to have been an American. If Wood is correct and Lindley Murray did actually receive his first instruction in grammar at the academy, this in itself would be a strong argument for the direct influence of the institution on later schools and school practices.

There is no intention of exaggerating the influence of Franklin's academy. Probably the schools and schoolmasters did not deliberately follow the academy as a model. It is much more likely that many of them were influenced by the numerous educational writers whose works were widely circulated in America, the very men who moved Franklin to his innovation. Responsive also, as was Franklin, to the growing feeling of restlessness under the Latin curriculum as unsuited to the intensely practical life of the Nation, many of the schoolmen turned instinctively to the mother tongue. A discussion of these broader agencies, which spread the vernacular instruction far more powerfully than did the example of Franklin or of any institution, constitutes the following section.

The history of educational reforms shows that observation and imitation of actual school practices, even more than the study of educational theories, is the unrivaled moving force. To Melancthon's school, to St. Paul's, to Yverdun, to the Boston Latin, to Rugby, to Gary, schoolmen make pilgrimages, either literal or figurative; then they go home to inaugurate these innovations for themselves. There is reason to suppose that this was a common procedure in 1750 to 1775;²⁷ and the one school, above all others, which in loca-

²⁴ S. C. G., May 20, 1766. ²⁵ List printed in Montgomery. *Hist. of U. of P.*, 284.

²⁶ Wood, *Hist. of U. P.*, 186.

²⁷ An interesting example of this, of the date we are now considering, and establishing further the influence of the Philadelphia institution is the following: Rev. James Madison was graduated from William and Mary in 1771, and nine years later became President of that college. He is said to have introduced into William and Mary the curriculum of the Philadelphia College and Academy. In 1785 he received the degree of doctor of divinity from the University of Pennsylvania. *Montgomery, op. cit.*, 263.

tion, in point of time, in publicity, in prestige of foundation, was most suited for such leadership was Franklin's English school of 1750. We believe that Robert Proud, in his *History of Pennsylvania in North America*, written between 1770 and 1780, was right in at least one respect when he said: "The College and Academy of Philadelphia . . . is likely . . . to become the most considerable of its kind, perhaps in British America."²⁸

3. EDUCATIONAL THEORIES SUPPORTING GRAMMAR IN AMERICA UP TO 1775.

Preceding sections presented schools and colleges teaching English grammatically and the Franklin academy as having the right to be considered the first leading secondary school with the English program. Consideration now turns to an analysis of the educational ideas which induced American schools to enlarge upon the few scattered beginnings of grammar in the eighteenth century and to adopt very widely at its close an English program with grammar as its central study.

EDUCATIONAL TREATISES IN THE COLONIES.

Several educational treatises widely known in England made their way into the American colonies before 1775. Prominent among these were "Some Thoughts concerning Education," 1639, by John Locke;²⁹ "British Education," by Thomas Sheridan, 1756;³⁰ "Observations for Liberal Education," London, 1742, by George Turnbull;³¹ "Dialogues Concerning Education," published anonymously, 1745, by James Fordyce;³² and "Essays on Education, by Milton, Locke, and the Authors of the Spectator," London, 1761 edition, by R. Wynne.³³

In 1747 Franklin advertised the works of Locke, Turnbull, and Fordyce, and showing that he was himself interested in these books

²⁸ Proud, *op. cit.*, II, 281.

²⁹ Advertised, Pa. G., Dec. 3, 1747, by B. Franklin; B. N. L., Sept. 4, 1750; N. Y. M., Sept. 24, 1752; Conn. G., Apr. 12, 1755; Ga. G., Apr. 14, 1763; B. Ch., May 1768, etc.

³⁰ Advertised, S. C. G. and C. J., Mar. 1, 1763; N. Y. M., Nov. 7, 1763; B. Ch., May 2, 1768; Va. G., June 10, 1773, etc.

The full title of Sheridan's book is "British Education; or, the Source of the Disorders of Great Britain, being an Essay towards proving, that the Immorality, Ignorance, and false Taste, which so generally prevail are the natural and necessary Consequences of the present defective System of Education, with An Attempt to show that a Revival of the Art of Speaking, and the Study of our own Language, might contribute, in a great Measure to the Cure of those Evils." By Thomas Sheridan, A. M., London, 1756 edition.

³¹ Advertised, Pa. G., Dec., 3, 1747, by B. Franklin; N. Y. G., Dec. 11, 1753; N. Y. M., June, 1775, etc.

³² Advertised, Pa. G., Sept. 22, 1747, by B. Franklin; N. Y. G., Nov. 13, 1753, etc.

³³ Advertised, N. Y. M., Sept. 30, 1765; N. Y. G. or W. P. B., Oct. 19, 1761; *ibid.*, Feb. 11, 1771; *ibid.*, Sept. 10, 1769, etc.

he quotes Locke extensively.³⁴ What is more significant he drew up his plan of English education in exceedingly close conformity to one striking passage in Turnbull. No attempt is made to use the "deadly parallel";³⁵ but the conclusion is inevitable that Franklin was thoroughly familiar with Turnbull. At any rate, every one of the main parts of the academy's English program is advocated in the same order as in Turnbull's discussion. Both writers believe that grammar, composition, declamation, oratory, and the study of English classics are primarily for the cultivation of "stile," and to cap it all the principal motive of each is regard for the various professions in which the mother tongue is to be used.

THE BURDEN OF LEARNING LATIN.

Four more contentions are discernible in the educational treatises which came to America in the eighteenth century.³⁶ The first of these is the burden of learning Latin. The revolt against the extreme hold of Latin is a very old one, having as its earliest conspicuous champions Comenius, Mulcaster, and Milton. An idea of the unspeakable grind transferred from John Sturm's Gymnasium to the sixteenth-century grammar schools of England may be seen by a glance at Sturm's curriculum. He required seven years to be spent on the acquirement of a "pure Latin style," two to be given to "elegance," and five collegiate years to be passed in learning the art of Latin speech, 14 years, with the ultimate goal of proficiency in writing and speaking the Latin tongue.³⁷

Comenius, the Bohemian educational reformer, 1592-1671, voiced one of the earliest protests against Latin instruction like that of Sturm. Comenius, to be sure, retained Latin as the most valuable study, but he would first have the vernacular taught, then a neighboring modern tongue, then Latin, Greek, etc. He advocated as well objective study of the natural world.³⁸

Mulcaster, 1582, also raised his protest: "Is it not a marvelous bondage to become servants to one tongue, for learning's sake, the most part of our time . . . whereas we may have the very same treasure in our own tongue, with the gain of most time. . . . I love Rome, but London better; I favor Italy, but England more; . . . I honor the Latin, but I worship the English."³⁹

Milton, in 1650, urges: "We do amiss to spend seven or eight years merely in scraping together as much miserable Latin and Greek as

³⁴ Franklin illustrated his "proposals" by extracts from Milton, Locke, Sheridan, Walker, Rollin, Turnbull, "with some others." In Smyth, *Life and Writings of B. Franklin*, II, 387, Franklin's quotations are given.

³⁵ See Appendix B. The writer has seen no other suggestion that Franklin followed Turnbull closely.

³⁶ Nearly all the other writers cited follow Locke very closely.

³⁷ Summary of Sturm's curriculum. Monroe, *Hist. of Ed.*, 391.

³⁸ Comenius, *Great Didactic*, Laurie, 115.

³⁹ *Elementarie*, pt. 1; Quick, *Ed. Ref.*, 300-2.

might be learned otherwise easily and delightfully in one year. . . . These are not matters to be wrung from poor striplings like blood out of the nose or the plucking of untimely fruit." He refers to the prevalent instruction as "those grammatical flats and shallows, where they stuck unreasonably to learn a few words with lamentable construction" and as "that assinine feast of sow-thistles and brambles, which is commonly set before them as all the food and entertainment of their tenderest and most docible age."⁴⁰

The goals to which these early reformers strove were, first, knowledge to be written in the vernacular; second, instruction in reading and writing for the masses, in order that this secular knowledge, like religious knowledge in the Bible, might be made accessible to all.

Before the eighteenth-century agitators began work English was established in its elementary branches in the schools and books in English teaching were widely printed; that is, the two goals of Comenius, Mulcaster, and Milton were attained. Now began the work of a second group of educational reformers, headed by the greatest master of them all, John Locke. They led the attack upon the second-line trenches of Latin and established the principle that for the masses a vernacular education of a secondary grade is equivalent to a Latin education of the same grade for a privileged few. To-day's fight is for the third-line trench and over the question, shall the classics remain as an important part of the curriculum because of the few privileged to attain the highest culture?

The newer leaders, headed by Locke, sound the same note, lamenting the heavy burden of the Latin-grammar program. Locke, in 1693, says:

When I consider what ado is made about learning a little Latin and Greek, how many years are spent in it, I can hardly forbear thinking that the parents of children still live in fear of the schoolmaster's rod. . . . How else is it possible that a child can be chained to the oar seven, eight, or ten of the best years of his life, to get a language or two?⁴¹

The Tatler of 1710 urges that masters should teach pupils to use English instead of perplexing them with Latin epistles, themes, and verses—

For can anything be more absurd than our way of proceeding; . . . to put tender Wits into the intricate maze of Grammar, and a Latin Grammar; . . . to learn an unknown art by an unknown tongue; . . . to carry them a dark round-about way to let them in at the back door?⁴²

Dr. Johnson, Franklin's friend, in the preface of his dictionary, said: "A whole life can not be spent upon syntax and etymology, and even a whole lifetime would not be sufficient."⁴³

⁴⁰ Wynne, *op. cit.*, 5-8.

⁴¹ Wynne, *op. cit.*, 29; Locke, *Thoughts Concerning Education*.

⁴² Tatler, IV., No. 234.

⁴³ Johnson, *Dict. of Eng. Language*, I, preface, 13.

It may be worth while to dwell upon the influence of the Spectator and Tatler,⁴⁴ because Addison and Steele speak out boldly for English grammar.

Addison and Steele enjoyed popularity on both sides of the Atlantic. Says Steele:

I found . . . the principal defect of our English discipline to lie in the Initiatory part, which, although it needs the greatest care and skill, is usually left to the conduct of those blind guides, Chance and Ignorance. . . . I could furnish you with a catalogue of English books . . . wherein you could not find ten lines together of "common Grammar," which is a necessary consequence of our mismanagement in that province. . . . The liberal Arts and Sciences are all beautiful as the Graces; nor has Grammar, the severe mother of all, so frightful a face of her own; it is the vizard put upon it, that scares children. She is made to speak hard words that, to them, sound like conjuring. Let her talk intelligibly and they will listen to her.

In this, I think . . . we show ourselves true Britons, always overlooking our natural advantages. It has been the practice of the wisest nations to learn their own language by stated rules to avoid the confusion that would follow from leaving it to vulgar use. Our English Tongue . . . is the most determined in its construction, and reducible to the fewest rules.

To speak and write without absurdity the language of one's country is commendable in persons in all stations, and to some indispensably necessary. To this purpose, I would recommend above all things the having a Grammar of our mother tongue first taught in our schools. . . . Where is such grammar to be had? . . . It is our good fortune to have such a Grammar with notes now in the press, to be published next Term.

In a footnote Wynne adds: "This, I suppose, was the English Grammar published by John Brightland,⁴⁵ with the approbation of Isaac Bicherstaff, the edition of which was published⁴⁶ in 1726." This reference to the Brightland grammar leads to the supposition that Steele was the author.

ENGLISH THE LANGUAGE OF DAILY USE.

The second note, frequently found in the treatises on education of the eighteenth century, is that English is the language of daily use. This was the burden of the Tatler just cited. Locke also would have grammar learned by those whose main business is with the tongue or pen, but—

it must be the grammar of his own tongue; of the language he uses; . . . it will be a matter of wonder, why young gentlemen are forced to learn the grammar of foreign and dead languages, and are never once told of the grammar of their own tongue. . . . Nor is their own language ever proposed to them as worthy their care and cultivating; though they have daily use of it, and are not

⁴⁴ Franklin undoubtedly drew his first interest in the teaching of English from his close study and imitation of these, as narrated in his autobiography.

⁴⁵ Tatler, IV, No. 234.

⁴⁶ Wynne, *op. cit.*, 177-9.

seldom . . . judged of by their handsome or awkward way of expressing themselves in it.⁴⁷ . . . And since 'tis English that an Englishman will have constant use of, that is the language he should chiefly cultivate; . . . to mind what English his pupil speaks or writes is below the dignity of one bred up among Greek and Latin, tho' he have but little of them himself. These are the learned languages, fit only for learned men to meddle with and teach; English is the language of the illiterate vulgar.⁴⁸

A student "ought to study *grammar*, among the other helps of speaking well; but it must be the grammar of his own tongue . . . that he may understand his own country speech nicely and speak it properly; and to this purpose *grammar* is *necessary* but it is the grammar *only of their own proper tongues.*"⁴⁹

In 1769, in the Boston Chronicle, Joseph Ward strikes the note of English as of daily value to the masses as follows:

The subscriber has opened an English Grammar School in King Street. . . . The understanding the English Grammar is so necessary for those who have not a Liberal Education, and as it will greatly facilitate the learning any other Language, such a school is said by the Literati to be very much wanted in this town. . . .⁵⁰

In 1769 Richard Carew asserts:

Whatsoever grace any other language carrieth in verse or prose, in tropes or metaphors, in echoes or agonominations, they may all be lively and exactly represented in ours. Will you have Plato's verse? Read Sir Thomas Smith; The Ionic? Sir Thomas More; Cicero's? Ascham; Varro? Chaucer; Demosthenes? Sir John Cheke . . . Will you read Virgil? Take the Earl of Surrey; Catullus? Shakespeare and Marlowe's fragment; Ovid? Daniel; Lucian? Spencer; Martial? Sir John Davies and others. Will you have all in all for prose and verse? Take the miracle of our age, Sir Philip Sidney.⁵¹

We have seen above that Franklin in his "proposals" stressed the idea of "Regard being had for the several Professions for which they (the students) are intended." English is the instrument of trade, of law, pulpit, and Senate Chamber. Locke pointed out that a man is often judged by his skillful or awkward use of his native language. Wynne's books spread the teaching of Locke, Milton, and Steele in America, and Turnbull follows Milton and Locke with almost the identical argument.

Milton said:

Tho a linguist should pride himself to have all the tongues Babel cleft the world into: yet if he had not studied the solid things in them as well as words and lexicons, he were nothing so much to be estimated a learned man, as any yeoman or tradesman competently wise in his own dialect only.⁵²

⁴⁷ Wynne, op. cit., 60-2.

⁴⁸ Sparks, op cit., II, 137-138. Cited by Franklin in his "proposals."

⁴⁹ Footnote in Franklin's "Observations," Sparks, op. cit.; also Wynne, 252.

⁵⁰ B. G., Apr. 20, 1769.

⁵¹ Quoted, Watson, Beginnings, 11, from "Elizabethan Critical Essays," Gregory Smith, 2, 293.

⁵² Wynne, op. cit., 4, 5.

Locke expressed the obverse idea that "nothing can be more ridiculous than that a father should waste his own money and his son's time in setting him to learn the Roman language, when at the same time he designs him for a trade."⁵³ Turnbull follows in the same vein: "Few think their children qualified for a trade till they have been whipped at a Latin School for five or six years to learn a little of that which they are obliged to forget."⁵⁴

The demand for practical instruction is most vigorously demanded by Turnbull as follows:

Can any one hesitate to choose whether that his son should early be acquainted with men, manners, and things, or that he should early be a profound linguist. . . . What man of sense . . . would not rather have his son at fourteen tolerably skilled in geography and history, acquainted with the true method of unravelling nature, . . . and able to express truths of these classes with propriety and taste, in his own language . . . though he know little Latin?⁵⁵

Sheridan, in a *reductio ad absurdum* upon the utility of classical learning, tells of the "ingenious and learned translator of Milton's *Paradise Lost* . . . now starving on a poor curacy in a remote part of the country. And shall many fathers expect that their sons will be able to outdo him in learning, or have nobler opportunities of displaying it?"⁵⁶

Thomas Byerley, author of the second grammar published in America, 1779, in the same year set up a grammar school in New York. In his elaborate advertisements, after setting forth the necessity of giving up the study of Latin for the purpose of learning English grammar, he quotes Locke in the passage just cited above on the futility of making a boy learn the Roman language when he is at the same time designed for a trade.⁵⁷

Even more vigorously does William Watson speak of his school in Charleston, S. C., 1769, "for the Instruction of Youth in the English Language . . . grammatically. . . . The utility of such an undertaking is too obvious to need any Recommendation." He goes on to say that Latin and Greek are of "little consequence to those who spend their days in rural, mercantile, or mechanical Employments." He dwells on the inutility of spending "six or seven years in the study of dead languages. . . . If knowledge can be obtained . . . without the dry and tedious process . . . it may not be a useless attempt. . . . Such an attempt as this the subscriber humbly presumes to make."⁵⁸

One of the earliest notices of an English school is William Gough's, a plantation school near Charleston, in 1742. "William Gough

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 46.

⁵⁴ Turnbull, *op. cit.*, 4.

⁵⁵ Turnbull, *op. cit.*, 260.

⁵⁶ Sheridan, *op. cit.*, 222-3.

⁵⁷ N. Y. G. and W. M., Aug. 23, 1773.

⁵⁸ S. C. G., June 24, 1769.

gives notice that he is now settled entirely at the Plantation of Mr. James Taylor, and continues to teach the several most useful branches of learning (in the English Tongue) according to the London Method, whereby Youth may be qualified for Business by land or Sea."⁵⁹

THE IMPORTANCE OF STANDARDIZING AND PRESERVING THE ENGLISH TONGUE.

We have pointed out that the plans for Franklin's academy matured while Philadelphia, and, indeed, the colonies at large, were under the influence of Whitefield's oratory. The emphasis of the Philadelphia program upon oral English may have received its immediate inspiration from that source. But there was a far-reaching appeal for public speaking of greater significance than the inspiration of any one man. This larger appeal runs through the educational treatises which both in England and in America led the eighteenth-century movement for the vernacular. Indeed, the discussion which follows shows that the movement to place vernacular on a par with Latin found its early strength in two correlated arguments: First, that the cultivation of a style for pure speech would assist in formulating, standardizing, and preserving the English tongue; second, that in the new world, with its conglomeration of tongues, the schools must make an effort to keep the vernacular free from the influence of other languages and to establish English as the standard language of the new land.

A pretentious elaboration of the first of these arguments is the treatise of Thomas Sheridan. His large volume of 534 pages, dedicated to the Earl of Chesterfield, prime minister and famous orator, develops the thesis that a "Revival of the Art of Speaking, and the study of our own Language, might contribute to the Cure of that . . . Ignorance and False Taste, which so generally prevail."⁶⁰

In his address to Lord Chesterfield, Sheridan says: "The scheme is: A design to revive the long-lost art of oratory and to correct, ascertain, and fix the English Language."⁶¹ In almost every chapter Sheridan acknowledges his indebtedness to Milton, Swift, Locke, and Addison. Out of the writings of these men Sheridan has judiciously extracted those passages which champion the vernacular, especially oral instruction in it.

Two postulates underlie Sheridan's argument: First, the causes which stressed Latin and Greek dedicated so vast a portion of time to

⁵⁹ S. C. G., Feb. 13, 1742.

Gough does not advertise grammar. "Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic in all its Branches" are his principal subjects. Before 1750, and, indeed in all the advertisements up to 1775, arithmetic in all its branches, as an intensively practical subject, appears almost invariably. The appeal of, immediate practicality, found effective in arithmetic, gradually creeps into the announcements of English speaking and grammar.

⁶⁰ Sheridan, op. cit., title page.

⁶¹ Ibid., preface, VI.

the acquisition of skill in those languages and at the same time the pupil's own was totally neglected and no longer of any force.

The learned languages are no longer the sole repositories of knowledge; . . . the English is become an universal magazine . . . of all wisdom. . . . Add to this, that we have many excellent writers of our own, besides, the language itself has been so much enlarged and improved. . . . To state the account in short between our forefathers and us, they shewed great wisdom and good sense in making the learned languages the chief study in their days (time of Reformation) because, however round about the way, knowledge was then to be acquired in none other; and because our own, then poor and uncultivated, could be in no other way enriched or refined. . . .⁶²

English is the language most universally read by Englishmen.⁶³

The second postulate is that as yet, say in 1750, English had no fixed standard. Sheridan complains of general "bad taste which is allowed to prevail," both in writing and speaking, on the part of public men, of "the amazing number of wretched pamphlets," and of "those heaps of trash, which are constantly exposed to sale in the windows of booksellers, like unripe fruit, greedily devoured by green-sickness appetites, and which fill the mind with crudities." Quoting Steele, Sheridan says: "I would engage to furnish you with a catalogue of English books . . . within seven years past . . . wherein you could not find ten lines together of common grammar or of common sense."⁶⁴

Upon these two postulates Sheridan constructs his plea that oratory fixed the standards of the ancient languages and perpetuated them; that the other nations of Europe—

the French, Italians, Spaniards, etc., . . . after having enriched and illustrated their several languages by the aids and lights borrowed from the Greek and Roman, employed the utmost industry to refine, correct, and ascertain (make certain) them by fixed and stated rules. . . . The English alone left theirs to the power of chance or caprice; insomuch that it is within a few months that even a dictionary has been produced here.⁶⁵ Whilst in all the others many excellent grammars and dictionaries have long since been published.⁶⁶

Both the ancients and all moderns but the English studied their own languages with respect to what is pure and correct in style and in pronunciation.

What shall we say to our practice so contrary to that of polished nations . . . (we) who take great pains in studying all languages but our own? Who are very nice and curious in our choice of preceptors for the ancient and modern tongues, yet suffer our children to be vitiated in the very first principles of their own. Is it because that the knowledge of our language is so easily acquired, that it can scarce be missed? This surely can not be said when it is universally

⁶² *Ibid.*, 217-9.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 228.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 227, *Tatler* IV, No. 230.

⁶⁵ This refers to Johnson's Dictionary and fixes the date for Sheridan's first edition.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 212-3.

allowed that there are hardly any who speak or write it correctly. Is it because we have less use for it than for any other? ⁶⁷

When we consider that after Greek and Roman languages were brought to a standard of perfection, when their youth had the advantage of established invariable rules upon which to found their knowledge; of able preceptors to instruct and guide them; of the noblest examples and most perfect patterns for their instruction; . . . shall we who have none of their advantages, without any pains or application expect to have a competent knowledge of one, which in its present state is far more difficult to be learned than theirs? This omission in our education . . . is wonderful. ⁶⁸

And the supreme means of establishing this uniformity of fixing and ascertaining the tongue is, according to Sheridan, the fostering of the "ancient art of oratory"; by this means "our Shakespeare and our Milton" will not be suffered "to become two or three centuries hence what Chaucer is at present, the study of only a few poring antiquarians, and in an age or two more victims of bookworms." Sheridan completes his argument with the curious fallacy that the orators of a nation are its sound philosophers; that they perpetuate a language; that upon them and their art depends the safety of their nations. ⁶⁹

It is highly significant that Sheridan dedicated his work to Chesterfield, an eloquent orator of his day. Moreover, Chesterfield had made a public proposal to the provost and fellows of the University of Dublin, while he was viceroy of Ireland, "for the endowment of proper lectures and exercises in the Art of Reading and Speaking." ⁷⁰

The project failed. In his preface Sheridan comments upon an innovation recently made in Eaton by Barnard and at Rugby by Markham, by which, "amongst many other good customs . . . pronunciation and the art of speaking are now made effectual points." ⁷¹ This appears to indicate that the English schools were not many years in advance of the American.

Only one of Sheridan's arguments is likely to have had a strong appeal in America. Americans had no literature of their own; they were not primarily interested in the establishment of a standard style of literature; the appeal for the preservation of the language of Shakespeare and Milton was remote from the interests of the new land. The main interest of Americans would lie in the substance of Sheridan's appeal, not in the reasons for it. He wished to teach oratory; he eulogized public speech; he lauded correct pronunciation and fluent oral address. This would appeal especially to Americans, with their democratic town meetings, their traditions of pulpit leadership, and their necessity of oral communication in general. Moreover,

⁶⁷ Sheridan, *op. cit.*, 195-196.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 196-7.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, XXIX.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, preface, XVII.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, XIV.

statesmanship in the local governments and provincial councils was the goal of parents for their children. The profession of the law was increasing in popularity, and in any and all lines of activity effective speech was looked upon as a prime requisite.

Private schoolmasters were not slow to realize the popularity of this appeal. Advertisements of the day are replete with it. For example, "The boys learning oratory make orations every fortnight";⁷² "I intend teaching the English language with proper accent and emphasis";⁷³ "parents . . . may depend on having their children . . . diligently instructed in grammatical English, with due attention to emphasis, pause, cadence, and puerile declamation";⁷⁴ "weekly exercise of reading the English authors with propriety and grace";⁷⁵ "the Boys, as soon as they are capable to be exercised in pronouncing Orations";⁷⁶ "nor will the true pronounciation, the proper stops, emphasis, accent and quantity be neglected";⁷⁷ "Pains will be taken to form them early for Public Speaking";⁷⁸ "Great pains are taken to cultivate the Art of Public Speaking, which is necessary in order to shine in the Senate, at the bar, or in the pulpit";⁷⁹ boys who have "a taste and talents for Oratory may be taught rhetoric and to pronounce with due action and diction."⁸⁰ The first advertisement of King's College (Columbia), 1754, added to the learned languages "reasoning, writing, and speaking eloquently."⁸¹

An exact expression of this idea, that neglect of vernacular grammar caused incorrect speech, which had been taken verbatim from Sheridan or paraphrased from him, is found in the announcement of William Johnson, who set up an English grammar school on Union Street, Charleston, S. C., in 1767. He says:

It is a common, but too well-grounded complaint that a grammatical study of our own language seldom makes any part of the ordinary method of instructing youth. . . . To this neglect may justly be attributed the great incorrectness of speech, observable amongst almost all ranks of people . . . to remedy which . . . is the point the proposer has in view.⁸²

There was a growing realization that the Nation ought to have one common language; that the best national life could not obtain if English, German, French, Dutch, Scandinavian languages—not to mention others—should each remain the speech of a portion of the people. Moreover, the mingling of so many tongues must certainly result in

⁷² Joseph Garner, Pa. G., July 3, 1765.

⁷³ Mary McAllister, Pa. G., June 4, 1767.

⁷⁴ John Hefferman, Pa. G., Sept. 14, 1774.

⁷⁵ Witherspoon, Princeton, N. J., Pa. J., Mar. 2, 1769.

⁷⁶ Jacob Giles, Mount Pleasant, Md., Md. G., July 19, 1765.

⁷⁷ Grammaticaster, Pa. G., Oct. 29, 1767.

⁷⁸ James Thompson, Charleston, S. C., S. C. G., Dec. 10, 1772.

⁷⁹ Somerset Academy, Maryland, Va. G., Feb. 23, 1769.

⁸⁰ Andrew D'Ellicent, Charlestown, S. C., S. C. G., May 20, 1766.

⁸¹ N. Y. G. and W. P. B., May 31, 1754.

⁸² S. C. G., June 15, 1767.

the corruption of them all, and especially of the dominant one, the English. It is certain that this feeling was present in the minds of the authorities in the College and Academy of Philadelphia, inasmuch as Pennsylvania had an exceedingly composite population. In 1758 Provost Smith, the chief Latinist against whom Franklin inveighs, wrote an article, which appeared in the *American Magazine* in October of that year, entitled "Account of the College and Academy of Philadelphia." He says:

Oratory, correct Speaking and Writing the Mother Tongue is a branch of education too much neglected in all our *English Seminaries*, as is often visible in the public performance of some of our most learned men. But in the circumstances of this province, such a neglect would have been still more inexcusable than in any other part of the British dominions. For we are so great a mixture of people, from almost all corners of the world, necessarily speaking a variety of languages and dialects, that true pronunciation and writing of our own language might soon be lost among us without such a previous care to preserve in the rising generations.⁸³

A schoolmaster of New York, advertising an English grammar school in the consistory room of the French church, says: "The English Grammar, . . . the learning of it being indispensably necessary in an English country, I intend to teach to all my scholars."⁸⁴

Benjamin Franklin himself voices this appeal:

Why should you . . . leave it (America) to be taken by foreigners of all nations and languages, who by their numbers may drown and stifle the English which otherwise would probably become in the course of two centuries the most extensive language in the world. . . .⁸⁵

It appears that we have now reached the heart of the primary cause which forwarded the study of English grammar. A movement, in the words of Sheridan cited above, "to refine, correct, and ascertain (make certain) the English language by fixed and stated rules" is essentially grammatical. Samuel Johnson's dictionary, and others, standardized English diction. Sheridan spoke the truth when he said that the English needed "the advantage of established and invariable rules" upon which to establish and perpetuate the language.

The very prevalence of illiteracy in the public and private speech of the eighteenth century demanded the study of grammar. Granted that the mother tongue was more useful and less laborious than Latin, granted that it was desirable to speak and write well, granted that Dilworth, Greenwood, Lowth, and the *British Grammar* had reduced English to "established and invariable rules," it seems to have followed with irresistible logic that the schools must teach English

⁸³ Montgomery, *op. cit.*, 520-9.

⁸⁴ N. Y. G. and W. P. B., June 5, 1766.

⁸⁵ Letter to Wm. Strahan, Passy, Aug. 19, 1785. Sparks, *op. cit.*, II, 131.

grammar. Hence we find that every one of the schoolmasters cited in a previous paragraph as teaching oratory also taught grammar. Are we not safe, then, in saying that English grammar came into the curriculum primarily as a result of the popularity of the teaching of public speaking and secondarily as the result of a desire to make rising generations familiar with "fixed and stated rules"?

As a corollary, the study of English as a language came as an antidote for the variety of languages spoken by early settlers, especially in the middle colonies. It is perhaps more accurate to say that it was an attempt to keep English the dominant language of the new continent.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE MASSES IN 1650 AND IN 1750.

Massachusetts and her sister colonies inherited the idea of education for leadership. The grammar schools of England, prototypes of the higher schools set up in New England by the laws of 1647 and 1650, were planned distinctly for an intellectual, educational, and political aristocracy. The society from which the first settlers came was distinctly a class society. Many of the Pilgrim Fathers and their immediate successors from England came from the smaller landed gentry in the mother country. Moreover, the first settlers, although apparently possessing a democratic form of government, characterized in local affairs by the town meeting, were in reality controlled by a relatively small group of leaders. These men, as we have seen, were clergymen, but their authority and influence extended over almost every aspect of life. To perpetuate this leadership Harvard College was founded only eight years after the settling of Massachusetts Bay. To the college, with its inherited curriculum of the classics, must be sent the more promising youth, prepared either under the private tutorship of some clergyman or in a suitable school. This is the origin of the grammar school in America.

Given a grammar school, some means must be provided for the preliminary education considered necessary for entrance. This was provided either by dame schools or by the reading schools or by grammar schools. Along with this idea of higher education for leadership there existed a second idea. This was that all citizens must be taught to read the Scriptures and to understand the capital laws of the country. The idea of universal education grew out of a combination of these two purposes. Briefly, universal education in 1650 meant universal ability to read, possibly to write and cipher, and widespread opportunity to train leaders.

By the middle of the next century a somewhat different idea of universal education was dawning. Various causes had reduced the importance of religious leaders. The rough life of the new continent

had brought out native qualities of leadership, undeveloped by education. The ancient classics did not hew the forests, blaze pathways into the wilderness, nor fight back Indians. A Benjamin Franklin, forced at 13 to forego the higher schools of Boston, by sheer native merit had made himself an influential man. Many lesser Franklins had raised themselves in various settlements. Just as on the American frontiers of the early nineteenth century a vigorous and robust democracy seemed to produce and develop Jacksons and Lincolns, so 100 years earlier kindred causes were at work in New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and the rest. No longer did it count primarily what a man knew. What he could do was far more important. In short, after 1650, 100 years of frontier life had demonstrated that suitable leaders were forthcoming in all aspects of life, except possibly the ministry, irrespective of a classical education.

If this be true, when the frontiersmen of the eighteenth century found themselves victors in the first severe struggle with privations and established in somewhat settled communities, they began again to think of education.⁸⁶ Their uncouth manners and dress were like their intellectual life and their speech—strong, but coarse. A desire for refinement grew apace, if not for themselves, at least for their children. In addition, new professions and occupations came into prominence as the communities became more stable. All these newer professions were the outgrowth of the new country itself, and, like the needs which called them forth, they were practical, everyday man-to-man occupations. Still further, as always in a new land, statesmanship offered an attractive field.

All of these causes had grown out of the soil. Unschooling men controlled public opinion. This type of society, living intensely in the present, both ignorant and scornful of the past, craved an education that would furnish direct help in everyday life. A vernacular education of a higher order than reading and writing, including the "practical branches of mathematics," the modern languages, history, geography, and, above all, a mastery of the English tongue, was the outcome. In short, the ideal of universal education retained in 1750 its central idea of 1650—equal opportunity for all; but there had come in a noteworthy enlargement of it. In 1750 no American was predestined for a high rank in life; out of the masses themselves were to come the leaders; a practical education for all was to open the way. On the crest of this wave the mother tongue was carried to the foremost place in American education.

⁸⁶ Franklin, *Autobiography*, 177.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION.

Several lines of investigation have been advanced to enable us to answer the questions: When, where, why, and by whom English grammar made its first appearance in the curricula of American schools. Conclusions reached are as follows:

1. Textbooks in English grammar do not seem to have been imported until about 1750. Dilworth's was published in England in 1740 and had its first American reprint in 1747.⁸⁷

Dilworth's was introduced primarily as a speller. After 1750 there is considerable evidence that Greenwood's and several other British grammars made their way into the colonies.

2. There were at least two grammars written and published in America before the Revolution—Johnson's and Byerley's. Considering the rush of American texts in grammar after 1784,⁸⁸ this early scarcity is strong negative evidence to the effect that attention to grammar was relatively insignificant before the appearance of Webster's first book in 1784. In addition, seven grammars by English authors were reprinted in America before 1784. Our estimate places the number of texts before Webster's, both native and imported, at 10. Of these Dilworth's was the only one available for the schools in large numbers. Dilworth's "New Guide," although primarily a speller, deserves the name of the first American textbook in English grammar.

3. A respectable number of private schools, of which we have mentioned 60, some of them called English grammar schools, were offering courses in "English, as a language" by 1775. These schools began to appear before 1750; they were most numerous in the middle colonies, in the regions neighboring to Philadelphia Academy, where Franklin's program of the vernacular struck a plane never reached before. The New England colonies, with the classics more firmly entrenched, resisted the innovation for two decades after the middle colonies had adopted it.

4. A careful consideration of Franklin's plan leads to the conclusion that this English school, preceding any general importation or publication in America of textbooks in grammar, deserves the honor of setting a positive example of a full vernacular program of secondary grade and of being imitated by masters tired of the old type of schools. Therefore the year 1750 is selected as the date when the higher branches of the vernacular, including grammar, entered seriously into American education. To Benjamin Franklin, in this, as in many other respects, America owes a debt of gratitude. As his experiments in science antedated by decades general school instruction in

⁸⁷ Wickersham, in Pennsylvania, is in error in assigning this date as 1757. Wickersham, *Hist. of Ed. in Pa.*, 197.

⁸⁸ See Chap. IV, p. 80.

them, so his experiment in vernacular education was more serviceable as an example and a model than as an actual accomplishment.

5. Representative curricula of colleges and secondary schools showing the earliest appearances of grammar are in accord with the inferences reached above. Before 1750 curricula do not show grammar. After 1750 to 1790 first, private schools; second, colleges; third, public schools, seem to have followed Franklin's lead. In fact, the colonies effected the independence of their schools and colleges from the exclusive hold of the classics contemporaneously with their political independence.⁸⁹ The latter separation was itself not a sharp breaking off; similarly the struggle for the supremacy of the vernacular as the supreme study in the schools was long protracted. The traditions of Latinized instruction, which almost routed Franklin's English program, although they could no longer keep the vernacular in the background throughout the Nation at large, now did the next best thing—they Latinized the methods of teaching English grammar. To a discussion of this Latinizing process in methods we now turn. If the entrance of grammar was an arduous struggle, its emancipation from Latin methods was little short of a titanic one.

6. In answer, then, to the question, When? the answer is 1750, with due reservation for a few obscure earlier efforts. Where? In the middle colonies, headed by Pennsylvania. Why? As the core study of an English program to supplant the classical program for students fitting for practical life. By whom? By Hugh Jones, the first American grammarian; by Waterland, who first taught grammar in an American school; by Franklin, who projected the model English program; by William Samuel Johnson, first president of Columbia, the first American to write a grammar published in America and the first college official to put English on a par with the classics in a college curriculum.

This is a far cry from the credit which has hitherto been awarded to Noah Webster and New England.

⁸⁹ Brown in his "Making of Our Middle Schools" states that the growth of nationalism and national literature had little effect on the schools; that "it took the Romantic Movement and the American and French Revolutions to give the mother tongue an assured position in the program of instruction." *Mid. Sch.*, 188. To the present writer this appears to be only a part of the truth; it is possibly a *post hoc ergo propter hoc*. It seems more accurate to say that in America all revolutions, political, educational, and possibly religious, were largely due to the same fundamental causes. In each there is revolt against outside authority, revolt against established traditions, and a determination that the individual and the nation have a right to live, not in the past but in the future, a vital, active, aggressive life.

Chapter IV.

THE RAPID RISE OF GRAMMAR AFTER 1775.

The period immediately after the Revolution marks the well-nigh universal adoption of English into the curricula of American schools. Earlier sections have indicated that the time was ripe. Many successful experiments had been made in private schools; the Latin curriculum, with its apparent unfitness for the intensely practical life of the new continent, was becoming more and more unpopular; for a considerable number of years colleges had been teaching grammar, composition, and oratory. In fine, irrespective of the Revolution, the time had arrived when a rapid spread of the subject was to be expected. And just as the new national life of England in the sixteenth century, with the accompanying pride in its self-sufficiency, brought forth a vigorous demand for the vernacular, so the national independence of America cooperated powerfully with other causes in transferring generally to the public schools the higher branches of the vernacular. The fact is that increased attention to the English language is the most significant change that occurred in the curricula of the schools after the States began to recover from the turmoil and disruption of war.

1. THE LEGISLATIVE RECOGNITION OF GRAMMAR.

The entire history of education in New England up to the end of the eighteenth century seems to have been preparing the way for the laws which, shortly after the Revolution, placed English in the curriculum and almost, if not quite, on a par with Latin. The Latin curriculum especially was increasingly unpopular. Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire each passed a series of laws with increasing fines for failure to keep open the prescribed schools,⁹⁰ indicating a failure of school spirit in New England.⁹¹ This was referred

⁹⁰ In 1647 Massachusetts levied a fine of £5 (Rec. Co. Mass. Bay, II, 203); in 1671 the fine was increased to £10 (ibid., IV, second vol., 486); in 1683 towns of 200 families were fined £20 (ibid., V, 414); in 1692 the fine for failure to keep an elementary school was increased to £10, but the penalty for a grammar school was not altered (Acts and Res. Pro. Mass. Bay, 1, 63); in 1701 the fine was imposed on towns proportionally for the time they were delinquent (ibid., 470); and in 1718 the fine was increased to £20 for towns of 150 families, £40 for towns of 200 families and £50 for towns of 250 families (ibid., II, 100).

The series of increasing fines in Connecticut begins in 1650 (Rec. Col. Conn., 1, 521) and continues in 1677 (ibid., II, 307-8), in 1678 (ibid., III, 9), and 1700 (ibid., IV, 331). For New Hampshire see Laws of New Hampshire, Prov. Period, I, 561, 337, 358.

⁹¹ Martin, Evolution of Mass. Sch. Sys., 85.

to in the election sermon of 1762 by Rev. Thomas Shephard, in which he laments especially the decay of the Latin schools preparatory for Harvard.⁹² While it is true that some of these laws fined towns for failing to support English schools, the main inference is that the Latin schools, set up under the early laws by a university generation, were too advanced for primitive communities successfully to maintain in operation.

This being the case, many towns found that the best way to comply with the requirements for both Latin and elementary schools was to combine them; that is, to provide a schoolmaster qualified to give instruction in both the classics and the elementary branches of the vernacular. Records of so-called grammar schools in many towns indicate that this combination was effected. For example, Salem in 1677 "agreed with Mr. Eppes to teach all such scholars . . . in y^e English, Latin and Greek Tongue";⁹³ Nearly 100 years later, in 1752, the same town found it necessary to vote that each of the boys "who go to the grammar school must study Latin as well as read and write and cypher."⁹⁴ In 1691 Cambridge voted to engage a schoolmaster "to teach both latten and english and to write and sipher."⁹⁵ and in 1679 Watertown agreed with Richard Norcross to teach for three months only "lattin schollurs and writturs . . . and the other 8 munths . . . both lattin and inglish schollurs."⁹⁶ Other towns showing the combination of Latin and English schools were Dedham, 1667;⁹⁷ Plymouth, 1725;⁹⁸ and Braintree, 1690, which provided

⁹² Felt, *Ann. of Salem*, 433.

⁹³ Relation between the Latin and the English program is interestingly shown in the history of the schools of Salem. In 1667 records of the town show one school for both branches (Felt, *op. cit.*, 434); in 1713 there were separate schools called the English and the Latin schools (*ibid.*, 442); in 1743 the town voted to combine the two under a master and an usher (*ibid.*, 447); this act was revoked three years later, 1746 (*ibid.*). In 1752 the town was compelled to justify the existence of a Latin-grammar school by a special act requiring that every boy, a pupil there, must study Latin as well as reading, writing, and arithmetic (*ibid.*, 448). In 1796, as a natural consequence of the unpopularity of Latin manifested in the preceding order, for the first time the records show the English master made a peer of the Latin master both in title and salary. The town voted that each English master have a salary of £150 and "find ink" and that the Latin master have £130 (*ibid.*, 456). In 1801 notice is published that writing, arithmetic, English grammar, composition, and geography are to be taught in the grammar school besides Latin and Greek (*ibid.*, 458). In other words, the Latin-grammar school is now made over into an English school, with the classics secondary. It is curious to find that in Salem English grammar was not added to the curricula of the English schools, although, as we have seen, it was added to the grammar school in 1801. In 1816 this provision was made also for the English schools to supply "a grammatical acquaintance with their native tongue" (*ibid.*, 464), and finally, in 1827, the Latin and the English high schools of the town appear to be on a par (*ibid.*, 474). This struggle of the two programs in Salem is suggestive of what may have taken place in many other towns in the course of 150 years.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 448.

⁹⁵ *Rec. Town Cambridge, 1630-1703*, II, 296.

⁹⁶ *Watertown Rec.*, I, 137.

⁹⁷ *Rec. Town Dedham, 1659-73*, 133.

⁹⁸ *Rec. Town Plymouth, II*, 232.

“Master to be agreed with as will be willing to Teach english as well as Latten, and also to Teach wrighting and Cyphering.”⁹⁹

Both the legislative efforts to compel towns to maintain Latin schools and the efforts of the towns themselves to stress the vernacular rather than the Latin indicate a leaning toward the State laws which, in the decades immediately following the Revolution, gave English an equal legal standing with the classics. These laws may be said to fructify the tendencies of the previous 150 years. The makers of the Massachusetts law of 1789 and corresponding laws of other States, which will be cited, realized that a renewal of educational enthusiasm must center around the national tongue, eloquent testimony to the fact that the study of English “as a language” had advanced very rapidly since its first feeble beginnings.

In 1789 Massachusetts required that “every town . . . containing two hundred families . . . shall be provided with a grammar school-master . . . well instructed in the Latin, Greek and English Languages.” This school was to be kept for 12 months. Every town of 150 families was to keep a similar school six months; every town of 100 families, an English school for 12 months; every town of 50 families, an English school for six months; that is, “every town . . . containing fifty families . . . shall be provided with a schoolmaster . . . to teach children to read and write and to instruct them in the English language, as well as in arithmetic, orthography, and decent behavior.”¹ Moreover, the statute allows selectmen to maintain mixed schools if they prefer. This, for example, is what Braintree did in 1790.²

Martin points out that by this act 120 towns out of 270 in Massachusetts were relieved of the necessity of keeping a Latin school.³ In 1825 Massachusetts relieved all towns of less than 5,000 inhabitants of the Latin school.⁴ In short, between 1789 and 1825 compulsory Latin-grammar education may be said to have passed; English schools, with the English curriculum, including English grammar, had been substituted.

Boston, pursuant to the law of 1789, completely reorganized her schools. A manuscript copy of “The System of Public Education,” bearing the signature of John Scollay, chairman of the board of selectmen, under date December 1, 1789, was in the possession of Jenks when he wrote his “Sketch of the Boston Latin School.” This manuscript indicates how prominent a place was assigned to the various branches of the vernacular in the Boston schools. The center of the system was a classical grammar school, for entrance to which two

⁹⁹ Braintree Town Rec., 1640-1693, 598.

¹ Perpet. Laws of Com. Mass., 1799, II, 39.

² Braintree Town Rec., 1640-1793, 598.

³ Martin, *Ev. of Mass. Sch. Sys.*, 85.

⁴ Laws of Com. of Mass., X, 558.

prerequisites are indicated. The boy must have reached the age of 10 years and must have been "previously well instructed in English Grammar." In addition, there were three writing schools and three reading schools, in which children of both sexes were to be taught to "spell, accent, and read both prose and poetry, and also be instructed in English Grammar and Composition." In the reading schools textbooks include the Holy Bible, Webster's Spelling Book, The Young Ladies Accidence (Caleb Bingham's elementary grammar), and Webster's American Selections. It is also ordered that "the upper Class in the Reading Schools be instructed in Epistolary Writing and other Composition."⁵

It is not asserted here that the Massachusetts law of 1789 made English grammar compulsory,⁶ but that this law, as those of several other States, was enacted in response to a demand for increased attention to vernacular instruction. In Massachusetts English grammar was specified in the law of 1835.⁷

The Vermont laws of 1797 and 1810, while they do not mention grammar, do nevertheless stress the vernacular.⁸ Virginia in 1796 enacted a similar statute,⁹ and Delaware, in 1796, defines a "good English Education," prescribing "the English language, arithmetic, and other such branches of knowledge as are most useful and necessary in completing a good English education."¹⁰ The regents of the University of the State of New York, in 1793, in a report to the legislature say: "We can not help suggesting . . . the numerous advantages that would accrue . . . from the institution of schools . . . for reading their native tongue with propriety . . . writing . . . arithmetic. . . ."¹¹ The ultimate effect of these laws was, of course, to stress grammar together with the other "senior branches"¹² of English. However, the effect of the universal turning to the vernacular, as it bore particularly upon grammar, may be seen better in certain State laws contemporary with the Massachusetts law which specifically mention the subject.

The first State legislation to speak definitely of grammar appears to have been the New York law of 1797, which provided "for maintaining one or more free schools in the city of New York, in which Scholars shall be instructed in the English Language, or be taught reading, writing, the English grammar, arithmetic, mathematics, and

⁵ Jenks, *Cat. and His. Sketch Boston Latin School*, 286; original document printed in full.

⁶ Corey makes this mistake. *Hist. Malden*, 631.

⁷ *Rev. Stat. Mass.*, chap. 23, sec. 1.

⁸ *Laws State Vt.*, Wright, 1808, I, 181; *ibid.*, Fay Davidson and Burt, 1817, III, 236.

⁹ *Stat. at Large of Va.*, Shepard, 1835, III, 5.

¹⁰ *Laws State Delaware*, S. and J. Adams, 1797, II, 1298.

¹¹ *Hist. and Sta. Rec. of the Univ. of N. Y.*, Hough, 66.

¹² This suggestive phrase is used in the charter for Potosi Academy, Mo., 1817. *Laws Dist. Louisiana*, etc., 1804-1824, Lush & Son, I, 519.

such other branches as are most useful and necessary to complete a good English education." ¹³

By 1827 the legislature, acting on repeated recommendations of the regents, was ready to pass the law making academies training schools for teachers. The law of that year includes this declaration:

No student shall be deemed to have pursued the higher branches of an English Education unless he shall have advanced beyond such Knowledge of common vulgar and decimal arithmetic, and such proficiency in English grammar and geography as are usually obtained in common schools.¹⁴

The first State-wide act definitely prescribing grammar seems to have been the 1798 law of Connecticut:

Enacted, That any School Society shall have liberty . . . to institute a School of higher order . . . to perfect the Youth . . . in Reading and Penmanship, to instruct them in the Rudiments of English Grammar, in Composition, in Arithmetic and Geography, or, on particular desire, in the Latin and Greek Languages, also in the first principles of Religion and Morality, and in general to form them for usefulness and happiness in the various relations of social life.¹⁵

It is significant to note here that Noah Webster's grammars were being published in Hartford between 1784 and 1790. The State law of 1790 ¹⁶ had retained the compulsory grammar schools in county towns; but the law of 1798 abolished this obligation and gave any school society the right to substitute, on a vote of two-thirds of the inhabitants, English schools of a "higher order." Noteworthy, too, is the suggestive phrase at the end of the law of 1798—"in general to form them (the pupils) for usefulness and happiness in the various relations of social life." All these considerations indicate that in the lawmakers' minds must have been a conviction that the traditional curriculum must go, that schools of higher order must be retained, but that in the nature of English schools grammar and composition were the vernacular branches of the "senior" order, and, finally, that usefulness and happiness in everyday life for all and not for a few highly educated individuals was the supreme purpose of the new English education. Brown very fittingly characterizes this revolution in the curriculum at the end of the century as coming in response "to the chaotic desire to study the vernacular" and prefaces that expressive characterization by affirming that "in the study of English grammar a means was found for giving vent" to this desire.¹⁷

The legislation of New Hampshire is especially enlightening concerning the status of grammar. The first educational law after the Revolution, repealing all previous acts, provided funds, in 1789, which—

¹³ Laws State N. Y., 1797 to 1800, inclusive, IV, 42-3.

¹⁴ Laws State N. Y., Croswell, 1827, 237.

¹⁵ Acts and Laws Conn., Hudson and Goodwin, 1796, 1802 edition, 483.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 373.

¹⁷ Brown, *Mak. of Mid. Sch.*, 234.

shall be applied for the sole purpose of keeping an English Grammar School . . . for teaching reading, writing and arithmetic, except in shire and half shire towns, in which the school by them kept shall be a Grammar School for the purpose of teaching the Latin and Greek.¹⁸

This statute uses the term English grammar school, meaning merely an English secondary school, not a school based on English grammar. But it implied an effort to raise the English school to a higher dignity than before, placing it in title at least on the same footing with the Latin-grammar school. Obviously the real difficulty here is that the lower branches of the vernacular do not possess the substance to present the same drill in an English-grammar school as in a Latin. In order to make the curriculum somewhat analogous and to justify the claim of equal dignity, the higher branches of the vernacular—grammar and composition—would be the next logical advance for the English-grammar schools.

This step was taken by New Hampshire several years later, in the law of 1808, ordering an extension of the curriculum of the English school, and, what is even more significant, dropping the provision for Latin schools in shire and half shire towns "for the sole purpose of keeping an English school . . . for teaching the various sounds and powers of the letters of the English Language, reading, writing, English Grammar, arithmetic, geography, and such other branches of education as it may be necessary to teach in an English School."¹⁹ To be noted here is the fact that most of the English grammars of the day, of which by 1808 there were at least 49²⁰ published or used in America, had orthography as their first section, usually defined as "the various sounds and powers of the letters." This phrase in the law, then, with the term English grammar, is certain proof of the legal sanction of this branch in a secondary school which was clearly intended to supplant the Latin school.

The law of 1808 goes still further. It provides that "no person is qualified to teach unless he or she procure a certificate from some able and reputable English Grammar school-master."²¹ For schoolmistresses it is demanded that "the literary qualifications of schoolmistresses be required to extend no further than that they are able to teach the various sounds and powers of the letters in the English Language, reading, writing and English Grammar."²² It is clearly shown by the specifications concerning schoolmistresses that English grammar was prescribed for elementary schools. Ultimately grammar was placed in schools in almost all parts of the country which were neither elementary nor secondary, but distinguished by the name

¹⁸ Laws State of N. H., Melcher, 1792, 276.

¹⁹ Laws State of N. H., Norris, 1815, 368.

²⁰ A list of grammars was compiled but has been omitted in this publication.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 368.

²² *Ibid.*, 369.

“grammar school.”²³ As indicated above, it is quite often impossible to determine whether a legal enactment follows or precedes the general adoption of a subject into the curriculum. However, the general absence of textbooks before 1790²⁴ makes it appear that the public schools at least could not have attempted grammar very generally before that date. But the private schools, as we have seen, were turning more and more to the English curriculum, following the tendency seen in its beginnings between 1750 and 1775. Not infrequently during the two decades before 1800 references are made in various academies to “Professors of English.”²⁵

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RISE OF THE ENGLISH SCHOOLS.

In the laws of two centuries there is discernible a marked tendency toward the gradual elimination of a classical education. Geography and history, with the feeble beginnings of science, were receiving a little attention; but around the English branches, especially grammar and oral composition in the form of oratory, the new curriculum was in formation. With the passing of Latin, seeming to many unrelated to “usefulness and happiness in the various relations of social life,” there was left little language study suitable for any but the most elementary instruction. In the Latin school the backbone of the course

²³ It does not appear that many States specifically mention the incorporation of grammar by State law in their curricula. The Louisiana law of 1826 placed in the primary schools of New Orleans “a professor” to teach “the elements of the English and French grammar.” *New Digest Stat. Laws of Louisiana*, Bullard and Curry, 1842, I, 374. In 1834 Maine followed the usual practice of the day by providing that “no person shall be employed as a schoolmaster . . . unless . . . well qualified to instruct youth in reading and writing the English Language grammatically.” *Rev. Stat. State of Me.*, Smith & Co., 1841, 169. The law makes the same requirement for schoolmistresses. *Ibid.*

²⁴ Chap. IV, p. 77.

²⁵ A case in point is the Delaware Academy of Wilmington, primarily a classical school, which as early as 1786 had a “Professor of English.” An extract from the curriculum shows “English, Lowth’s Grammar, Blair’s Lectures in Rhetoric,” and even “the higher English classics frequently employed in exercises and compositions.” References like this to English classics before 1800 are extremely rare. Powell, *Hist. of Ed. in Del.*, 45.

The grammar school of Brown University, in 1786, advertised “Greek, Latin and English Languages taught grammatically.” Tolman, *Hist. of Ed. in R. I.*, 35.

Apparently the best way to interpret an expression like this is to believe that grammatical instruction in the English language stands in exactly the same relation as grammatical instruction in the classical languages.

The Trenton, N. J., grammar school, in 1789, gave a certificate under the seal of the corporation “to such scholars as shall have studied the English language grammatically.” In 1792 the price of tuition was put at \$3 a quarter “for the English School and English Grammar,” and in 1817 the trustees recommended the use of “Lindley Murray’s system of teaching the English Language.” Murray, *Hist. of Ed. in N. J.*, 126.

A suggestive item indicating the way in which grammar spread is found in the story of John Howland, father of the movement for public schools in Rhode Island. Appointed by the city of Providence to draw up rules for the first schools established under the new law, 1789, he went to Boston and there procured a copy of the rules establishing the new school system of 1789 and secured also a list of the textbooks used under that act. Howland says: “Up to this time I had never seen a grammar . . . but observing The Young Ladies Accidence (Caleb Bingham’s elementary grammar, Boston, 1785) was used in the Boston schools, I sent to the principal bookseller in that town, and procured one hundred copies for ours. The introduction of Grammar was quite an advance in the system of education as it was not taught at all except in the better class of private schools.” Powell, *Hist. of Pub. Sch. Sys. in R. I.*, 17.

had been grammar; the term grammar, the methods of teaching grammar, were ingrained. Latin grammar had stood for the next step above reading and writing the vernacular. When, therefore, the advocates of a practical English training found English grammar in Dilworth and other texts, what was more natural than that they should seize upon it as a suitable substitute for the next step above reading and writing and spelling? English they found reduced to the same accident as Latin; English rules were to be learned as the Latin; textbooks informed them on title pages that grammar was the art of speaking and writing the English language correctly, and this was their laudable desire for their children; here is a suitable setting in the vernacular program for grammar as the basic study. This conviction made its way into legal sanction for English and English grammar in the last decade of the eighteenth century.

2. THE FLOOD OF TEXTBOOKS AFTER 1784.

In the preceding chapter the number of textbooks available for instruction in grammar before 1784 was shown to have been very insignificant. With the exception of Dilworth's, primarily a speller, certainly no single book was available in a large number of copies. Therefore nothing is more effective in establishing the rapidly rising popularity of the new subject after the Revolution than the flood of grammatical textbooks which began to pour from the American press.

Even before the State laws at the end of the century paved the way for a higher order of instruction in English these textbooks in grammar began to appear. It is significant that in 1783 Noah Webster, the dean of American textbook writers, opened in Hartford, Conn., a rhetorical school for the express purpose of teaching the English language. It was here that he laid the foundation for his first grammar, Part II of "The Grammatical Institute of the English Language."²⁶ In Hartford also was framed, in 1799, the first State-wide act specifically mentioning instruction in "the rudiments of English Grammar." It is significant that this was the exact wording of the subtitle of Webster's second grammar, published in 1790, "The Little Reader's Assistant. Rudiments of English Grammar, Being an introduction to the Second Part of The Grammatical Institute." This, too, was published in Hartford.²⁷ Of course, there is no certainty of causal relation between Webster's instruction and his books and the Connecticut law of 1798.

However that may be, Webster's "Plain and Comprehensive Grammar," of 1784, was the first American textbook on the subject to attain

²⁷ Evans, *op. cit.*, 8, 105.

²⁶ Love, *Col. Hist. Hartford*, 270.

wide circulation. Before 1792 it had passed through at least 10 editions.²⁸ By 1807²⁹ this book, together with his three other treatises on grammar, although by far less popular than his "Grammatical Institute," enjoyed a wide circulation before Murray appeared in 1795. Webster's success appears to have attracted other American writers into the field at once, since at least 17 other works on grammar appeared before 1795.³⁰

Eleven of these 17 textbooks were unsuccessful, apparently none of them enjoying more than two or three editions, including Kenrick's, 1784; Mennye's, 1785; Anonymous, 1789 (3d ed.); Ussher's, 1790; Hutchins's, 1791; Humphries's, 1792; Tichnor's, 1792; Miller's, 1795; Carroll's, 1795; and Dearborn's, 1795. Of the 17, two were Webster's books mentioned above—"The Rudiments," 1790, and "The Young Gentleman and Ladies Accidence," 1792. Harrison's, 1787, was an English text reprinted in Philadelphia³¹ and in its ninth American edition before 1812; Ussher's, 1790, was also an American edition of a London book of 1787³² and had its third American edition in Exeter, N. H., in 1804.³³

Of the 17 books antedating Murray's (between 1784 and 1795) there remain two which attained relatively wide use in American schools before Murray's grammars appeared. Of these, the less important was Caleb Alexander's "A Grammatical System of the English Language," Boston, 1792. It passed through at least 10 editions before 1814.³⁴

Bingham's little elementary book of 45 pages appeared in Boston in 1785 and in a very few years leaped into popularity in that city and elsewhere. It was printed in at least 20 editions before 1815;³⁵ 100,000 copies were sold.

²⁸ Webster says: "I published a grammar on the model of Lowth's; . . . this work passed through many editions before Murray's book appeared. . . . I determined to suppress my grammar; . . . a new work appeared in 1807." Webster's Dictionary, 1828, preface, 3. Of this book Evans lists 10 editions before 1792, the first in 1784 (Evans, 6, 337), the last in 1792 (*ibid.*, 8, 382). The number of editions was large. The writer, for example, is using the sixth Connecticut edition, 1800, and the book was published by firms in both Boston and Philadelphia, 1790 and 1787, respectively. Evans, 8, 104, and *ibid.*, 7, 183. In both places there were several editions before 1800.

²⁹ Webster's second grammar, "The Rudiments," 1790, passed through six editions in the first two years, in Hartford, Albany, Boston, and Northampton. Evans, *op. cit.*, 8, 105; 8, 233. His third book appeared in 1792, published anonymously under the title "The Young Gentleman and Ladies Accidence, a Comprehensive Grammar of the English Tongue," in Boston. The 1807 text was "A Philosophical and Practical Grammar." His last grammatical treatise appeared as late as the year 1831, "An Improved Grammar of the English Tongue," Barnard, *Am. J. of Ed.*, XV, 569.

³⁰ See Appendix A.

³¹ Evans, *op. cit.*, 7, 121.

³² *Ibid.*, 8, 98.

³³ *Am. Jour. of Ed.*, XV, 565.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, XIII, 212; Evans, *op. cit.*, 8, 242.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 218. The writer uses the nineteenth edition, Boston, 1813; the name Martha Stebbins appears on the flyleaf.

Bingham, a graduate of Dartmouth, 1782, had opened a private school for girls in Boston in 1784 and had there begun what has been called the first pretentious effort to teach English grammar in that city.³⁶ This statement ignores the earlier efforts to teach grammar, some of which, as we saw above, antedated 1775, either through ignorance of their existence or because they were insignificant as compared with Bingham's. At any rate, "The Young Ladies Accidence" was the result of Bingham's work in this school. It is interesting to remember that Noah Webster published anonymously in Boston, in 1790, an elementary book of approximately the same size as Bingham's under the name "The Young Gentleman and Ladies Accidence." Bingham, in 1789, accepted a position in the reorganization of the Boston schools,³⁷ and his grammar was adopted by vote of the board as the official text in the writing schools.³⁸

Of Webster and Bingham, William B. Fowle, editor of the *Common School Journal*, says:

No two men ever exercised more influence over the schools of this country. . . . Webster's Grammar was but little used compared with Bingham's; but his spelling book was far more extensively used. . . . The two authors divided the field between them.³⁹

Neglecting now the reproduction of grammars which we have mentioned as preceding 1784, we find 17 entirely new books in the field appearing in America before Murray's was introduced. Of these 17 certainly no fewer than 50 editions had been published within the decade before 1795. We may conclude, first, that the impending flood of grammars had begun to appear, and, second, that Brown is in error in maintaining that "Lindley Murray's Grammar, published in 1795, gave the first definite direction to this department of study."⁴⁰

But the grammars of Webster, Bingham, and the rest were insignificant in their influence compared with the unexampled popularity of Lindley Murray's, beginning shortly after 1795. This is the Lindley Murray whom we saw as a boy enrolled in the English school of the Academy and Charity School of Philadelphia in 1754.⁴¹ On both sides of the Atlantic this man's productions were reprinted literally hundreds of times and were copied and abridged at least a score of times by other authors. His most famous text was "English Grammar, Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners," York, England, 1795.⁴² He also prepared an "Abridgement of English Grammar,"

³⁶ Wm. B. Fowle, *Barnard's Am. Teachers and Ed.*, 70.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 57.

³⁸ Jenks, *op. cit.*, 228.

³⁹ C. S. J., 1850, 74.

⁴⁰ Brown, *op. cit.*, 234.

⁴¹ See Chap. III, p. 54.

⁴² Barnard, *op. cit.*, XV, 775.

1797; "An English Grammar, in Two Volumes," 1814, 2d edition; and "English Exercises," published first before 1802.⁴³

An 1812 edition of the first book asserts that 35,000 copies of his larger book and 50,000 of his "Abridgement" were being sold annually in America. In 11 years the "English Grammar" passed through 21 editions in England and twice that number in America, while the "Abridgement" had had 20 editions in England and 30 in America. Murray's "English Exercises" were published frequently, and his larger grammar had its fifth edition in New York in 1823.⁴⁴ The larger books were adopted by many of the colleges in both countries. It is asserted that his grammatical texts totaled over 120 editions of 10,000 copies each on the average; that more than 1,000,000 copies of his books were sold in America before 1850.⁴⁵

But Murray's influence can not be estimated by his own books alone. At least 12 men prepared and published editions or abridgements of his various works. Among them may be mentioned Bullard, 1797, tenth edition, by 1817; Flint, 1807, sixth edition, by 1826; Lyon, 1811, fourteenth edition, by 1821; Pond, 1829, eighth edition, by 1836; Alger, 1824, fourth edition, by 1846; Fisk, 1821, third edition, by 1824. In this list are included also Russell, 1819; Booth, 1819; Cooper, 1828; Putnam, 1825; Miller, 1823; Blair, 1831; Bacon, 1818; and Cheesman, 1821, third edition.⁴⁶ In other words, a very conservative estimate of the total number of Murray's grammars, including his own and his followers' before 1850, is 200 editions, totaling between 1,500,000 and 2,000,000 copies.

Some idea of the rapid rise of grammar after 1784 may be gained by examining the distribution of the 301 grammars written by Americans and printed in America before 1850.⁴⁷ Distributed by decades they are: 1760-1770, 1; 1771-1780, 5; 1781-1790, 9; 1791-1800, 18; 1801-1810, 14; 1811-1820, 41; 1821-1830, 84; 1831-1840, 63; 1841-1850, 66; total, 301.⁴⁸

It is to be remembered that each unit in the foregoing represents a new author or an entirely new book by an earlier author. As in the case of the Murray grammars, we have seen the very large number of editions issued. In other words, during the decade 1821-1830, in addition to the 84 new books, many of which were printed several times, there were also published at the same time a very large number of editions of books whose first editions had preceded 1821.

The above indicates that the desultory and scattered beginnings of English grammar before 1775 sowed the seed which, after the Revo-

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 776.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 775.

⁴⁵ Gould Brown, *Am. Ann. of Ed. and Ins.*, 1832, 584.

⁴⁶ Barnard, *op. cit.*, 775-6.

⁴⁷ This catalogue is omitted from this volume; Appendix A has list of grammars to 1802.

⁴⁸ Includes English books reprinted in America up to 1800.

lution, began very rapidly to ripen into a harvest. The number of new textbooks alone for the entire period averaged more than four a year, and in the decade between 1821 and 1830 more than seven a year.

Only a rough estimate of the total number of editions can be made; many of the textbooks reached large circulation. Among the more popular may be mentioned Comly's, 1804, which reached its fifteenth edition in 1838; ⁴⁹ Greenleaf's "Grammar Simplified," 1819, its twentieth edition in 1837; Samuel Kirkham's "An English Grammar in Familiar Lectures," 1823, its thirty-sixth edition in 1834, its fifty-third edition in 1841; ⁵⁰ Parker's "Progressive Exercises," 1823, primarily a composition book, attained its forty-fifth edition in 1845. Bullion's "Practical Lessons in English Grammar," 1844, reached its thirteenth edition by 1851; William H. Wells's "School Grammar" was in its twentieth edition in 1854; and in five years Peter Bullion's "Analytical and Practical Grammar," of 1849, attained its thirty-fifth edition.

A modest estimate, then, of the total number of editions attained by the leading grammarians, including Murray and his followers, is 400. Others were frequently reprinted; for example, Alexander's, 10; Jandon's, 18; Brown's, 10; Hull's, 7, etc. Even estimating that many had only one edition, the total number of American editions of grammars before 1850 was in the neighborhood of 1,000.⁵¹

Still more difficult is it to estimate the number of copies turned out in these 1,000 editions. The number of volumes printed in a few editions is known. As early as 1772 and 1787 editions of 10,000 copies of Dilworth's "New Guide" were issued. This is hardly a fair criterion, however, because Dilworth's included three textbooks in one and was without serious competitors. In 1766 the firm of Franklin & Hall was preparing an edition of Dilworth's consisting of 2,000 copies.⁵²

One of the most used early texts was Bingham's "Young Ladies' Accidence." Of this the 1792 edition included 4,000 copies.⁵³ It has been asserted that this book passed through 20 editions of 5,000 copies on the average, aggregating 100,000 copies, before 1820.⁵⁴ Kirkham affirmed, in 1837, that his book was selling at the rate of 60,000 a year.⁵⁵ In 1829, after being only six years off the press, Kirkham's book was selling at the rate of 20,000 a year.⁵⁶

⁴⁹ The evidence as to the number of editions is taken from Barnard's list of American textbooks in *Am. J. of Ed.*, XIII, XIV, XV.

⁵⁰ Barnard refers to a one hundred and tenth edition. *Op. cit.*, XIV, 736; also Gould Brown, *Gram. of Gram.*, 28.

⁵¹ The actual count of known editions of books mentioned in the catalogue previously referred to is 961. The evidence is acknowledged to be very incomplete. See Barnard's lists, *Am. J. of Ed.*, XIII, XIV, XV.

⁵² Evans, *op. cit.*, 4, 52, 314, and 7, III.

⁵³ Evans, *op. cit.*, 8, 257.

⁵⁴ Small, *Early N. E. Sch.*, 107; also Barnard, *op. cit.*, XIV, 212.

⁵⁵ Knickerbocker Mag., Oct., 1837.

⁵⁶ Brown, *op. cit.*, 28.

If we may assume that 5,000 copies is a fair average for each edition, then approximately 5,000,000 copies of grammatical textbooks were printed in America by 1850. In other words, two editions for every large city were issued by that date.

3. THE EXTENT OF INSTRUCTION IN GRAMMAR IN REPRESENTATIVE STATES, 1800-1850.

NEW YORK.

English grammar was a part of the curriculum of the academies chartered by the regents of the University of New York from 1784, the year of its beginning. Regents' reports for the years 1804 to 1807, based on data obtained from the individual reports made by the academies, show that during these years English grammar was taught on a par with Latin grammar.⁵⁷

Each year special mention is made of English grammar, together with other branches usually considered parts of the English curriculum, as distinguished from the Latin. Indeed, they are mentioned in a larger number of academies than is the curriculum of the "dead languages."⁵⁸

The academies have more significance than appears at first thought. After 1821 the academies of New York were regarded as a source of supply of teachers for the common schools of the State. In that year the regents said: "It is to these seminaries that we must look for a supply of teachers for the common schools."⁵⁹ In 1827 and succeeding years recommendations to this effect were repeated to the legislature by the regents, with pleas for increased appropriations. In 1834 the legislature passed the desired law.⁶⁰ In consequence the regents declared that no person should be admitted to the teachers' department until he had passed such an examination as to entitle him to be

⁵⁷ The following table is taken from Hough's Hist. and Statis. Rec., Univ. of New York, 1784-1884, 421

Studies.	1804		1805		1806		1807	
	Academies.	Pupils.	Academies.	Pupils.	Academies.	Pupils.	Academies.	Pupils.
Reading, writing.....	14	480	10	205	10	208	18	631
English grammar, arithmetic.....	16	429	10	228	10	312	19	649
Mathematics, bookkeeping.....	12	123	7	36	7	51	15	134
Dead languages.....	15	213	9	184	10	130	18	214
Logic, rhetoric, composition.....	6	101	4	48	4	38	17	97
Moral philosophy.....	1	1	2	14	3	22
Natural philosophy.....	1	1	3	14	4	36
French language.....	4	38	1	1	4	16

⁵⁸ This term was upon the printed blank sent out by the regents during the four years named.

⁵⁹ Hough, op. cit., 527.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 536.

considered a scholar in the higher branches of English education, the first specified subject of which is the English language.⁶¹ By 1837, 374 persons were enrolled in these teachers' departments.⁶² After 1836 the total enrollment in the academies increased at the rate of nearly 1,000 students a year, reaching the number of 20,920 in 1852.

Consideration of the textbooks used by the academies between 1832 and 1850 shows that the Murray grammars gradually disappeared.⁶³ Kirkham's book does not reach its height until 1840; then it begins to disappear, while Brown's gradually increases in popularity and the new books of Weld, Wells, and Greene come to the fore. Greenleaf's has meantime sunk into insignificance. Bullion's books were "The Principles of English Grammar," Albany, 1834, which reached its fourteenth edition in 12 years; "Practical Lessons in English Grammar and Composition," New York, 1844, thirty-third edition in seven years; two minor works, and, finally, "Analytical and Practical English Grammar," New York, 1849, which attained its thirty-fifth edition in six years.⁶⁴ Wells's, Clark's, Weld's, and Greene's books belong to a new generation of textbooks. These we shall see in a later chapter originating an entirely new conception of the nature and functions of grammar and the methods of teaching it.⁶⁵

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 539.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 546.

⁶³ *Textbooks in grammar, New York academies, 1836-1852—Number of academies using various texts.*

[Compiled from Annual Reports of Regents of State of N. Y., 1837-53.]

Year.....	1836	1837	1838	1839	1840	1841	1842	1843	1844	1845	1846	1847	1848	1849	1850	1851	1852
Total number of academies reporting.....	69	74	106	119	127	131	142	149	146	153	155	156	156	161	166	168	170
Number of students.....	6,056	6,391	7,070	8,892	10,168	10,560	11,977	11,689	12,257	13,481	13,998	14,262	15,043	16,514	17,912	19,552	20,920
Grammars:																	
Murray.....	18	15	14	11	10	9	6	6	5	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1
Kirkham.....	38	45	58	56	61	54	54	51	39	33	37	33	25	22	15	17	9
Brown.....	20	27	37	36	40	47	54	71	73	69	67	75	71	72	72	66	68
Smith.....	24	25	40	46	53	48	52	56	52	48	40	35	29	24	22	21	22
Bullion.....	4	7	10	8	8	13	21	37	47	48	52	53	49	45	50	60	55
Webster.....			1	2	6	3	4	5	6	3	3	3					
Spencer.....																7	5
Greenleaf.....		3		3	3	3	3	4	4	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1
Wells.....											3	8	15	18	15	15	13
Clark.....													6	7	7	8	10
Weld.....													3	8	21	21	19
Greene.....													1	2	5	7	4
Scattering.....	2		2	7	5	3	1	5	9	10	9	10	8	11	14	16	11
Total grammars used..	106	122	162	169	186	180	195	247	235	216	225	220	212	211	213	241	218

⁶⁴ Barnard, *op. cit.*, XIII, 221.

⁶⁵ See Chap. VI, p. 152.

Turning now to the common schools of New York, as distinguished from the academies, we find that the reign of the Murray books reached its height about 1833.⁶⁶

The second book, reaching its height of popularity by 1839, is Kirkham's "English Grammar by Familiar Lectures," 1825, of which Barnard lists editions up to the forty-ninth, all published in New York before 1840.⁶⁷ Then follows Gould Brown's "The Institutes of English Grammar," New York, 1823. The fourth author is Roswell Smith, whose two works were "Intellectual and Practical Grammar on the Inductive System," Providence, 1829, and "English Grammar on the Productive System," Boston, 1831. Next comes Jeremiah Greenleaf, whose "Grammar Simplified," New York, 1829, reached its twentieth edition in 1851.⁶⁸

Detailed discussion of the significance of the domination of the Murray books, apparently reaching their height in New York about 1833, and of the almost meteoric rise of Kirkham contemporaneous with the passing of Murray, is reserved for another chapter⁶⁹ on methods of teaching. Of interest here is the comparison of the amount of grammar being taught during this period. County officers almost without exception report that four subjects are taught in all towns—reading, spelling, arithmetic, and grammar. The table on page 85 shows the three most widely used textbooks in the counties of New York of these three subjects, in addition to grammar.⁷⁰

In each subject there seems to be one book which goes far toward monopolizing the field. In grammar, honors for the period are fairly well distributed between two, and the two together have a distinct

⁶⁶ *Textbooks in grammar, New York Public Schools, 1826-1839—Number of towns using various texts.*

[Compiled from Annual Rept. Supt. Common Schls., N. Y., 1830-1840.]

	1826.	1829.	1831.	1832.	1833.	1835.	1836.	1837.	1838.	1839.
Grammars:										
Murray	389	472	466	462	459	373	294	267	209	177
Kirkham		28	72	111	179	331	371	382	427	468
Brown		3		17	18	21	31	43	60	
Smith					7	20	31	63	102	
Greenleaf	35	76	88	96	93	61	46	25	28	23
Murray Introd.	14	20	17	12	7	6	5	3		
Murray Sequel.		4			13	9	5	10	4	
Other books:										
English Reader	434	584	547	543	563	516	486	431		414
Daboll's Arithmetic	349	473	469	472	465	500	360	457		455
Webster's Speller	302	417	400	433	418	332	265	227		470

⁶⁷ Barnard, op. cit., XIV, 763.

⁶⁸ Ibid., XIII, 639.

⁶⁹ See Chap. VI, p. 134.

⁷⁰ Textbooks Used in New York, 1827-31. Summary from Reports of Supt. Com. Schs., N. Y., reprinted A. J. of Ed. and Ins., 1832, 378,

advantage over Daboll's Arithmetic. By 1839 Kirkham alone surpassed all other textbooks except Webster's Speller, which for some reason shows an unusual advance that year.

Books.	Towns (1827).	Towns (1830).	Towns (1831).
English Reader.....	434	584	547
Daboll's Arithmetic.....	349	473	469
Murray's Grammar.....	389	472	466
Webster's Speller.....	302	317	400
Testament.....	168	216	200
Woodbridge's Geography.....	110	309	412
Willet's Geography.....	117	120	121
Morse's Geography.....	108	98	72
Adams's Arithmetic.....	91	96	102
Pike's Arithmetic.....	80	61	46
Cobb's Geography.....	59	209	240
Greenleaf's Grammar.....	35	76	88
History of the United States.....	6	33	52
Tyler's History.....	4	9	6
Colburn's Arithmetic.....	1	8	26
Kirkham's Grammar.....	0	28	72

An idea of the proportion of pupils studying grammar may be obtained from facts a few years later. In 1842, out of 173,384 pupils, reported from 43 counties, 28,119 were studying English grammar.⁷¹ In 1846, of 227,760 pupils in winter schools, 51,484 were reported as studying grammar, and of 211,747 in summer schools 32,289 were studying the subject.⁷² In 1847, of 47,833 pupils in summer sessions 39,846 were studying grammar.⁷³ In round numbers, between 15 and 20 per cent of the total number of pupils were studying grammar in the common schools of New York as the middle of the century approached.

MASSACHUSETTS.

The Massachusetts law of 1826, amended in 1837 and 1839, required "in every town containing fifty families [extended in 1839 to 'every town in this commonwealth']"⁷⁴ . . . one school for the instruction of children in orthography, reading, writing, English grammar, geography, arithmetic, and good behavior." Horace Mann, secretary of the board of education, in 1838 interpreted this law to prescribe what he calls "minimum literary qualifications of teachers"; that is, they "must be competent to teach the various subjects named."⁷⁵

Moreover, the law of 1835 required the school committee of every town to submit annual school returns containing replies to 11 definite

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 1843, 7.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 1847, 18.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 1848, 81.

⁷⁴ Acts and Resolves, Mass., 1839, 22.

⁷⁵ Mass. Sch. Rept., 1838, 59.

Mann is very careful to emphasize the point that it is strictly lawful for districts to employ teachers more highly qualified, "who are able to teach the required branches better, because they are masters of higher ones—who, for instance . . . can teach English grammar better, because familiar, from the study of other languages, with the principles of universal grammar."

inquiries, of which the seventh was, "What are the Books in general use, specifying Spelling Books, Arithmetics, Grammars, Geographies, Reading and other Books?"⁷⁶ This provision was in force until 1841.⁷⁷

Pursuant, then, to this series of acts the first four annual reports of Mann, 1837 to 1840, inclusive, contain these data, as reported by the separate town school committees.⁷⁸

Concerning the status of grammar in Massachusetts between 1837 and 1841, several conclusions may be reached. The law requiring grammar was obeyed in letter at least. Only four towns did not report the subject in their curricula; in addition, only six towns failed to make any report. Almost all the towns reported at least one textbook in grammar. Roswell Smith's "Inductive" and "Progressive" grammars were by far the most popular, with gradually increasing numbers; Murray's followed in decreasing popularity. In Worcester County, Pond's Murray monopolized the field, showing the comparatively local popularity of the Worcester author. Of the 35 towns reporting Pond's as in use in 1837, 23 were in Worcester County and 8 in the neighboring county of Franklin. About one-fifth of the towns reported more than two grammars; some towns—Pittsfield, for example—reported as many as five textbooks in use.⁷⁹

The larger towns only, like Boston⁸⁰ and Dorchester, used separate

⁷⁶ Laws Com. Mass., XIII, 509.

⁷⁷ Acts and Resolves, Mass., 1841, 345.

⁷⁸ *Towns naming English grammar in Massachusetts.*

[Compiled from School Returns, 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841.]

Year.....	1837	1838	1839	1840
Number of towns.....	298	295	224	307
Smith's.....	208	215	224	237
Murray's.....	104	96	84	54
Putnam's Alger.....	19	18	17	15
Pond's.....	35	36	36	41
Greenleaf's.....	19	17	15	9
Brown's.....	11	12	11	13
Frost's.....	13	13	12	12
Ingersoll's.....	9	10	11	9
Kirkham's.....	7	7	7	4
Parker's.....	13	17	26	20
Webster's.....	1	1	2	3
Scattering.....	10	12	15	14

⁷⁹ Concerning the great variety of textbooks in all subjects, Mann reported that in 1837 there were in use in Massachusetts 110 different readers and spellers, 24 grammars, 22 arithmetics, 20 geographies, 9 books of diction, 3 chemistries, 5 geometries, 2 compositions. A. A. of Ed. and I., VII, 101.

⁸⁰ In 1840-41 the Boston school system embraced 1 Latin grammar school, 1 English high school, 13 grammar and writing schools, and 95 primary schools. Bost. Sch. Rept., 1841, 3. Regulations prescribed for the grammar schools (four-year course), in Class III, Murray's "English Grammar," abridged by Alger, or Parker and Fox's "Progressive Exercises"; Class II, the same continued and Foot's "Exercises in Parsing"; Class I, the same continued, together with composition and declamation. *Ibid.*, 16. For admission to the English high school an examination in grammar was necessary; for the first year of high school a review of grammatical texts of the lower schools was prescribed, while "the several classes shall be instructed in grammar." *Ibid.*, 20.

textbooks in parsing and composition. Mann says that only two schools had separate instruction in composition. Nevertheless, we see that increasing use of Parker's "Progressive Exercises in Composition" indicated that the latter subject was encroaching upon the field of formal grammar.⁸¹

The overwhelming preponderance of Smith's books, only six years off the press, denoted a rapid departure from the Murray type. To be sure, Pond's, Putnam's, and Alger's were nothing but modifications of Murray's; but even adding the towns using the three to the towns using Murray's a total of 159 towns in 1837 is still far short of the popularity of Smith's "Productive Lessons." Out of 298 towns reporting, 208 used Smith's book,⁸² many of them in the grades immediately above the primary, usually called grammar grades. Private schools and academies also used it.

This was the period of the extreme popularity of Kirkham's book in New York, but naturally we do not find the grammars of New York very widely adopted by the schools of Massachusetts.

The records of 1840 show a remarkable increase of schools breaking away from the Murray type of instruction.⁸³ Only 54 towns, as compared with 104 in 1837, still kept the Murray, while the Putnam and Pond merely held their own. Very many towns which in 1837 had reported the use of both Smith's and Murray's, in 1840 reported the former alone.

While on the whole the law requiring the teaching of grammar was generally obeyed, there is frequent testimony that it was studied with reluctance and even open opposition. For example, the Provincetown committee reported: "Grammar has been attended to very indifferently, in our town schools, for all past time. There are but few scholars who study it at all, and few indeed who have made much proficiency in it."⁸⁴ In the same year the Westport school officials asserted:

As there are some schools in which grammar has never been taught . . . and there are few or none who wish to pursue it . . . for these reasons the committee has been urged to grant certificates to teachers deficient in grammar.⁸⁵

VERMONT.

Vermont and New Hampshire present much the same relative emphasis on grammar between 1840 and 1850. Especially frequent is the complaint against the multiplicity of textbooks. The State superintendent of Vermont reports, in 1848, that several conventions of

⁸¹ Mann, *op. cit.*

⁸² See Chap. IV, p. 86.

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ Mass. Sch. Ret., 1843, 271.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 252.

county superintendents had recommended uniform textbooks. The grammar chosen was William H. Wells's.⁸⁶ English grammar was included, according to the State official, "among the usual branches."⁸⁷ Superintendents of various counties report "Wells' grammars in most schools,"⁸⁸ while the State superintendent thinks that the acquaintance with grammar acquired is "very slight."⁸⁹ "Teachers are very poorly prepared."⁹⁰

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

In his section on schoolbooks the school superintendent of New Hampshire, in 1846, makes a typical comment:

In the days of Pike's Arithmetic, and Murray's Grammar, and Webster's Spelling Book, there was no trouble in choosing books; there were none to choose from. Our difficulty consists mainly in determining which is best among so many that are good.⁹¹

One county official strikes even a new note when he recommends that "a portion of the time now devoted to grammar and arithmetic ought to be spent in the proper study of mankind."⁹²

OHIO.

Only an occasional reference concerning grammar finds place in the records of the State superintendent of Ohio during this early period. In 1838 one county official reported: "Reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, and grammar are taught in most schools."⁹³ Clerks of the county examiners complain of the almost utter incompetency of teachers, one saying that of 156 examined 53 were very poorly qualified and but 51 understood "either wholly or in part" geography, English grammar, and history. The county was compelled to accept them, else many schools would have been left without teachers."⁹⁴

Ten years later (1846-47) the status of grammar had improved considerably in Ohio. Reports of the State superintendent indicate that the subject was now regarded as an essential part of the common-school program. In the words of the State Teachers' Association of

⁸⁶ Rept. Supt. Com. Sch., Vt., 1848, 21.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 1849, 52.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁹¹ Rept. Supt. Com. Sch. N. H., 1846-7, 18.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 1848, Appendix, XXXIX.

⁹³ Rept. of Supt. Com. Sch., 1839, 52.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 53.

1847, "a substantial English education ought to be given every citizen of the State."⁹⁵ In the "union schools," Ohio's term for common schools, divided into primary, secondary, and senior or grammar-school departments—

a thorough course of instruction in all the common English branches is pursued, and to this is added, when practicable, a high school, in which the higher English branches, mathematics, and the languages are taught.⁹⁶

Ashtabula County reported that Smith's Grammar was used in 99 schools, Kirkham's in 49, Brown's in 25, Noell's in 16, Bullion's in 13.⁹⁷ The following tabular statement from the same county gives indication of the number of pupils studying the subject as compared with the other English branches:

Summer schools, 1847.

Townships.	Number of schools visited.	Average attendance.	Number in spelling.	Number in arithmetic.	Number in grammar.	Number in geography.	Number in composition.
28	131	2,869	3,550	560	371	873	163
WINTER SCHOOLS.							
28	157	4,190	<i>Per cent.</i> 19	<i>Per cent.</i> 35	<i>Per cent.</i> 19	<i>Per cent.</i> 23	<i>Per cent.</i> 8

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 34.

Seneca County also furnishes data on this point. The number of pupils studying spelling was 3,200; arithmetic, 3,540; grammar, 420; geography, 500.⁹⁹

Nevertheless, complaint was frequently made that teachers were incompetent to teach the subject.¹ Licking County so reports. In Fairfield County, of 110 licensed all were found competent to teach reading, writing, and arithmetic, only 64 were proficient in grammar, 62 in geography, and 10 in algebra.² In Knox County somewhat more than 50 per cent of the teachers were competent in grammar,³ and some districts refused to allow grammar and geography to be taught, the examiner adding: "If geography and grammar were added as legal qualifications of teachers, they would be required to understand them." Ashtabula County reported fully all the examinations given pupils in the various classes. Eighteen minutes were allowed candidates to answer the following examination in grammar:⁴

⁹⁵ Rept. of Sec. of State, Com. Sch., 1848, 52.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 56.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 47.

¹ *Ibid.*, 42.

² *Ibid.*, 40.

³ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 20.

It is the mind that lives.

1. How many capital letters should be used in writing the above sentence?
2. Is the sentence simple or compound?
3. How much may be regarded as a simple sentence?
4. In this sentence what are the principal parts?
5. What is government in grammar?
6. What is meant by case?
7. What is meant by the conjugation of a verb?
8. Give the principal parts of the verb "to go."

These questions were given to 455 children of average age of 15; 42 per cent of the answers were correct. The highest average was 72 per cent for Morgan Township.⁵ The same attitude toward the curriculum was found in the State reports of Ohio in the decade 1847-1857 as in the preceding 10 years; the references, however, are scattering and unsatisfactory. Nevertheless, the fact that we invariably find grammar named whenever a complete curriculum is mentioned indicates that the subject was fully established. In Ashtabula County, in 1850, the distribution of pupils by studies was: Orthography, 2,174; reading, 6,005; mental arithmetic, 1,684; written arithmetic, 2,214; geography, 1,248; English grammar, 934; composition, 759.⁶ Coshoc-ton County reported 255 pupils in spelling, 181 in arithmetic, 180 in grammar, 13 in geometry.⁷ Holmes, Meigs, Preble, Rockland, and Scioto Counties reported grammar taught in all the districts,⁸ while Pike County affirmed—

the provision of the law requiring teachers to understand Geography and English Grammar should by no means be repealed. It is found that in this county teachers are as defective in Arithmetic as in Grammar; . . . the majority, yea, four-fifths of the applicants, are unqualified to teach anything more than the first principles.⁹

NORTH CAROLINA.

The private schools of North Carolina generally included English grammar in their curricula after 1800.¹⁰ Five schools before 1800 report grammar. Grove Academy, the earliest, in 1787 reported "twenty-five students under a master who teaches only the Latin and English grammar."¹¹ The trustees of New Bern Academy report the examination of pupils in the English language in 1794;¹² likewise,

⁵ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁶ Ann. Rept. Sec. State, Com. Sch., 1851, 55.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 79, 96, 104, 107, 112.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 103.

¹⁰ Data in this section are compiled from North Carolina Schools and Academies, 1790-1840, A Documentary History, by Charles L. Coon.

¹¹ Coon (op. cit., 75) cites Carr's Dixon Letters, 34, 35.

¹² *Ibid.*, 50. New Bern Gaz., Jan. 4, 1794.

Fayetteville Academy announces that pupils excel in English grammar in 1800.¹³ in 1794 Wayne Academy began with emphasis in English, and a few years later the "fifth class . . . were examined in English Grammar from the verb 'to have' to syntax"; the sixth class "as far as the substantive"; the seventh "as far as the 'article,'" and the eighth class "to the verb 'to be.'" ¹⁴

The decade between 1801-1810 shows 18 schools specifically naming grammar. The following are typical statements: Wadesborough Academy, "English Grammar, Geography, . . . twelve Dollars."¹⁵ Caswell Academy employed an instructor "to teach the English Language grammatically."¹⁶ The Halifax Classical School was opened in 1807 "where he (the principal) taught the Latin & English grammatically. . . ." ¹⁷ The succeeding decade shows 25 academies and schools definitely mentioning the subject. In the Salisbury Academy Miss Elizabeth T. Harris was examined "on the whole of English Grammar, parsing, correcting false syntax, rules of punctuation, perspicuity, etc. . . . and she exhibited several specimens of Composition."¹⁸ In 1819 John Haasam came to Raleigh "as a traveling teacher of English Grammar." His announcement begins: "The Acquisition of English Grammar Rendered pleasing, expeditious and permanent."¹⁹ The decade of 1821-1830 shows 39 definite announcements of grammar; that of 1831-1840 shows 31 schools which give the subject a prominent place. One Edward Fowlkes, in 1831, announced of a certain school: "It is an institution in which the English Grammar is taught upon a completely new and successful plan in seven weeks, at seven dollars per scholar."²⁰

In all, 118 schools, of about 300 private institutions of which Coon has reprinted documents, were definitely teaching English

¹³ *Ibid.*, 60. Raleigh Reg., Aug. 19, 1800.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 634. Raleigh Reg., Oct. 9, 1818. The textbooks mentioned in these records are Murray's Grammar and Murray's Exercises. Among the books advertised in North Carolina during the period before 1810 appear also Webster's, Ashe's, Dilworth's, Priestley's, Lowth's, Aker's, Harrison's "Exercises in Bad English," Murray's "Exercises," Murray's "Introduction," Fisher's. *Ibid.*, 769, 73, 74, 75, 77, 80, 86. After 1810 there appear in addition Alexander's, Garretson's "Exercises in Bad English," Greenleaf's, Ingersol's, Comley's, Brown's, Boardman's. *Ibid.*, 789, 95. In 1838 Turner and Hughes, of Raleigh, advertised "200 Smith's Practical Productive Grammar, 700 Murray's English Grammar well bound in leather and offered at a reduced price." *Ibid.*, 798, Raleigh Reg., Mar. 12, 1838.

School officials were eager to secure good English teachers. Such advertisements appeared in the Raleigh Register between 1800-1810; also qualified "to teach English Grammar." *Ibid.*, 800-4. From 1811-1820 there are cited seven similar advertisements. Thirty of the 40 advertisements and announcements cited between 1821 and 1840 concern teachers for English schools. *Ibid.*, 813-820.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 2. Raleigh Reg., May 9, 1803.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 19. Raleigh Reg., Dec. 9, 1803.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 175. Halifax Jour., Jan. 12, 1807.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 363. Western Carolinian, Dec. 19, 1820.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 521. Raleigh Reg., Aug. 27, 1819.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 558; The Star, June 30, 1831.

grammar before 1840. No direct evidence appears with respect to instruction in English grammar in the 172 other schools, and we can not therefore assert positively that instruction in this branch was given in any one of them. Yet it seems likely that some of these schools gave such instruction, because many of them do not announce their curricula, and almost without exception those schools which do include grammar in the documents studied. However, among the schools not listed very many announced "the English School," "the branches usually taught in English Schools," "the lower and higher branches of English," "all branches of English," "the ordinary branches of English," or used similar phrases. We may conclude that the private schools of North Carolina were very generally laying stress upon grammar before 1840.

4. THE STATUS OF GRAMMAR, 1850 TO 1870.

In spite of the fact that an enormous number of grammars were sold every year in the middle of the nineteenth century, they were used mostly in the intermediate and high schools of the larger and more prosperous towns, and at best only in a perfunctory way in the schools of smaller communities.

PENNSYLVANIA.

A body of data concerning the status of the common schools of Pennsylvania seems to bear out this conclusion for that State. In 1854 the legislature passed a law requiring instruction in grammar²¹ and obliged each county superintendent to submit an annual report to the superintendent of common schools.²² In the following year all but a few counties complied.

Examination of these reports shows that there is almost universal evidence of scarcity of good teachers; that many who applied to take the examinations were rejected; that many times teachers who were deficient in grammar and geography had to be accepted. Out of 50 counties 28 county superintendents comment on the difficulty of securing competent teachers of any subjects, 39 upon the incompetency of teachers applying for examination in grammar. For example, in Bucks County 270 teachers were examined; certificates were granted to 20 who were deficient in English grammar on their promise "that they would make themselves acquainted with this subject during the year."²³ In Bradford County "out of 500 teachers examined . . .

²¹ "It shall be the duty of each county superintendent to see that in every district there shall be taught orthography, reading, writing, English grammar, geography, and arithmetic. . . ." Laws Com. Pa., 1854, 625.

²² *Ibid.*, 627.

²³ Pa. Com. Sch. Rept., 1854, 25.

one-fourth fell below the standard required by law."²⁴ Center County was compelled to issue many certificates from which English grammar and geography were stricken out.²⁵ Especially suggestive is the statement from Clearfield County:

I find many who can go through the grammar and repeat every rule and conjugate every verb correctly and can not analyze and parse the most simple sentence.²⁶

The foregoing are fairly typical replies.

The superintendent of Adams County found that general opposition to the new school law lay in the requirement that English grammar and geography should be taught. He affirmed that "none of the parents wish their children to study English Grammar and Geography."²⁷ He allayed the opposition by explaining that the law required grammar in every county but not in every school. This is typical of many references to hostility toward the subject; very few counties report favorable instruction in the subject, and that in the academies and larger schools. All these facts lead to the inference that English grammar as such had little place in the large majority of the common schools of Pennsylvania. To be sure, the law was new. The relative emphasis upon grammar and other higher branches in New York at this period indicates the effects of 25 years of legal requirement of the branches in the latter State as compared with the absence of such requirement in Pennsylvania. In the latter the report of Indiana County states what seems to have been near the general truth:

A rough knowledge of spelling, reading, writing, and ciphering is deemed all sufficient, whilst a knowledge of grammar, geography, etc., is most heartily repudiated.²⁸

In short, the Pennsylvania reports show that the schools were by no means fitted to give good instruction in grammar. Thirty-nine counties report grossly inadequate instruction; 29 say they have to accept whoever applies; 20 complain of hopeless variety of textbooks and incompetent grading; 18 speak of decided opposition to grammar; 14 say that local inspectors, being unpaid, are unsatisfactory; 11 mention wretched buildings; only 3 reports are really commendatory, although many are optimistic concerning the ultimate effect of State aid, certification of teachers, and other new features of the law.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 19.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 38.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 47.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 15. The superintendent of Bucks County, in one school, saw 9 classes recite in the following order: One scholar in Swain's Reader; 12 in Frost's History; 1 in Emerson's First Class Reader; 1 in Comley's Reader; 1 in Emerson's Third Class Reader; 2 in Emerson's Rhetorical Reader; 1 in Comley's Spelling Book; 2 in The Primer; 2 in The A B C's. The same program was repeated in the afternoon. *Ibid.*, 28.

NEW JERSEY.

The status of grammar in the common schools of New Jersey during the decade 1850 to 1860 may be seen by an examination of the reports of the State board of education for three representative years—1850, 1854, and 1860. The total number of references in these reports concerning the curriculum include statements from 12 of the 21 counties and from 19 different townships which specifically mention grammar. In 1850 Bergen County reports “grammar, history, arithmetic taught orally to young pupils” in Hackensack Township; ²⁹ of 154 boys and 152 girls in Northampton Township, Burlington County, 66 were studying grammar,³⁰ and of 150 pupils, 50 were studying grammar in Southampton Township.³¹ The superintendent of Hunterdon County reports that a few pupils only study grammar.³² An interesting sidelight, indicating that in certain quarters the subject was regarded as the capstone of the common-school curriculum, is found in the following statement of the superintendent of Woodbridge Township, Middlesex County: “There are taught all the subjects usually taught in the schools, from the alphabet to English grammar.”³³ Of reports from 175 townships, in 1851, only five cited above speak of grammar. However, the subject is mentioned by every officer who mentions the curriculum at all.

The following table giving the distribution of pupils by subjects in seven districts of Wall Township, Monmouth County, is enlightening as showing the relatively small number of pupils studying grammar, which, as we have seen, was regarded as one of the higher branches in the common schools.³⁴

	District.							Total.
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Number of pupils.....	40	81	50	61	68	40	92	432
Average attendance.....	20	42	30	36	40	25	42	235
Alphabet.....	1	9	4	6	5	1	5	31
Spelling.....	27	70	25	30	60	25	37	274
Reading.....	25	55	20	30	60	20	32	237
Writing.....	12	30	10	16	40	20	25	153
Arithmetic.....	12	12	14	15	30	15	15	113
Beyond division.....	10	4	6	10	20	7	6	63
Geography.....	4	3	4	5	8	4	6	35
Grammar.....	2	4	2	5	6	2	3	24
Defining words.....						7		7
Philosophy.....				1				1

In 1860, 205 townships in 21 counties show meager evidence as to grammar being a part of the curriculum, only eight townships referring definitely to it. Roswell Smith's grammars predominate, and there is constant indication that the subject is taught as a higher

²⁹ Rept. State Supt., 1851, 32.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 41.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 45.

³² *Ibid.*, 63.

³³ *Ibid.*, 85.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1854, 127.

branch, only very few pupils pursuing it. The conclusion which must be reached is that grammar was but indifferently taught in New Jersey, only in the better common schools, with less than one-tenth of the pupils studying it. This is entirely consistent with the status of the subject in Pennsylvania during the same period.

NEW YORK.

The showing of New York for the decade in question is more favorable. The State was evidently far in advance of Pennsylvania and New Jersey.³⁵

In comparing with the adjoining States it needs to be remembered that the academies of New York are higher schools than the common schools considered in Pennsylvania and New Jersey. Data concerning the status of grammar in the common schools of New York are not available after 1839; but even as early as 1826-1839 the showing for grammar in common schools in New York far surpasses that of the two other States named even for 20 years later.³⁶

Regents' reports of New York, covering the condition of grammar for the period, 1865 to 1874, in the academies, show the complete passing of the grammars of the old guard (with the exception of Gould Brown's, Murray's, Kirkham's, Smith's, and Webster's). The newer grammars of the middle of the century have taken their place, as will be seen from the following table:³⁷

	1865	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873
Brown.....	72	66	75	61	62	58	52	54	51
Smith.....	3	3	1						
Bullion.....	24	20	26	30	30	35	30	35	35
Clark.....	55	56	58	53	45	34	36	34	34
Weld.....	17	13	14	10	10	6	7	6	5
Greene.....	13	9	7	13	12	12	17	21	25
Quackenbos.....	25	25	29	26	17	20	17	16	11
Kerl.....	13	26	30	28	28	32	34	31	50
Swinton.....								5	12
Scattering.....	4	4	4	5	3	4	7	6	7

³⁵ The following table continues the table on page 83 through the years 1850 to 1856, inclusive.

Year.....	1851	1852	1853	1854	1855	1856
Academies reporting.....	168	170	169	173	165	176
Number of students.....	19,552	20,920	22,670	22,778	18,051	20,860
Grammars:						
Murray.....	2	1	1	0	1	1
Kirkham.....	17	9	3	3	2	0
Brown.....	66	68	77	75	75	80
Smith.....	21	22	18	16	13	21
Bullion.....	60	55	52	53	54	54
Webster.....			1	5	1	
Spencer.....	7	5	6	7	5	4
Wells.....	15	13	14	10	5	6
Clark.....	8	10	9	12	11	15
Weld.....	21	19	19	21	18	14
Greene.....	7	4	3	4	2	7
Kenyon.....			5	2	2	2
Scattering.....	16	11	10	12	15	12

Compiled from Regent's Reports, 1852-1857, inclusive. The 1855 figures represent two-thirds of the year.

³⁶ See p. 84.

³⁷ Reg. Rep., 1876, 439.

The new grammars of Quackenbos and Kerl have attained prominence, and Swinton's "Language Lessons," of 1873, which was to revolutionize the teaching of the subject, is seen just entering the academies. The fact is significant that the total number of grammars reported is considerably diminished, even though the number of academies is increased. This means that the place of the subject in the curriculum has become more stable.

Some light can be thrown on the status of grammar in the academies during this period by reports of regents' examinations. The percentage of those passing in grammar is noticeably lower than in arithmetic, geography, and spelling, the three other subjects used.³⁸

OHIO.

In Ohio, 1852, the 26 townships of Licking County taught English grammar.³⁹ That the instruction was largely perfunctory in some of the rural counties, at least, is evidenced by the superintendent of Pike County, who reported:

That our children should learn to read and write, and occasionally, in large towns and cities, to the highly favoured, may be added, by way of luxury, a little sprinkling of Geography and Grammar, answers almost universal custom.⁴⁰

That this man somewhat underestimated the universal custom is shown by the report of the State commissioner for the year 1856, summarizing the number of pupils instructed in the various branches. The total number of "unmarried" children of school age (5 to 21) in the State was 799,666; of these, 561,315 were enrolled in the schools; the average attendance was 322,643.⁴¹ The distribution of these by subjects is as follows:⁴²

	1856.	1857.
Penmanship.....	249,002	271,440
Mental arithmetic.....	82,640	112,744
Written arithmetic.....	166,665	187,290
Geography.....	90,784	108,270
English grammar.....	63,414	75,353
Composition.....	15,201	21,916
History.....	5,824	6,759
Algebra.....	5,790	7,644

³⁸ Percentage of students passing in grammar in New York academies, 1866 to 1872.

	1866	1867	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872
Number examined.....	12,939	12,266	11,780	11,322	12,286	13,063	15,442
Number passed.....	5,306	5,354	4,861	3,251	3,276	4,161	6,118
Per cent passed.....	4.1	8.65	30.97	28.71	26.66	31.85	39.61

Ann. Rept. Regt. Univ. N. Y., 89, 472.

³⁹ Rept. Sec. State, Com. Sch., 1852, 40.

⁴¹ Rept. of Sch. Comm., 1857, 86.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 51,

⁴² Ibid., 89,

	1856.	1857.
Rhetoric.....	404	929
Latin.....	675	1,319
Greek.....	113	159
German.....	903	1,320
French.....	180	250
Zoology.....	675	688

This table, indicating that approximately one-fifth of the pupils were studying grammar, seems to warrant the assertion that the subject was almost universal, including quite as large a percentage of pupils as in New York and Massachusetts. This conclusion must be qualified by two facts: First, undeveloped counties, like Pike⁴³ and Gallia,⁴⁴ report that, with very few exceptions, reading, writing, and arithmetic are “all the pupils are expected to acquire”; second, there is frequent complaint that teachers are incompetent, especially in grammar and geography. In 1858 the State commissioner said: “As the chief of all causes of poor schools, *poor teachers* stands out. That one-half, or one-tenth (*sic*), even of the thousands of teachers in Ohio are in all respects what their profession demands no one can justly claim.”⁴⁵

The status of English branches in academies of Ohio in this decade (1850–1860) may be seen in the reports of typical academies made to State officials:⁴⁶

Academy.	Ancient languages.	Modern languages.	Higher English branches.
Seneca County.....	20	150
Western Reserve.....	75	8	190
Pomeroy.....	22	27
Gallipolis.....	12	20	40
Kingsville.....	65	37	142

NEW HAMPSHIRE

The status of grammar in New Hampshire schools in 1850–1852 is indicated by the report of the county commissioner of Rockingham County for the year 1851. The commissioner had been conducting a campaign against the multiplicity of schoolbooks and had succeeded in inducing his various town committees to recommend uniform books for the use of all the schools in their towns. He records, town by town, the grammars represented. Thirty towns report. Of these, 2 do not mention books recommended; only 1 other does not mention a grammar. Of the remaining 24 towns, preference is shown in 14 for W. H. Wells’s Grammar; in 7 towns for Roswell

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 1852, 49.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 1856.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 1858, 61.

⁴⁶ Rept. State Com. Ed., 1858, 168, 67, 66, 61, 59.

Smith's "Productive Lessons," and in 6 towns for Weld's "New Grammar." As second choice (used in a few schools) 3 towns reported Wells's, 4 Weld's, and 6 Smith's.^{46a} The total number of towns in Rockingham County, in 1852, was 37, with 455 schools in operation.⁴⁷ Scattered references in reports from commissioners of other counties indicate that Rockingham is typical. In Carroll County the commissioner especially examined grammar classes.⁴⁸ In Cheshire County Institute a teacher of grammar was provided.⁴⁹ Sullivan County named a number of towns in which "grammar was better taught than it was last year."⁵⁰ In Grafton County the commissioner emphasized the "elements of grammar."⁵¹ In Coos County children of 12 were passing good examinations in grammar.⁵²

The report of the State commissioner of the following year (1852) indicates that the county commissioners, meeting at the capital, recommended a uniform system of textbooks, among them H. N. Weld's New Grammar and Dyer H. Sanborn's Grammar.⁵³ Several county commissioners endeavored to have grammar "taught understandingly,"⁵⁴ and occasionally there crept in a vigorous advocacy of composition as supplementary to grammar.⁵⁵ Cheshire County reported a large variety of grammars.⁵⁶

MICHIGAN.

In 1857 the superintendent of instruction of Michigan asked the officers of all the union schools⁵⁷ to furnish him information upon 12 points, one of which was the course of study pursued in the school. Replies from a number of schools, although very incomplete, enable us to determine the status of grammar in the curriculum. The normal grading appears to be reported in Dowagiac union school, divided into primary, grammar (or intermediate), and high school departments. Rudiments of grammar were begun in the grammar school (the fifth year of the pupil's school life), together with composition and declamation. The high-school department, beginning in the seventh year of school life, included grammar, composition, analysis of English sentence, declamation, and elocution.⁵⁸ The equivalent course is reported in Grand Rapids, Jonesville, and Ontonagon.⁵⁹ Ypsilanti, in the grammar department, used Clark's Primary Grammar, with declamations and compositions weekly; in the academic

^{46a} Rept. Comm. Sch. N. H., 1852, 61-7.

⁴⁷ Op. cit., 1853, 64.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 1852, 82.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 105.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 110.

⁵¹ Ibid., 121.

⁵⁷ A term embracing all the public schools in the various communities.

⁵⁸ Mich. Sch. Repts., 1857, 457.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 465, 7, 77.

⁵² Ibid., 133.

⁵³ Ibid., 1853, 29.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 94.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 96-7.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 118.

department, Clark's Grammar, English analysis, original and selected declamations, and compositions weekly.⁶⁰ Coldwater reported the same curriculum with different textbooks.⁶¹ Ann Arbor High School showed English grammar in its first year,⁶² while Adrian High School required an entrance examination in grammar, analysis, and simple rules for composition.⁶³

Neither the academies nor the common schools so far considered are in themselves sufficient to determine the status of instruction in grammar. We have seen that the common schools give but very limited and indifferent instruction in the subject and that the New York academies, looked upon as fitting schools for teachers, had special interest in grammar. There is available in convenient form information from the printed school regulations as to the status of the subject obtaining in a considerable number of cities of representative distribution throughout the Union. The regulations of New York City; Springfield, Mass.; New Haven, New Bedford, Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Louisville, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati are studied particularly.⁶⁴

LARGER CITIES.

In the primary school (common, elementary, or district school in some cities), with from four to seven grades, the formal study of grammar was not begun. There is exception in the case of New Haven, where grammar is prescribed for the sixth and seventh grades of the common school. However, this city seems to have had no intermediate or grammar school. By 1866 Chicago had also adopted the twofold division—elementary and high schools—and grammar appears in the eighth, ninth, and tenth grades. The latter city announces, however, that "grammar shall be taught practically in all the grades in connection with composition." In the regulations of all the other cities noted a similar provision is made, either specifically or by implication. Eastern cities seem to lay great stress on oral-grammar work in all grades except the first two. New York and Cincinnati have unique courses in "punctuation," running through all the primary grades. Cincinnati, insisting upon "practical" grammar for the first five grades, adds "and pupils in grade A (sixth)

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 476.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 440.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 449.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 434.

⁶⁴ Data in Barnard's *Amer. J. of Ed.*, 1870, 469-518.

In the Cincinnati schools, 1860, pupils were distributed in the various branches of English as follows: High schools—English grammar, 174, rhetoric, 294, reading, 364, composition, 363, declamation, 199; intermediate schools—reading and orthography, 1,179. English grammar, 1,174, penmanship, 1,179, composition, 941, elocution, 204; in the district schools—alphabet, 4,632. English grammar, 421, composition, 463, elocution, 266. Common Sch. Cincin., 31st Ann. Rept., 9. The principal of the Woodward High School reported that "grammar is now well taught in the intermediate schools." *Ibid.*, 57. The following year showed a total of 2,682 pupils in grammar, 3,616 in composition, 954 in elocution, 363 in rhetoric out of a total of 22,749 children enrolled. *Ibid.*, 1861, 9.

shall be familiar with their textbook (in grammar) as far as mode." With this exception the fact seems to be that no formal grammar was taught in the first five years of school life, that it was rarely taught in the sixth year, and not often in the seventh. Provision for incidental instruction during these years is universal.

In the intermediate grades, usually called grammar grades, the subject reigned supreme. New York, after her six years in punctuation, apparently gave two years of relief, for formal grammar study does not appear until the third year of the grammar school. Not till the fifth year of the intermediate schools did textbook work in grammar begin, but it had been taught orally for the two years preceding. In the fifth year "English grammar commenced, with the use of textbooks, to include the analysis, parsing, and construction of simple sentences, and with such definitions only as pertain to the parts of speech." This type of teaching was continued for the two following years.

To summarize, New York began formal grammar in the ninth year of school, New Haven in the seventh, Cincinnati in the sixth, Springfield in the seventh, New Bedford in the eighth, Boston in the eighth, Chicago in the eighth, St. Louis in the sixth, Louisville in the eighth, Philadelphia in the eighth. The average for these representative cities was about the eighth grade.

As to the length of time given the study below the high school, New York assigned five years (two orally); New Haven, three years; New Bedford, two years; Cincinnati, three years; Springfield, three years; Boston, three years;⁶⁵ Chicago, three years; St. Louis, two years; Louisville, three years; Philadelphia, five years. The average time given, apparently, was three years. This does not consider informal

⁶⁵ Boston shows the normal arrangement of three schools, as follows:

Primary school. Six grades. No traces of formal grammar, but oral instruction in all grades. Grammar incidental.

Grammar schools. Four grades. Grammar in the last three grades, class No. 3 using Kerl's "Elementary English Grammar," class No. 2 using Kerl's "Elementary" or Kerl's "Comprehensive English Grammar," class No. 1, grammar. The last two classes have composition and, in the boys' school, declamation.

Girls' high school. Three grades. Entrance examination in grammar. Lowest class—grammar reviewed, analysis of language and structure of sentences, composition.

English high school. Three grades. Entrance examination in grammar.

"The several classes shall also have exercises in English composition and declamation. The instructors shall pay particular attention to the penmanship of the pupils and give constantly such attention to spelling, reading, and English grammar as they may deem necessary to make the pupils familiar with these fundamental branches of a good education."

The regulations of the English high schools for 1820, date of founding, required grammar in the lowest class, with composition, criticism, and declamation in all the classes. By 1836 grammar as a formal study had been dropped; for the first class, however, were prescribed "reviews of the preparatory studies in the textbooks authorized to be used in the grammar and writing schools," and the provision was that "the several divisions shall also receive instruction in spelling, reading, writing, English grammar, declamation, composition, and the French language." In the successive regulations of 1820, 1836, and 1852 we see the process of forcing formal grammar into the lower school and retaining incidental study of it in the high school, with entrance examination required.

study of grammar or collateral study in connection with composition either before or after the formal study. Philadelphia was the only city on the list requiring textbook study for five years.

The position of grammar in the high schools was as follows: In some cities an entrance examination or certificate of proficiency from the grammar school was required, as in New York and Boston; in some cities review courses were prescribed in the first year of the high school, as in Louisville, Philadelphia, and others; in still other cities grammar was designated as an incidental study in the high school—in all three grades of the Boston high school and in the last three grades in New Haven.⁶⁶

Further light upon the status of grammar in the high-school curriculum of 1867 is found in a study made from the official regulations of 29 cities published in 1870. The original study includes all the subjects mentioned in the statutes as being taught in the high school. The following table⁶⁷ indicates only the subjects pertaining to the vernacular:

Cities.	Spelling.	Reading.	English synonyms.	English literature.	Rhetoric.	Composition.	Declamation.	Grammar.
Baltimore.....		X		X	X	X		X
Boston.....	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Cambridge.....		X	X	X	X			
Chicago.....				X	X	X		X
Cincinnati.....				X				X
Cleveland.....					X	X	X	X
Dubuque.....					X	X		X
Fond du Lac (Wis.)..		X		X		X	X	X
Hartford.....		X	X	X				X
Indianapolis.....					X	X		X
Lewiston (Me.).....				X				X
Louisville.....				X	X	X	X	X
Madison (Wis.).....		X			X	X	X	
Manchester.....				X	X	X	X	
New York.....		X	X		X	X	X	X
New Haven.....	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Newark.....	X	X			X	X	X	X
Niles (Mich.).....		X		X	X	X	X	X
Philadelphia.....	X	X		X	X	X	X	X
Portland (Me.).....	X			X	X	X	X	X
Providence.....				X	X	X	X	X
Rochester.....					X			
Sandusky.....					X			X
San Francisco.....				X	X	X	X	
Springfield.....				X	X			
St. Louis.....				X		X		X
Terre Haute.....					X	X	X	X
Troy.....			X	X	X	X		X
Worcester.....		X		X	X	X	X	X

Spelling and English synonyms appear in the statutes of 5 cities, reading in 12, declamation in 17, English literature in 21, composition in 23, grammar in 23, and rhetoric in 27. However, the data are

⁶⁶ In St. Louis grammar was begun as a textbook study in the sixth grade of the district school; the first quarter to page 27; second, 46; third, 58; fourth, 75; continued in seventh grade, first quarter to page 100; second, 122; third, 164; fourth, review. The subject was then dropped until the first year of the high school, in the first year of which English parsing and analysis are prescribed.

In Louisville no grammar was shown in the four years of the primary department; in the intermediate department there was oral instruction based on the readers, in which the

ambiguous, because a number of the cities are listed in the above table as giving grammar whose educational statutes, printed in the same volume, do not require it. Among them are Boston, Chicago, and Cincinnati, which, according to the statutes, had grammar in the high school only as an incidental study; yet these cities are listed in the table as teaching grammar in the high school. This fact indicates the only inference that can safely be drawn from the table, namely, that 23 of the 29 cities prescribe grammar in some form, either (1) as a regular subject, supplementing a two or three year course in the intermediate schools, as in New Haven, or (2) as a review course, lasting one or two terms, as in New York, or (3) as incidental or supplementary work in connection with composition or rhetoric, as in Boston, Chicago, and Cincinnati.

pupils "repeat orally and in writing, in their own language, the substance of each lesson"; in the grammar department of three years "they shall be taught all the lessons in Butler's Large Grammar to syntax. They shall also be taught to parse words in simple sentences not found in the grammar." This is for the first year. In the second "the same . . . to prosody; to compare adjectives and adverbs, to decline nouns and pronouns and to conjugate verbs, in writing. They shall also be taught to parse all the parsing exercises in said lessons and to parse words in sentences not found in the grammar." For the third year Butler's grammar was prescribed complete. The girls' high school had English grammar and composition throughout the first year. The boys' high school seems to have had no grammar.

Philadelphia had no grammar in the four years of the primary or five years of the secondary departments. In the grammar-school department of five years the instruction was the most elaborate the writer has found. In the first and second years Hart's "Introduction" or Parker's through the nine parts of speech, including the simple rules of syntax; in the third year Hall's or Parker's introductory work completed and construction of simple sentences within the same limits; in the fourth year Hall's or Parker's English Grammar commenced and continued to the rules of syntax; parsing and construction of sentences and correction of false syntax; in the fifth year Hall's or Parker's completed and reviewed. Directions for teachers are: "The disputed points or matters far above the pupils' capacity should never be dwelt upon. The teacher's object must be rather to impart such a knowledge of the construction of the language as will enable the pupil to speak and write with a reasonable degree of correctness."

⁴⁷ Am. J. of Ed., 1870, 643.

Chapter V.

TRADITIONAL METHODS OF TEACHING LATIN GRAMMAR TRANSFERRED TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS.

From the very beginning it seems that English grammar was intended to perform for the mother tongue the same functions Latin grammar performed for that language. The aim of grammar schools—to make finished writers and speakers of Latin—was paralleled by the aim of English schools in America, patterned after Franklin's Academy—to make finished writers and speakers of the vernacular. In each the grammatical study of the languages was fundamental. As the requirements of practical life in America seemed to demand less Latin and more English, and as the English schools more and more took on the dignity formerly held by the Latin schools, English grammar advanced correspondingly to a more prominent place in the curriculum. This identity of function is powerfully supported by the striking similarity in content and in methods of study as expounded by textbook makers.

The present and the succeeding chapter trace the changes in methods of teaching which have marked the successive stages of English grammar in American schools between 1750 and 1850.⁶⁸ Roughly, this aspect of the study may be outlined in two grand divisions, each consisting of three subdivisions of approximately 25 years:

I. Grammar as an art.

- (a) Latin period, 1750 to 1784.
- (b) Rote period, 1784 to 1823.
- (c) Parsing period, 1823 to 1847.

II. Grammar as a science.

- (a) Analysis period, 1848 to 1873.
- (b) Rhetorical period, 1873 to 1891.
- (c) Incidental study period, 1891 to 1920.

The two main divisions are based upon the fundamental conception of grammar held by the leading grammarians.⁶⁹ About 1850 the idea

⁶⁸ A later study will carry the investigation down to 1920.

⁶⁹ The term "leading grammarians" is perhaps misleading. The connotation intended is to designate authors leading in influence upon school practices. In this sense Murray is the leading grammarian in this country up to 1850. The date of his textbook (1795) is not selected as a dividing point in the outline, because the date of Webster's Grammar

that grammar as an art was changed to the idea that grammar is a science. To the various subdivisions names have been given on the basis of the one method predominating during the period involved. The chronological limits of the periods have been marked by the date of an innovating textbook of widespread influence or by some other important or culminating event explained in the course of the discussion.

The year 1848 does not mark a sharp breaking away from the conception of grammar as an art, for progress in methods of teaching can not be marked by exact dates. Long before any important change becomes prevalent in all or in almost all schools, far-seeing teachers are discarding the old and experimenting with the new. For instance, before 1848 some grammarians had substituted the sentence for the word as the unit of instruction; long after 1848 many textbook makers clung tenaciously to the word as the unit of study. Grammarians earlier than Greene (1848) had made their point of departure the analysis of sentences; but Greene seems to have come at the opportune moment, when schoolmen were aroused, when disgust with old methods had reached a crisis. His book became exceedingly popular; he had many followers. The date of his grammar marks the chief turning point in our discussion of methods. In a similar way the significance of the major event which marks each step in the outline will be considered in detail through 1850. The point to be borne in mind is that great changes in methods are not instantaneously inaugurated; they are matters of slow and painful growth.

One further word of explanation. The names given to the six periods are titles of predominating methods. A possible criticism of this nomenclature is that parsing, for example, is as old as grammar itself and will continue in some form as long as grammar is studied. Granted that this is true. The evidence presented for the years 1823-1848 seems to indicate that amid the passing of the old and the coming in of the new methods parsing was the method par excellence. The same comment is pertinent to all the other periods except the first. The confusing element here is that Latinized methods exerted a strong influence in a great majority of schools through the entire nineteenth century and are with us to-day, though happily in diminishing emphasis. Noah Webster was right when he said that it requires the club of Hercules wielded by the arm of a giant to destroy the hydra of educational prejudice.

(1784) more closely approximates the close of the Revolution. Moreover, in influence upon the schools Webster and Murray were very similar. Regarded in another sense, Murray was far from a leading grammarian, for he was a confessed compiler, frankly indebted to Lowth; Priestley, and the British grammar. He was a follower, not a leader, in constructive grammatical scholarship, being in this regard below Noah Webster. Throughout this chapter grammatical thinkers have our attention only in so far as it can be shown that they exerted a direct influence upon the school practices of their day.

The methods of the early Latinists ⁷¹ seem to have cast their baneful influence over the entire four centuries during which the vernacular has been building for itself a suitable grammatical study. At any rate, the Latin and the Rote periods are really one and the same. The writer has no particular pride in maintaining strict chronological balance in his outline, except that he thinks it helpful to divide the period 1750 to 1823 into two parts. The other five periods are useful limitations both as to time and title. The following study of the interrelations of these periods may throw some light upon what has been heretofore a confused and confusing field.

1. GRAMMAR AS AN ART.

An examination of a series of definitions of grammar taken from influential textbooks ⁷² indicates that grammar was considered an art in the texts which determined the earliest instruction in America.

Ben Johnson: Grammar is the art of true and well-speaking a language; the writing of it is an accident.⁷⁴

Lily: Grammatica est recte scribendi, atque loquendi ars.⁷³

Wharton: Grammar is the Art of Writing, and Speaking, well.⁷⁵

Brightland:

Grammar do's all the Art and Knowledge teach,
According to the Use of every Speech,
How our Thoughts most justly may express
In Words, together join'd, in Sentences.⁷⁶

Greenwood: Grammar is the Art of Speaking rightly. I have left out the Art of Writing, because that is an Accident of Speech, and none but the essential or chief Things ought to be put into a definition.⁷⁷

Dilworth: Grammar is the Science of Letters, or the Art of Writing and Speaking properly and syntactically.⁷⁸

Fisher: Grammar is the Art of expressing the Relation of Things in Construction, with due Accent in Speaking, and Orthography in Writing, according to the Custom, of those whose Language we learn.⁷⁹

British: Grammar is the Art of Expressing the Relations of Words in Construction, with due Quantity in Speaking and Orthography in Writing.⁸⁰

Lowth: Grammar is the Art of rightly expressing our Thoughts by Words.⁸¹

Priestley: The grammar of any tongue is a collection of observations on the structure of it, and a system of rules for the proper use of it.⁸²

⁷¹ "Latinists" is the term repeatedly used by Franklin.

⁷² An attempt is made here to select for comparison books which immediately preceded the beginnings of grammatical instruction in America: First, books upon which English grammar was founded; second, books which, printed in England in the eighteenth century, were imported or reprinted in America and used as textbooks; and, third, books written by American authors which were most influential before 1825. The text selected and the editions used are named in the bibliography.

⁷³ Lily, op. cit., 1.

⁷⁴ Johnson, op. cit., 3.

⁷⁵ Wharton, op. cit., 1.

⁷⁶ Brightland, op. cit., 1.

⁷⁷ Greenwood, op. cit., 48.

⁷⁸ Dilworth, op. cit., 85.

⁷⁹ Fisher, op. cit., 1.

⁸⁰ British, op. cit., 1.

⁸¹ Lowth, op. cit., 1.

⁸² Priestly, op. cit., 1.

Alexander: Grammar teaches the Art of expressing and communicating our thoughts with verbal propriety.⁸³

Murray: English Grammar is the art of speaking and writing the English language with propriety.⁸⁴

Webster: Grammar is the art of communicating thoughts by words with propriety and dispatch.⁸⁵

Brown: English Grammar is the art of speaking and writing the English Language correctly.⁸⁶

Brightland uses the definition "Art and Knowledge, according to the Use of every Speech, how we our Thoughts express in Sentences"; that is, the idea—knowledge of the use of language in sentences—seems to be prominent. But our feeling that the author of Brightland's textbook may have had an inkling in 1706 of the modern conception of grammar as a science is quickly dispelled. We find him explaining in a footnote: "The modern as well as the old grammarians have given us various Definitions of this useful Art."⁸⁷ Greenwood, who is a close follower of Jonson, in his edition of 1711, calls writing an accident; but in his third edition (1747) he changes his definition to "English Grammar is the art of speaking and writing the English language with propriety." This definition Murray copies exactly.

Dilworth uses the word "science," but he speaks of the science of letters, which he considers the art of speaking and writing properly. Priestley certainly states the modern conception in his definition, but his apparant insight is misleading, for, in spite of certain innovations in method to be considered later, he treats grammar as an art. The true nature of grammar had apparently not even remotely suggested itself to Webster when in 1784 he wrote his first grammar. At that time his definition is: "Grammar is the Art of communicating thought." By 1790 the light seems to have dimly dawned upon him, for in the preface to his "Rudiments of Grammar" he affirms: "Rules are drawn from the most general and approved practice, and serve to teach young students how far their own practice in speaking agrees with the general practice."⁸⁸ In a later grammar (1831) he goes still further. His definition now is: "A system of general principles, derived from the national distinction of words, deduced from the customary forms of speech in the nation using that language."⁸⁹ Here, certainly, Webster has gone far toward the modern conception that grammar comes after a language has been in use; that it is a statement of principles of usage as found in the spoken and written communication of the most expert. The principles of this science are to be found by minute analysis of wholes into parts, with consequent

⁸³ Alexander, *op. cit.*, 3.

⁸⁴ Murray, *op. cit.*, 7.

⁸⁵ Webster, *op. cit.*, 5.

⁸⁶ Webster, *An Improved Gram. of the Eng. Tongue*, 3.

⁸⁶ Brown, *op. cit.*, 15.

⁸⁷ Brightland, *op. cit.*, 1, footnote.

⁸⁸ Webster, *Rudiments*, 2.

generalizations to establish general principles. But Webster at first apparently had only a mere glimmer of the truth. He treated grammar as an art of building up wholes from smaller parts.

Finally, Gould Brown, whom we shall see even as late as 1851 the last prominent fighter of the old guard, still championed the conception of grammar as an art when nearly everyone else had abandoned it. He said in 1823: "Grammar is the art of speaking and writing the language correctly." This was the common conception held by grammarians up to the middle of the nineteenth century.

The force which fastened this conception so firmly is undoubtedly the force of tradition. Even the word grammar is from the Greek *gramma*, a letter. These characters are the elements of written language, as articulate sounds are the elements of spoken language. Hence, from the very derivation of the word, one seems bound to start with the simplest elements and build up the more complex forms. The natural and easy way to learn had always seemed to be to proceed from the element to the complex structure. Letters, syllables, words, sentences—this makes a seemingly more logical sequence than the reverse process. The child says "water" if he is thirsty. To-day it is recognized that he means a sentence—"I want water." Consequently the process of learning in both reading and writing (composition) to-day proceeds from the whole to the part. But to attain this new conception has been a matter of slow and painful growth. In it we have come to realize that grammar, the science of sentences, is a matter of late study, if, indeed, it need ever be taught to children trained by imitation to speak and write accurately.

The truth is that the term grammar—the art of letters—is a misnomer, considering our modern conception of the subject. However, our intent here is merely to state the apparent cause of the earlier misconception.

2. METHODS USED IN STUDYING LILY, AND LATIN GRAMMAR IN GENERAL, SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

We shall now consider how the methods of study pursued in Latin grammars were carried over into the study of English. In "The Epistle to the Reader," in all editions of Lily, we find specific recommendations as to classroom procedure.

First, Colet urges that progress be very slow;⁹⁰ also that there be liberal oral rehearsing of all parts until they be perfectly mastered mechanically.⁹¹ Perfect "without book" is an expression one meets

⁹⁰ "The first and chiefest point is, that the diligent master make not the schollar haste too much." Lily, Epistle, 2.

⁹¹ Make him to rehearse so, that until he hath perfectly that, which is behinde, he suffer him not to go forward; . . . the best and chiefest point . . . is, that the schollar have in minde so perfectly that, that he hath learned, and understood it so, that not only it be not a stoppe for him, but also a light and helpe unto the residue that followeth." Ibid.

again and again in pedagogical discussions of the time.⁹² This was to be accomplished by numerous repetitions, frequent rehearsals, and periodical examinations by the teacher.⁹³

In this laborious fashion the pupil is to make himself master of every declension of nouns and conjugation of verbs. He is to be able to decline and conjugate forward and backward.⁹⁴ Until this is done the pupils are not allowed to go forward.

From this mastery of paradigms the pupil is to pass to an equally difficult study of the "concordes." These are to be learned with "plaine and sundrie examples, and continuall rehearsall of things learned, and especially the daily declining of the verb, and turning it into all fashions."⁹⁵ Schoolmasters are advised that subsequent lessons will be easy if "the foregrounds be well and thoroughly beaten in."⁹⁶ Probably no pun was intended, but the phrase perhaps gave church authority for a common method of persuading reluctant pupils to their tasks.

After these studies of the concords the pupil is to "learn some petty book containing . . . good plain lessons of honesty and godliness."⁹⁷ Then is to follow the translation of English sentences from the book into Latin and the learning of the rules of syntax which govern the construction. The Latin sentences are to be repeated in the words of the book.⁹⁸ This sets another premium upon slavish memorizing. In all this the pupil is never to be idle, but "alwaies occupied in a continual rehearsing, and looking back again to those things they had learned."⁹⁹ Constant reviewing is the unbroken order of the day. Every process is based upon knowledge of the rules.¹⁰⁰

⁹² "That they have daily some speciall exercise of the memory, by repeating somewhat without booke; as a part in their rules the foure first daies of the weeke . . . all the rules of the weeke on the Saturday." Brinsley, *Ludus Literaris*, 51.

⁹³ In East Retford the first part of the morning in the first four days of the school week was devoted to saying over "one of the Eight Parts of Speech like as the manner and fashion of all grammar Schools, and upon Friday Sum es tul, with his compounds, as shall seem to the School-master convenient." Carlisle, *op. cit.*, II, 282, *Statutes*, 1552.

"This is all that I have used: To let them reade it (The Accedence) over every one by himselfe by lessons. . . . Thus I make them reade over their Accedence . . . before they do get it without booke. Secondly, for getting it without booke, I cause them . . . to say it as oft as they can." Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 53.

⁹⁴ "Wherein it is profitable, not only that he can orderly decline his nounes, and his verbe, but everyway, forward, backward, by cases, by persons: that neither case of nounes, nor person of verbe can be required, that hee cannot without stoppe or studie tell. And unto this time I count not the schollar perfect nor reade to go any further. . . ." Lily, *op. cit.*, 3.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁹⁸ "Therefore (from the book) take some little sentence, as it leeth, and learne to make the same out of English into Latine, not seeing the booke, or construing it there upon . . . which sentence well made, and as nigh as may be with the wordes of the booke." Lily, *op. cit.*, 3.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰⁰ "If the maister give him an English booke and cause him ordinarily to turne it every day some part into Latine. This exercise cannot be done without his rules." *Ibid.*, 4.

The final step is teaching pupils to speak Latin. This is to be accomplished by drill until "a man is clean past the use of this grammar booke," until he is as "readie as his booke." Then he is perfected "in the tongue handsomely."¹

In order to determine more certainly what the classroom practices of the early Latin study were, we may supplement the summary of suggestions of Colet, in Lily, with the advice of the schoolmaster, Brinsley. His book was written in 1612, when Lily was most popular in the grammar schools. It may be taken as reliable evidence of the practice of his day, perhaps in the most advanced practice. In "The Grammar School" Brinsley devotes a chapter to the topic "How to make children perfect in the Accidence." The following chapters discuss the other parts of instruction in Latin. Brinsley's exposition appears to be entirely consistent with Colet's, given above. He has his pupils (1) read over their lessons many times; (2) learn every rule, with title, "without booke"; (3) recite, one by one; (4) get accidence without book; (5) repeat the beginnings of rules in a connected title, "without booke" (he insists that the principal duty is to get rules without book); (6) go through weekly repetitions to prevent forgetting; (7) learn very little at a time (the pupil is to be letter-perfect in each part before proceeding); and (8) answer questions in the book.

He has the master (1) explain difficult parts, construe and show meanings; (2) use the question-and-answer method; (3) constantly call for examples of rules—the examples given in the book; (4) hear parts, making the pupil repeat his rule; (5) spend a month in making the accidence perfect; (6) give continual practice in parsing; (7) keep the rules in mind (by making scholars learn perfectly, constant repetition, continual care for parts, repeating often the summes of rules, applying examples); (8) endeavor to make the grammar a dictionary in their minds; (9) apply a prescribed formula for construing (construe the vocative first, the principal verb next, then the adverb, then the case which the verb governs, and, last, the substantive and adjective); (10) hear them parse every word as they construe, accompanying the parsing with rule and example; (11) follow by theme writing and verse making; and (12) give constant practice in the upper forms in speaking Latin.²

¹An interesting pedagogical doctrine, certainly sound, appears paradoxically in the midst of this insistence upon minute mastery of details. It is a caution against mere rote memorizing. "This when he can perfectly doe, and hath learned every point, not by rote but by reason, and is cunninger in the understanding of the thing, than in rehearsing of the words . . ." Lily, *op. cit.*, 3. Thus as early as 1541, at least, was uttered a protest against what was to be for nearly three centuries the curse of all grammar teaching in the mother tongue.

²Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 53-145.

In this list the endeavor has been to select 20 of the leading principles of instruction advocated by Philoponus, the character in Brinsley's dialogue, who represents the better type of teaching.³ In some cases the suggestions have been taken from the mouth of Spondeus, the representative in the dialogue of the poorer teachers of his day.

To the testimony of Colet and Brinsley may be added the practices of Roger Ascham in teaching Latin grammar, as set forth in "The Schoolmaster," 1563.

(A) Preparatory: Learn perfectly the eight parts of speech and the joining together of substantives with adjectives, verbs with nouns, relatives with antecedents.

(B) Double translation: 1. The master is to construe the model book for the child that he may understand.

2. Then the pupil is to parse and construe, as the master has done for him, often enough for the pupil to understand.

3. The lesson is to be translated into English in a paper book.

4. After an hour he is to translate his English back into the Latin in another paper book.

5. The master is to examine these translations and lead the pupil until he is able "to fetch out of his grammar every Rule for every example; so as the grammar book be ever in the scholar's hands, and also used of him as a Dictionary for every present Use."

6. The master is to compare the pupil's Latin with the original in the model book.

"With this way of good Understanding the matter, plain construing, diligent parsing, cheerful admonishing, and heedful amending of Faults; never leaving behind just praise for well doing: I would have the Scholar brought up."

(C) Analysis: 1. Give him longer lessons to translate. "Begin to teach him, both in Nouns and Verbs, what is Proprium, and what is Translabum (figurative), what Synonym, what Diversion, which be Contraria, and which be most notable Phrases, in all his Lecture (reading)."

2. Let him write four of these forenamed six diligently marked out of every lesson in a third paper book.⁴

(D) Reading: 1. "I would have him read now, a good deal at every Lecture, some book of Cicero, Cæsar, etc."

2. "He shall now use daily Translation, but only construe again and parse. . . . Yet let him not omit in these Books his former Exercise, in mastering diligently and writing orderly."

³ An admirable statement of the methods used in the grammar schools in 1818 appears in Carlisle, "Endowed Grammar School," 1818, 828-30. It begins: "When the Pupil has committed to memory. The Accidence, Propria quae maribus, etc. . . ." The account tallies in very many details with the methods laid down by Colet and Brinsley, and indicates that Latin instruction had remained in scope and method relatively stable for three hundred years.

⁴ Ascham, *The Schoolmaster*, Mayor, 1-9.

3. The master is to translate some easy Latin into good English, the pupil to translate it into Latin again.

4. The master is to compare the pupil's work with the original.

(E) Third kind of translation: 1. The master is to write some letter in English, as if from the boy's father, or copy some fable.

2. The pupil is to translate it into Latin.⁵

3. LATIN METHODS CARRIED DIRECTLY TO ENGLISH GRAMMAR. MEMORIZATION.

"The book itself will make anyone a grammarian." Thus spoke Gould Brown in his grammar of 1823.⁶ His statement fittingly characterizes the attitude of teachers and writers⁷ throughout the entire course of English grammar down to 1823, and, unfortunately, the same attitude has not entirely disappeared to-day. We have just seen a summary of methods used in teaching Latin grammar. We now turn to the task of showing that they were carried over directly into English in the spirit voiced by Gould Brown as late as 1823.

MASTERING PARTS IN ORDER.

This principle is worthy of mention first because it underlies almost all of the methods to be considered later. We have seen that Colet, in his "Epistle," asserts that "the first and chiefest point is, that the diligent Maister make not the scholar haste too much" and that he make him get "perfectly that which is behind" before "he suffer him to go forwards."⁸ Brinsley supports this plan. The children are first to get their letters, then to spell, then to join syllables together, then to go through the A B C's and primer, etc.⁹ To be sure,

⁵ *Ibid.*, 92.

⁶ Brown, *op. cit.*, preface, VII.

⁷ The efforts of the past century to break away from the Latin methods are reserved for the following chapter. In the preceding section were shown various supplementary devices, parallel reading, dictation, copy books, writing exercises, oral work, dating back to Brinsley, Ascham, Hoole, and Colet. In both the Latin instruction and the first vernacular instruction these devices were strictly subordinated to the great triumvirate of methods—memorization, parsing, and false syntax. They remained strictly subordinate and incidental until about 1850. But during the century preceding 1850 the use of "petty books" gradually evolved into the study of English literature; dictation, the use of copy books, and writing exercises by a similar process of evolution became composition as we now know it, and the simple oral exercises of the earlier day became oral composition of the present. The practice of orations and disputations in Latin, common in both grammar schools and colleges before English entered the curriculum, was very influential in bringing these exercises into English schools.

The process of evolution was but partially completed by 1850, because literature, composition, and oral work were all subordinate to grammar. Beginning about 1850 evolution has made these branches of the vernacular more robust. The best school practice of to-day makes grammatical study strictly subordinate to them. The point is that since 1850 this complete reversal between grammar, on the one hand, and vernacular branches, on the other, has taken place.

This statement, anticipating discussion not covered by this thesis, has been made here in order to place the extremely Latinized methods of the Latin and rote periods in sharp contrast with the best methods of to-day.

⁸ Lilly, *op. cit.*, 2.

⁹ Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 15 et seq.

he is in this instance speaking of learning to read; but it makes the inference all the more inevitable. In all studies the method was from the part to the whole, each part to be mastered perfectly in order. The pupil reads over and over the small part of the text assigned, forward and backward, until mechanically perfect.¹⁰

In the beginning of the eighteenth century Brightland and Greenwood (1706 and 1712) urge for English grammar exactly the same procedure.¹¹ The former describes his method. "We begin with what is first to be learnt, that what follows may be understood; and proceed thus step by step, till we come to the last and most difficult, and which depends on all that goes before it."¹²

Greenwood also indicates the mastery of part by part:

And every Body must readily grant that the Way to come to a true and clear Knowledge of any Art, is to explain Things unknown, by Things that are known.¹³

In the middle of the century, also, the author of the *British Grammar* explains the steps of a recitation:

Spell every word of the lesson, by syllables; give the signification of each word; state the part of speech, with reasons, etc.¹⁴ After the Scholars know their Letters ground them well in their Monosyllables with the soft and hard Sounds of C and G. This they will soon learn from Word of Mouth, by frequent Repetition. . . .¹⁵

Sewell, toward the end of the century, assigns "small portions to be got by heart,"¹⁶ and Brown, 1823, still continues the practice. "In etymology and syntax, he should be alternately exercised in learning small portions of his book and then applying them in parsing, till the whole is rendered familiar."¹⁷

The evidence thus presented is in strict accord with the textbook matter of all grammars. So long as orthography, etymology, syntax, and prosody were considered the four divisions of grammar, so long as it was thought of as an art, a whole to be built up "mosaic-like out of paradigms and syntax rules";¹⁸ so long as schoolmasters in general remained woefully ignorant and were competent only "to hear" recitations, verbatim, about matters they little understood,¹⁹ just so long this procedure, tedious and slow, from part to part, was fastened

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹¹ This is in exact accord with the educational theory of Herbart: "In the case of all essential elementary information—knowledge of grammar, arithmetic, and geometry—it will be found expedient to begin with the simplest elements long before any practical application is made." Herbart, *Outlines*, 129.

¹² Brightland, preface, 7th page (pages unnumbered in text).

¹³ Greenwood, preface, 2.

¹⁴ *British*, preface, XIV.

¹⁵ Fisher, preface, IX.

¹⁶ Sewell, preface, VI.

¹⁷ Brown, preface, VI.

¹⁸ W. D. Widgery, quoted by Watson, *Gram. Sch.*, 285.

¹⁹ See Resolutions of Germantown School Committee, Chap. II, p. 28.

upon the schools. The evidence presented shows little or no progress from Lily (1510) to Brown (1823).

MEMORIZING RULES.

Of course, this fundamental principle—mastering each part in order—could give but one meaning for the term mastering; it was slavish memorizing, nothing more nor less.

Colet and Brinsley insist that rules are to be learned and repeatedly rehearsed until pupils can “say them without book.” This, says Brinsley, is one of the chief points aimed at.

To teach scholars to say without book all the usual necessary rules; to construe the Grammar rules; to give the meaning, use, and order of the rules; to shew the examples, and to apply them; which being well performed, will make all other learning easie and pleasant.²⁰

He insists that the master is to have some exercise of the memory daily²¹ and that—

in hearing parts, aske them first the *chiefe* question or questions of each rule in order; then make them every one say his rule or rules, and in all rules of construction, to answere you in what words the force of the example lyeth, both governour and governed.²²

Moreover, both Philoponus and Spoudeus agree that this perfect memorizing is the principal method of procedure. Spoudeus: “Oh, but this is a matter, that is most accounted of with us; to have them very perfect in saying all their Grammar without booke, even every rule.” Philoponus: “To this I answere you; that this indeede is one principall thing.”²³ This is to be accomplished as follows. Spoudeus: “I have onely used to cause my Schollers to learne it without booke, and a little to construe it . . . by oft saying Parts.”²⁴

Greenwood, though advanced somewhat, indicates also the memorizing method. He has a device which avoids the necessity of learning every word of the text. Passages most necessary to be learned at the first going over are marked by an asterisk or star (*). “By what is to be learned, and what passed by, the discretion of the teacher will better determine.”²⁵

That the year 1750 had shown little progress is indicated by Dilworth, who, speaking of learning to spell, holds against spelling by ear. “There can be no true Method of Spelling without Rule.”²⁶ The British Grammar advises that “it will redound to a Scholar’s Advantage to begin the Repetition of the Grammar as soon as he can read it.”²⁷ Lowth, too, agrees as to learning grammar.

²⁰ Brinsley, op. cit., 74.

²¹ Ibid., 51.

²² Ibid., 69.

²³ Ibid., 85.

²⁴ Ibid., 70.

²⁵ Greenwood, preface, 5.

²⁶ Dilworth, preface, VIII.

²⁷ British, preface, III.

The principal design of a Grammar of any Language is to teach us to express ourselves with propriety in that Language. The plain way of doing this is to lay down rules, and to illustrate them by examples.²⁸

And Brown, in 1823, again shows the close adherence to the method of centuries before:

The only successful method of teaching grammar is, to cause the principal definitions and rules to be committed thoroughly to memory, that they may ever afterwards be readily applied.²⁹

In 1767 Buchanan, in his "Regular English Syntax," says:

Let them first spell this exercise (some good English classic) off by giving the rules of spelling; next the various significations of the word; let them give account of the parts of speech one by one, applying the rule of syntax.³⁰

A commentator on the methods of studying grammar in 1810 thus describes a schoolroom scene:

We learned the first six lines (Young Ladies' Accidence) which contained the names of the ten "sorts of words" and recited them at least 20 times to our neighbors; but, when called to the master's desk to recite them, our minds became a perfect blank. We stood mute and trembling . . . and were condemned to stand on a box with our face to the wall, till we could recite the lesson. Of course, we hated English grammar from that day forward.³¹

The famous Asa Rand comments on methods of his boyhood about 1790:

In the period of my boyhood we had strange notions of the science of grammar. We did not dream of anything practical or applicable to the language we were using every day till we had "been through" the grammar several times and parsed several months. Why? Because we were presented at once with a complete set of definitions and rules which might perplex a Murray or Webster without any development of principles, any illustrations we could understand, any application of the words to objects which they represent. We supposed that the dogmas of our "gram books" were the inventions of learned men, curious contrivances to carry the words of a sentence through a certain operation which we called parsing, rather for the gratification of curiosity than for any practical benefit. The rule in grammar would parse the word, . . . as the rule in arithmetic would "do the sum" and "give the answer." And with such exploits we were satisfied. Great was our admiration for the inventive power of those great men, who had been the lights of the grammatical world.³²

Also one more witness as to the practice of memory work, after the Lancastrian system was in vogue:

In those days we studied grammar by committing a portion of a small book (Accidence) to memory and reciting it to the teacher. If he was engaged, the lesson was recited to one of the highest class. . . . The rule was that the whole book should be recited literally, three times, before the pupils were allowed to apply a word of it in parsing sentences, and as no explanation was ever made of

²⁸ Lowth, preface, X.

²⁹ Brown, VI.

³⁰ Quoted in Ed. Rev., XII, 491.

³¹ C. S. J. (1850), 74.

³² See Am. Ann. of Ed. and Ins. (1833), 162.

any principle the pupil was as well qualified as the teacher to hear the words repeated.³³

William Ward, a schoolmaster of 30 years' standing, author of "A Practical Grammar," gives a minute description of the method used in his school about 1780, the public grammar school at Beverley, in the county of York, England:

Our Way of using the Book is this: if a child has not learned any Thing of the Latin Declensions and Conjugations, we make him get the English Forms by heart; if otherwise, we make him read the English Forms several times over, till he remembers them in a good measure; then we hear him read the Descriptions of the several parts of speech; and after he has done so, and has some notion of the Meaning of each, we oblige him for some weeks to read three or four Sentences twice or thrice a Day, in an easy English Book, and to tell the Part of Speech to which each word belongs. When the Child is pretty ready at distinguishing the Parts of Speech, we make him get by heart the Rules of Concord in Verse, and teach him how to apply them, by resolving the Sentences in some English Book. When this is done, we make him write out several of the other rules, and get them by heart, and shew him how to apply them likewise, by parsing, or resolving what he reads by these Rules. And thus by Degrees, children become Masters of all the material Parts of the Book without much Difficulty.³⁴

The educational literature of America concerning this period (1750-1823) is filled with evidence that memorizing methods predominated practice. Wickersham quotes a master of 1730 who said: "I find no way that goes beyond that of repeating, both in spelling, reading, writing, and cyphering."³⁵ A school boy of 1765 records that "at six . . . I learned the English grammar in Dilworth by heart."³⁶ In 1780 Principal Pearson, of Phillips Andover, testifies that "a class of thirty repeats a page and a half of Latin Grammar; then follows the Accidence Tribe, who repeat two, three, four, five, and ten pages each."³⁷ A Princeton college youth of 1799 wrote his brother, "committed to memory verbatim 50 pages of English Grammar."³⁸ Before the Revolution what little grammar was taught in Boston was confined almost entirely to committing and reciting rules.³⁹

W. B. Fowle, a prominent schoolman of Boston, says of the schools of 1795: "Pupils at our school were required to learn Bingham's Young Ladies' Accidence by heart three times. . . . We were two or three years in grammar."⁴⁰ Murray, author of the grammar most widely used, announced that in later editions he had been careful to rephrase his definitions smoothly, that they might be memorized and

³³ C. S. J. (1850), 337.

³⁴ Ward, *English Grammar*, preface, X.

³⁵ Wickersham, *op. cit.*, 214.

³⁶ C. S. J. (1850), 3.

³⁷ Quoted, Brown, *Mid. Sch.*, 262.

³⁸ Snopceance quoted in full, Snow, *Col. Cur.*, 116.

³⁹ Herman Humphrey, *Am. J. of Ed.*, XIII, 127.

⁴⁰ C. S. J. (1850), 5.

retained more easily.⁴¹ The minutes of the trustees of Oyster Bay Academy, New York, prescribe the memorizing method as follows: "(1) The Monitor, to be read daily as the last lesson; (2) Webster's Grammar, to be read or repeated from memory; (3) The Testament or Bible, to be read . . ." ⁴²

The evidence seems to indicate that the slavish memorization of rules, centuries old in schoolroom practice, had made but little progress from the time of Lily to Gould Brown. It was carried with all its terrors directly into the study of English grammar.⁴³

DEVICES TO AID IN MEMORIZING.

As complete memorization was the order of the day it is not surprising to find teachers endeavoring to find devices to aid the pupils in this arduous task. So far we have found records of five distinct devices tending to accomplish this purpose.

The first is constant repetition. Colet insists on daily defining rules; ⁴⁴ Brinsley strongly urges repetitions.⁴⁵ Teachers of the eighteenth century continued the practice of strengthening memory by constant repetition. The British Grammar urges masters to have their pupils repeat the entire grammar in portions once a month,⁴⁶ and Sewell especially requires of his pupils frequent repetitions of paradigms.⁴⁷

The second device is rhyming. We have already referred to Brinsley's plan of having pupils read the rules in meter. Rules of politeness in verse were old in Latin and were common in English; for

⁴¹ Murray, 12.

⁴² Fitzpatrick, Ed. Views and Inf. of D. Clinton, 22.

⁴³ An interesting proof of memorization is found in the copy of Alger's Murray, used by the writer, the stereotyped edition of 1825. The book belonged to one George A. Severins; his signature is dated Roxbury, December, 1828. Evidently his teacher had not been satisfied with Murray's definition of grammar and had dictated the following substitute: "Grammar teaches the arrangement of words according to the idiom or dialect of any particular people, and that excellency of pronunciation which enables us to speak and write a language agreeable to reason and correct usages." This is an unusually good definition for 1828 and indicates that this teacher was moving toward the modern conception of the science. But young Severins has written this definition out in full four times on the fly leaves and the blank pages at the end of the book, evidently making sure that he is letter-perfect.

Samuel G. Goodrich, telling of his boyhood school days in Ridgefield, Conn., about 1785, says: "The grammar was a clever book. . . . Neither Master Stebbins nor his scholars ever fathomed its depths. They floundered about in it, as if in a quagmire, and after some time came out of it pretty nearly as they went in, though perhaps a little obfuscated by the dim and dusty atmosphere of those labyrinths." *Am. J. of Ed.*, XIII, 139.

⁴⁴ Lily, preface, 3.

⁴⁵ "No evening is to be passed without some little exercise against the morning." Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 164. "To imprint it by repetition the next morning, together with their evening exercises." *Ibid.*, 152. A fuller explanation is given by Brinsley of insuring ease in remembering rules: Make the scholars learn them perfectly; give frequent repetition; instill continual care for parts; examine them daily; when parsing, turn every hard rule to use; in higher forms give repetition less often. *Ibid.*, 85. Brinsley also mentions two subdevices. He would have the pupils mark their books, copying from the teacher's book, to assist memory (*ibid.*, 141) and would have them "read the rules over in a kind of singing voice after the manner of running of the verse." *Ibid.*, 73.

⁴⁶ British, preface, III.

⁴⁷ Sewell, preface, VIII.

example, in "The Schoole of Vertue,"⁴⁸ Brinsley, speaking of verse, says: "To reade them over in a kinde of singing voice after the running of the verse. . . ."⁴⁹ Only two of the grammars here intensively studied adopt the method of rhyming for rules—Brightland's and Ward's. The former asserts that he has "put all the Rules into as smooth and sonorous Verse as the Nature of the Subject wou'd bear . . . to give them the greater Light." He adds an explanation in prose following the Jesuit Alvarus in his Latin grammar "which is used in all the Schools of Europe, except England." Brightland maintains that "verse is more easily learnt; that Rhimes help, one end recalling the other." These lessen the burden to memory.⁵⁰ In Ward's Grammar rules are put in verses that rhyme, with a repetition in prose of what each rule contains. For the 35 rules of syntax Ward has 170 verses.

The third device to assist memory is the use of examples. Brinsley goes so far as to insist that in recitations the example is to be given with "his" rule.⁵¹ He further makes them give examples:

Apply examples to rules; learn every rule perfectly as they go forward; read them over their rule leisurely and distinctly; construe the rules and apply examples for them; learn all the rules until the pupil can "beate it out of himselfe."⁵²

This is a common practice in all the more elaborate grammars. Lowth especially makes point of illustrative examples accompanying each rule.⁵³

The fourth device was selection of parts. The first textbook maker who desired to relieve memory by proper selection of parts to be memorized was Greenwood. In his grammar he distinguished the more important parts by printing them in larger type. Fisher did not desire his pupils to be troubled with learning the exceptions to rules.⁵⁴ Herein we find further evidence that it had been the practice to require the learning by heart of rules, examples, and exceptions. Murray uses the same device as Greenwood, commenting on the value of selections as follows:

The more important rules, definitions, and observations, and which are therefore the most proper to be committed to memory, are printed in larger type; whilst rules and remarks that are of less importance, that extend or diversify the general idea, or that serve as explanations, are contained in the small letter.⁵⁵

The fifth device is very old, namely, the question and answer. Hazlitt says that he has small volumes on cookery and gardening of the Middle Ages which are thrown into the interlocutory form, the most apt to impress names on the minds of the pupils.⁵⁶ He also gives a

⁴⁸ Eggleston, op. cit., 214.

⁴⁹ Brinsley, op. cit., 73.

⁵⁰ Brightland, preface, VI.

⁵¹ Brinsley, op. cit., 82.

⁵² Ibid., 70-1.

⁵³ Lowth, preface, X.

⁵⁴ Fisher, preface, X.

⁵⁵ Murray, preface, 1.

⁵⁶ Hazlitt, Sch. Books and Sch. Masters, 28.

series of rules and exercises in the form of question and answer in a textbook of 1509.⁵⁷ Brinsley advocates this method, but has Philoponus complain concerning books of this character—that he has been compelled to leave off entirely; that none are suitable; therefore he has made one for himself “having all the Questions and Answers arising most directly out of the words of the Rules.”⁵⁸

Of the 12 grammars here studied five retain the question-and-answer method—Greenwood’s, Dilworth’s, Fisher’s, the British, and Priestley’s. About the end of the eighteenth century the device seems to have gone largely out of vogue. Priestley says: “I have retained the method of question and answer . . . because I am still persuaded it is both the most convenient for the master and the most intelligible to the scholar.”⁵⁹ However, the question-and-answer method never had wide vogue in American grammatical textbooks; none of the important grammars which followed Murray seems to have used it. None of the Murray texts, nor Bingham’s, nor Brown’s, make use of it. About the only signs of advance made by American grammarians before 1800 are, first, the discarding of the question and answer, and, second, the simplification of the elaborate texts into the form of Bingham’s *Young Ladies’ Accidence*, Alexander’s *Grammar*, and Webster’s *Rudiments*.

SIMPLIFYING TERMS.

Quite in line with the devices enumerated above is the contention, constantly repeated by the various text-writers, that they are simplifying terms for the ease of the pupils. Brightland and his follower, Fisher, have, indeed, some right to make this contention. They discarded the four Latin main divisions—orthography, etymology, syntax, and prosody—and substituted letters, words, and sentences instead. Moreover, they call nouns, names; pronouns, pronames; adjectives, qualities; verbs, actions. They attempt to give definitions and explanations simply. Brightland waxes quite indignant. He claims “glorious improvements,” complains against Greenwood and others for not following him in his previous edition.⁶⁰ “Little Progress they made in a Discovery that had so fairly been laid before them by Dr. Wallis and Ourselves: For Custom has so strong a Force on the Mind, that it passes with the bulk of Mankind for Reason and Sacred Truth.”⁶¹ Murray insists that he phrases his rules exactly and comprehensively; also that they may readily be committed to memory and easily retained.⁶² For this purpose he has selected terms

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 90.

⁵⁸ Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 87.

⁵⁹ Priestley, *preface*, VI.

⁶⁰ Brightland’s first edition was 1706, Greenwood’s 1711.

⁶¹ Brightland, *preface*, I.

⁶² Murray, *preface*, 4.

that are "smooth and voluble; has proportioned the members of one sentence to another; has avoided protracted periods and given harmony to the expression of the whole."⁶³

Priestley's argument for simplicity is convincing:

I have also been so far from departing from the simplicity of the plan of that short grammar (his first edition) that I have made it in some respects, still more simple; and I think, on that account, more suitable to the genius of the English language. I own I am surprised to see so much of the distribution, and technical terms of the Latin grammar, retained in the grammar of our tongue; where they are exceedingly awkward, and absolutely superfluous; being such as could not possibly have entered into the head of any man, who had not been previously acquainted with Latin. Indeed this absurdity has, in some measure, gone out of fashion with us; but still so much of it is retained, in all the grammars I have seen, as greatly injures the uniformity of the whole; and the very same reason that has induced several grammarians to go so far as they have done, should have induced them to have gone farther. A little reflection may, I think, suffice to convince any person, that we have no more business with a future tense in our language, than we have for the whole system of Latin moods and tenses; because we have no modification of our verbs to correspond to it; and if we had never heard of a future tense in some other language, we should no more have given a particular name to the combination of the verb with the auxiliary shall or will, than to those that are made with the auxiliaries do, have, can, must, or any other.

It seems wrong to confound the account of inflections either with the grammatical uses of the combinations of words, of the order in which they are placed, or of the words which express relations and which are equivalent to inflections in other languages. I can not help flattering myself that future grammarians will owe me some obligations for introducing this uniform simplicity, so well suited to the genius of our languages, into the English grammar.

Priestley bases his revolt against the Latin grammar upon another argument, which was decidedly new in his day, contending that the "only just standard of any language" is the custom and modes of speaking it. He revolts against leaning too much on analogies in language. He says:

I think it is evident that all other grammarians have leaned too much to the analogies of that language (Latin) contrary to our modes of speaking. . . . It must be allowed that the custom of speaking is the original and only just standard of any language. We see, in all grammars, that this is sufficient to establish a rule, even contrary to the strongest analogies of the language with itself. Must not custom, therefore, be allowed to have some weight in favor of those forms of speech to which our best writers and speakers seem evidently prone?⁶⁴

EXAMPLE AND ILLUSTRATION.

One final method, frequently urged by good teachers, was the setting of a good example and the careful explanation by the teacher of doubtful points. Colet urges that masters must set a good

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Priestley, preface, VII-IX.

example.⁶⁵ Brinsley has the master read and explain difficult parts of the lesson; ⁶⁶ has the pupils read parts after the master has read; ⁶⁷ shows how the lecture method arose by lack of books; ⁶⁸ and has them parse in imitation of the master.⁶⁹ Greenwood gives as the reason why youth have found grammar "irksome, obscure, and difficult," "partly through the Want of having every Thing explained and cleared up to their Understanding as they go along."⁷⁰ The author of the *British Grammar* explains what was doubtless the practice of the better masters about 1750; he indicates a distinct advance in method. In this respect the author is shown as an innovator.

The Method I take, and I find it so far effectual to the End proposed, is, having got what I judged to be the best Book of Letters, I make several young Gentlemen stand up and read a Letter gracefully; after which I read it to them myself, making observations on the Sentiment and the Style, and asking their Opinions with Respect to both.⁷¹

This admirable practice was found only in the better schoolrooms. We shall see the movement for "oral explanation" as a part of the educational revival led by Horace Mann.⁷²

4. PARSING.

We come now to the other two of the great triumvirate of methods carried over from the Latin to the English grammar—parsing and false syntax. Brinsley complains that "there is so much time spent in examining everything" (parsing); nevertheless, he insists that his pupils parse as they construe.

Ask the child what word he must begin to parse (Principal word).⁷³ . . . In the several forms and Authors to construe truly, and in propriety of words and sense, to parse of themselves and to give a right reason of every word why it must be so, and not otherwise. . . . Parse over every word; teach what part of speech, how to decline it. give a true reason for every word, why it must be so.⁷⁴

Brinsley's elaborate method of procedure is as follows: The scholar is to read the sentence before he construes; mark all the points (punctuation) in it; mark words beginning with great letters; understand the matter; mark the vocative case; seek out the principal verb; give every clause his right verb; supply wanting words; give every word his "proper signification"; join the substantive and adjective; mark if the sentence have an interrogation point.⁷⁵

⁶⁵ Lily, *op. cit.*, 2.

⁶⁶ Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 74.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 99.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 53.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 95. This is a careful examination of the nature of the sentence which does not come into the practice of American schools until well down into the nineteenth century. Green's *Analysis* of 1848 did much to throw the emphasis previously given to dry formalism in grammar to the analysis of sentences. See Chap. VII.

⁷¹ Greenwood, *preface*, II.

⁷² *British*, *preface*, XXVIII.

⁷³ See Chap. VI, p. 146.

⁷⁴ Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 127.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 125.

An example of "praxis" or "grammatical resolution," the system of torture called parsing, which lasted well toward the end of the nineteenth century, may be taken from Lindley Murray's books:

The sentence:

And he came into all the country about Jordan preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. The Resolution: And, a Conjunction Copulative: he, a Pronoun, third Person Singular, Masculine Gender, Nominative Case, standing for John: came, as before: into, a Preposition: all, an Adjective: the Country, a Substantive: about, a Preposition; Jordan, a Proper Name; preaching, the Present Participle of the verb Active to preach joined like an adjective to the Pronoun he: the baptism, a Substantive in the Objective Case following the Active verb Preaching, and governed by it, etc.⁷⁶

It requires but a glance at the contents of the grammars which began instruction of the subject in America to see how this formalism of parsing reigned supreme. The British Grammar believes in parsing every word;⁷⁷ Murray advertises a new system of parsing.⁷⁸ Gould Brown was perhaps the most ardent champion of parsing in America. He explains the philosophy of the exercise in this:

[It is] neither wholly extemporaneous, nor wholly by rote; it has more dignity than a school boy's conversation, and more ease than a formal recitation. The exercise in parsing commences immediately after the first lesson of etymology, and is carried on progressively until it embraces all the doctrines that are applicable to it. . . . It requires just enough of thought to keep the mind attentive to what the lips are uttering; while it advances by such easy graduations and constant repetitions as to leave the pupil utterly without excuse, if he does not know what to say.⁷⁹

Brown further insists that in the entire range of school exercises, while there is none of greater importance than parsing, yet, perhaps, there is none which is, in general, more defectively conducted. Brown's grammars are the culmination of the series of parsing grammars; in the last chapter we have seen them in use quite extensively in the academies of New York as late as 1870.⁸⁰ Brown champions parsing on one ground which has an entirely modern ring. He wishes to have the child given something to do as well as something to learn.⁸¹

Elaborate formulas of procedure reduce all to a system, so that by rote correcting and parsing the whole process may be made easy. This makes the exercise free from all embarrassment, which is conducive to proficiency in language. Says this master of parsing:

The pupil who can not perform these exercises both accurately and fluently . . . has no right to expect from anybody a patient hearing. A slow and faltering rehearsal . . . is as foreign from parsing or correcting as it is from elegance of diction. Divide and conquer is the rule here, as in many cases. Begin with what is simple; practice it until it becomes familiar and then proceed. No child ever learned to speak by any other process. Hard things become easy by use, and skill is gained little by little.⁸²

⁷⁶ Murray, 47.

⁷⁷ British, preface, VI.

⁷⁸ Murray, preface, 6.

⁷⁹ Brown, preface, VI.

⁸⁰ See Chap. IV.

⁸¹ Brown, preface, V.

⁸² Brown, Gram of Gram., preface, V.

This in a nutshell is the philosophy of grammar from Lily down to almost 1900. Grammar is the art of speaking and writing the English language; the child learns to speak by getting first the elements. A constant process of dividing wholes into parts, even to the letters as a starting point, is the natural and logical method for teachers who will start their pupils rightly. As written and spoken language is accomplished by the putting together of parts, so the taking of them apart is the initial step of the learning process. Parsing and correcting involve this extremely analytical philosophy. Therefore they are the best methods of learning. Moreover, parsing is looked upon as a—

critical exercise in the utterance as well as of evidence of previous study. . . . It is an exercise for all the powers of the mind, except the inventive faculty. Perception, judgment, reasoning, memory, and method are indispensable. . . . Nothing is to be guessed at, or devised, or uttered at random.⁸³

Here we have the second step in the logical process of the parsing enthusiasts. The first rests on the natural analytical process as the basis of learning the parts of complicated wholes. The second is the logical result of the old faculty psychology. The powers of the mind, in order to be trained in the extremest sense of formal discipline, are exercised by the analytical procedure of tearing wholes into parts. This applies to all of the powers of the mind except invention, which is supposed to be a constructive, not an analytical, process. The reduction of parsing to strict models makes certain the elimination of invention on the part of the pupil. There is little doubt that the statement of Gould Brown, cited above, is the essence of the pedagogical thinking which regarded grammar as "the disciplinary study par excellence." It is a result in large part of the reign of faculty psychology and formal discipline.

5. FALSE SYNTAX.

The practices of the Latin and the rote periods added another bane to schoolboy life, namely, the correction of false syntax. This appears to have been generally introduced about the middle of the eighteenth century, the first to use it being Fisher and the author of the *British Grammar*. These writers are followed by all the others in our series, each seeming to be more convinced of the pedagogical value of the exercise than any of his predecessors. The author of the *British Grammar* asserts that his book is "differently planned,"⁸⁴ because it offers "promiscuous exercises in false syntax, both in verse and in prose."⁸⁵ He also urges the master to deceive his pupils by reading wrongly.⁸⁶ Fisher also urges the master to "read falsely,"⁸⁷

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *British*, preface, I.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, III.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, XV.

⁸⁷ *Fisher*, preface, XII.

to keep the pupils alert, and defends himself for putting his exercises in false syntax in a separate part of his book instead of scattering them "promiscuously" throughout the text.⁸⁸

Lowth believes in teaching "what is right, by showing what is wrong." He thinks there is no English grammar which sufficiently performs this duty, though it may prove "the more useful and effectual method of instruction."⁸⁹ Two examples of Lowth's false syntax follow:

Rule: The article, a, can only be joined to Substantives in the Singular number. A good character should not be rested in as an end, but employed as a means of doing still further good. (Atterbury's Sermons.) Ought it not be a mean? I have read an author of this taste, that compares a ragged coin to a tattered colours. (Addison on Medals.)⁹⁰

The foregoing amusing example of extreme emphasis put upon a perfectly trivial point is especially ludicrous, because Lowth is wrong. Both the sentences from Atterbury and Addison are correct; in the first, means is a singular noun; in the second "colours," meaning flag, is also singular.

The other example has to do with choose, chose, chosen:

Thus having chosed each other. . . . (Clarendon, Hist., Vol. III, p. 797, 8vo.) Improperly.⁹¹

Lowth complains that in 200 years English had made "no advances in grammatical accuracy." He quotes Swift "On the imperfect State of our Language"—that "in many cases it offended against every part of Grammar." He asserts that in his day "Grammar is very much neglected," and fills the bottom of nearly every page with footnotes of what he terms proof "that our best authors have committed gross mistakes for want of due knowledge of English Grammar." Lowth assures us that these examples "are such as occurred in reading, without any very curious or methodical examination." It is a curious speculation, then, as to why Lowth advocates so vigorously the teaching "of what is right by showing what is wrong." It may be that he was eager to make use of the copious notes which he had doubtless been accumulating in years of reading.⁹² He is impartial in his selection of false grammar, citing Hobbs, the Bible, the Liturgy, Pope, Shakespeare, Prior, Hooker, Dryden, and Addison.⁹³

⁸⁸ Ibid., X.

⁸⁹ Lowth, preface, X.

⁹⁰ Lowth, op. cit., 19.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid., preface, I-X.

⁹³ "You was . . . is an enormous Solecism; and yet authors of the front rank have inadvertently fallen into it. 'Knowing that you was my old master's friend.' Addison, Spectator, No. 517. 'Would to God you was within her reach.' Lord Bolingbroke to Swift, letter 46, etc." In these footnotes Lowth's practice is somewhat of a deviation from correcting false syntax. Op. cit., 35.

Priestley approves of Lowth's methods, as follows:

An appendix would have been made of examples of bad English; for they are really useful; but they make so uncouth an appearance in print. And it can be no manner of trouble to any teacher to supply the worst of them, by a false reading of a good author, and requiring his pupils to point out, and rectify his mistakes. . . .⁹⁴ I think there will be an advantage in my having collected examples from modern writings, rather than those from Swift, Addison, and others, who wrote about half a century ago, in what is called the classical period of our tongue. By this means we see what is the real character and turn of the language at present; and by comparing it with the writings of preceding authors, we may better perceive which way it is tending, and what extreme we should most carefully guard against.⁹⁵

William Ward also commends Lowth's method:

Very lately we have been favored with one (grammar) by the learned Dr. Lowth. . . . This Piece is excellent on account of his notes, in which are shewn the grammatic inaccuracies that have escaped the pens of our most distinguished Writers. This way of distinction, by showing what is wrong in English in order to teach us to avoid it, is necessary, because the pupils will themselves offend against every rule: there will be plenty of opportunity to shew them what is wrong.⁹⁶

Again, we have the testimony of that high priest of parsing and false syntax, Gould Brown: "Scarcely less useful . . . is the practice of correcting false syntax orally, by regular and logical form of argument."⁹⁷ Murray also believes in the practice, as will be seen from the following quotation:

From the sentiment generally admitted, that a proper selection of faulty composition is more instructive to the young grammarian, than any rules or examples of propriety that can be given, the compiler has been induced to pay particular attention to this part of the subject; and though the instances of false grammar, under the rules of Syntax are numerous, it is hoped they will not be found too many, when their variety and usefulness are considered.⁹⁸

The above examples are to be corrected orally.

Fisher thinks that he is the first to introduce English exercises in false syntax. He says that the practice was considered expedient in Latin and mentions two Latin texts of his day which have the device. He says: "I never observed this method recommended or prescribed by others."⁹⁹ It will be remembered that Fisher antedates Lowth, the British Grammar, and Priestley. The British Grammar improves on Fisher, the author of that book thinks, by scattering false syntax throughout the text and putting the errors in italics, not "to distract the learner too much."¹

6. SUBORDINATE METHODS.

There can be no doubt that the grammars which determined the earliest instruction in the subject in America put a premium upon the

⁹⁴ Priestley, preface, XXII.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, XI.

⁹⁷ Brown, preface, 4.

⁹⁶ Murray, preface 3.

⁹⁸ Ward, *op. cit.*, preface, IX.

⁹⁹ Fisher, preface, XXI.

¹ British, preface, IV.

three major methods of teaching we have just been considering, viz: Memorization of rules, parsing, and correcting false syntax. All three, except possibly the last, are direct inheritances from the classrooms of Latin grammar, and if we can believe Fisher, as cited above, the latter was inherited also. We have now to consider certain minor methods. It must be borne in mind that grammar included in 1800 far more than it does to-day. It was instruction in the use of the mother tongue, embracing many of the purposes served to-day by composition, rhetoric, writing, reading, euphonics, declamation, and the rest.

There is constant evidence as to the use of these additional functions of grammatical instruction. We may cite, for example, emphasis upon the parallel study of reading from authors in the mother tongue. This was to be the means of becoming familiar with good writers for the sake of observing good grammatical construction, as well as of getting lessons in morality, honesty, and goodness. Many of the grammars have appendices with fables, prayers, catechisms, and the like, which were prescribed as a regular part of the study called grammar. It is by no means improbable that in these parallel readings we have the origin of school practices which have to-day eventuated in the study of the English classics. Franklin, however, seems to have had in mind a larger purpose in his proposals, approaching in 1750 somewhat nearer our modern conception; that is, the English classics for their content as well as for literary excellence.²

Colet recommends the use of "prettie bookes" with "lessons of godlinesse and honestie." In the edition of 1627 he enjoins teachers to "be to them your own selves also speaking with them the pure Latin very present, and leave the rules."³

Dilworth feels that this reading will help make palatable what he calls "the pills of memorization."⁴ The author of the *British Grammar* gives his pupils a taste of the poets;⁵ Fisher has the master or one of the scholars read to pupils from the best authors.⁶ Ward uses the *Spectator* as a suitable classic and selects from easy books "examples for resolving,"⁷ while Priestley collects examples from

² See Chap. III, p. 44.

³ "For reading of good books, diligent information of taught masters, studious advertisement and taking heed of learners, hearing eloquent men speak, and finally busy imitation with tongue and pen, more availeth shortly to get the true eloquent speech, than all the traditions, rules and precepts of masters." Lily, *op. cit.*, 3.

⁴ "As Practice, in all Arts and Sciences, is the great Medium of Instruction between Master and Scholar, I would advise all Teachers, when they find their Learners relish the Rules of this Part (grammar) to enjoin them at the same time to read the best English Authors, as the *Spectator*, *Tatler*, *Guardian*, etc. . . . and banish from their eyes such *Grubstreet Papers*, *idle Pamphlets*, *lewd Plays*, *filthy Songs*, and *unseemly Jests* which . . . debauch the Principles." Dilworth, *preface*, VIII-IX.

⁵ *British*, *preface*, XXII.

⁶ Fisher, *preface*, X.

⁷ Ward, *preface*, X.

the best authors and indicates that he, too, believes in the device.⁸ Later authors seem largely to have given up recommending the practice, perhaps because formal grammar is to an extent becoming more confined in its scope.

Four other methods, or classroom devices, appear quite frequently: Emulation, preferments, copying, and dictation.

Brinsley is the champion of the first of these. He desires all to have their adversaries and to be so matched and placed that all may "be done by strift."⁹ Sewell has his pupils certify inaccuracies in each other's expressions, constantly correcting each other.¹⁰ Brown passes the errors of one pupil on to the next.¹¹ Here we seem to find indication of the practice "going to the head of the line," so often described by our fathers. Fisher was an especially ardent advocate of emulation.¹²

Similar in purpose, if not quite identical in practice, is the elaborate system of preferments described by Brinsley. This has continued in all teaching up to the present day. Brinsley describes his plans for encouragement in this wise: Promotions to higher classes; giving higher places to those who do better; commending everything well done; giving rewards to victors in disputation and applause to the victors; and comparing exercises in writing books.¹³ Copying might have been listed as a device for aiding memory. However, it seems to have been considered a means of stimulating interest, a sad commentary indeed upon the dry-as-dust processes which it could be thought to relieve. Typical advice is found in Fisher,¹⁴ in Dilworth,¹⁵ and in the British Grammar,¹⁶ urging masters to have pupils copy exercises in both prose and verse for their "evening copy."

Dictation is closely akin to copying and is even more frequent in the recommendations of the grammarians. Brinsley strongly recom-

⁸ Priestley, preface, XXIII.

⁹ Brinsley, op. cit., 50.

¹⁰ Sewell, preface, VII, VIII.

¹¹ "When a boy notes an impropriety in his schoolmate's Expression, he writes down the Expression just as it was uttered; then he adduces the Rule of Grammar from which the Expression deviates, and underneath he inserts the Expression corrected. For this Feat, he receives a Clap of Applause and takes his Place Superior to the Boy whose Expression he corrected."

The teacher should "carefully superintend . . . rehearsals; give the word to the next, when any one errs, and order the exercise in such a manner that either his own voice, or the example of the best scholars, may gradually correct the ill habits of the awkward, till all learn to recite with clearness, understanding well what they say, and make it intelligible to others."

¹² "After they are masters of letters, syllables, and words they will be able to remember Rules. . . . After reading they are to learn the stops and marks. . . . Employ time in writing Words down, whilst the Master, or one of the Scholars, reads a Paragraph from the Spectator . . . and let all that are appointed to write, copy from his Reading, then to create an Emulation, compare the Pieces and place the Scholars according to the Defect of their Performances." Preface, IX-X.

¹³ Brinsley, op. cit., 280 et seq.

¹⁴ Fisher, preface, X.

¹⁵ Dilworth, preface, IX.

¹⁶ British, preface, IV.

mended the practice.¹⁷ Fisher also¹⁸ would have pupils keep alphabetical lists in pocketbooks, the use of which he constantly urges. The British Grammar is likewise in favor of the device.¹⁹ Sewell has pupils take dictation on their slates and then the teacher corrects it.²⁰ Dilworth also recommends the exercise.²¹

There remains to be noted the use of copy books, writing exercises, and oral work. Brinsley recommends "note books of daily use with inke," and requires each pupil to possess "a little paper booke to note all new and hard words in."²² Fisher gives extended directions for the use of copy books.²³

The British Grammar, elaborating the discussion of dictation, gives it the nature of a writing exercise. When a master dictates he may mix the rules, making the exercise as promiscuous as he chooses. Let a tyro "first copy the several Exercises, and then write them a second time from Dictation," then correct it and copy it again. The author advances this as a reason for making his book so short. He also commends the writing of an anonymous letter with the purpose that "One Exercise should be daily to write a Page of English, and after that to examine every word by the Grammar Rules; and in every Sentence they have composed, to oblige them to give an Account of the English Syntax and Construction."²⁴

Sewell requires pupils to write on their slates, and has in the appendix a chapter for practice in letter writing.²⁵ Ward has the study of grammar accompanied by the composition of short letters.²⁶ Brown gives four chapters of exercises adapted to the four parts of the subject, which are to be written out by the learner. "The greatest peculiarity of the method is that it requires the pupil to speak or write a great deal, and the teacher very little."²⁷

Fisher's book and the British Grammar are particularly emphatic in recommending oral work, the former making pupils pronounce

¹⁷ Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 46 and 124.

¹⁸ Fisher, *preface*, VI.

¹⁹ British, *preface*, XIII.

²⁰ Sewell, *preface*, VII.

²¹ Dilworth, *preface*, VI.

²² Brinsley, *op. cit.*, 46 and 124.

²³ "Let the Master write down all their mis-spelt words right in their Writing-Books, to be got by Heart before they leave them and withal, make each Scholar write his own into an Alphabetical Pocket-book kept for that Purpose." He also recommends that the master write misspelled words into the pupils' writing books. Perhaps we have in these books the germ of composition work which first came about 1750. Fisher, *preface*, XI.

²⁴ British, IV, VI, XIX

²⁵ "Now and then as a General Exercise, I make my pupils write down on their Slates a select sentence, as I dictate to them; each one keeps his Performance close to himself. On Examination those whose Performances appear correct, are ranked in a Superior Place, and to prove that they have written correctly, by Dint of Judgment, and not as the Effect of Chance, I make them rectify the Error of Inferior Boys, by quoting the Rule of Grammar, from which each Error is a Deviation." Sewell, *preface*, VII. The appendix for letter writing is on page 163 of Sewell's Grammar.

²⁶ Ward, *preface*, X.

²⁷ Brown, *preface*, VI.

orally in prosody,²⁸ the latter requiring them to speak every day their unwritten thoughts.²⁹

7. METHODS USED BY HUGHES AND BYERLEY.

So far the endeavor has been to show how the methods of teaching grammar in the Latin and rote periods were, with but slight variation, the methods used in instruction in Latin grammar. This chapter may fittingly close with a description of methods used in two prominent English grammar schools in New York in 1769 and 1773, respectively. Fortunately, Hugh Hughes and Thomas Byerley have left careful explanation of their methods. The description of these masters is also strong evidence that English grammar was coming to occupy in a few American schools a position very closely resembling that held by Latin grammar in classical schools, indeed, that identical methods were employed in the teaching of both.

HUGHES.

In 1771 Hughes modified his program, at least he so claims, to lay greater stress upon English. His advertisement of that year reads: "Orthoepy, or Just Pronunciation, which the Pupil is taught, not by Precept alone: but by Occular Example . . . with proper Stops. Emphasis, Cadence, Quantity, and a Delivery, varied and governed by sense."³²

In 1771 Hughes had changed his program into that of a thorough-going English grammar school. On December 30 he announces: "The Subscriber proposes, if encouraged, to teach the English Language Grammatically." It is to be noted here that the method proposed is probably unfamiliar, or at least not common, in New York and that "if encouraged" indicates the dependence of private-school men upon the desires of patrons, of which concerning his new proposal he is somewhat in doubt. Hughes thus describes his methods:

When the pupil can read fluently and write a Legible Hand he shall be taught the English Accidence,³³ or the Properties of the Parts of Speech, as divided and explained by the latest and most eminent English Grammarians; that is Dr. Lowth, Dr. Priestley, and others.

After which he will be taught to parse disjunctively, then modally, and instructed in the Rules of English Syntax: and, when he is sufficiently skilled in them, to account for the Construction of Sentences in General, he will receive Lessons of False Spelling and Irregular Concord, etc., taken from some classic Authors, but rendered ungrammatical for the Purpose of trying his Judgment. When he has reduced these as near the Original as his Knowledge of Grammar will permit, he will be shown all such irregularities as may have escaped his Notice, either in the Orthographical or Syntactical Part.

²⁸ Fisher, preface, XI.

²⁹ British, preface, XXVIII.

³² N. Y. G. and W. P. B., Dec. 30, 1771.

³³ It is to be noted that the study of English grammar begins exactly where that of Latin grammar began.

These Lessons will also be selected from different Authors in various Subjects; and frequently, from the Works of those who are the most Celebrated, for the Elegance of their Epistolary Writings; as this Kind of Composition is acknowledged to be as difficult as any, and of greater Utility. The erroneous Part in every Lesson will likewise be modified. At one time it will consist of false Spelling alone; . . . at another of false Concord; . . . the next perhaps will consist of both; . . . the fourth may not be composed of either of them, but may contain some Inaccuracies or Vulgarisms, etc.; the fifth may retain all the foregoing Inproprieties, and the last, none of them, of which the pupil need not be appraised, for Reasons, that are too evident to require a Recital. To the preceding exercises will succeed others on the Nature and Use of Transposition; . . . the Elipses of all the Parts of Speech, as used by the best Writers, together with the use of Synonymous Terms. . . .

A General Knowledge of all which, joined to Practice, will enable Youth to avoid the many orthographical Errors, Barbarisms, inelegant Repetitions, and manifest Solecisms, which they are otherwise liable to run into, and in Time, which render them Masters of an easy, Elegant Style, by which they will become capable of conveying their Sentiments with Clearness and Precision, in a concise and agreeable Manner, as well with Reputation to themselves as Delight to their Friends.

Lastly, tho' the Pointing of a Discourse requires Judgment and a more intimate Acquaintance with the Syntactical Order of Words and Sentences, than the Generality of Youth can be possessed of, to which may be added the unsettled State that Punctuation itself is really in; so that very few precise Rules can be given, without numerous Exceptions, which would rather embarrass the Pupils by continually searching of their Dictionaries, in quest of Primitives and their Derivatives, as well as the constituent Parts of Compound Terms; besides learning the Dependence that their Native Language has on itself; will also treasure up in their Memories a vast Stock of Words, from the purest Writers: and what is of infinitely more Value, their just Definitions; as every one of this Class will have Johnson's Dictionary in Octavo.³⁴

BYERLEY.

Byerley is the author of the second grammar written by an American and published in this country, "A Plain and Easy Introduction to English Grammar," 1773. In the same year we find him advertising an English grammar school in New York City, giving a detailed record of the methods of teaching used in his various classes.

Byerley, like Franklin and other American champions of the mother tongue, had been reading John Locke.³⁵ In the advertisement of his school, he sets forth the necessity of giving up the study of Latin for the purpose of learning English grammar, quoting Locke

³⁴ Advertisement in N. Y. G. and W. P. B., Dec. 30, 1771.

³⁵ Byerley, after quoting Locke and Lowth, continues: "Heretofore it was thought a competent knowledge of the English could not be acquired without some previous acquaintance with the Latin Tongue: which therefore became the only Vehicle of grammatical Instruction. This error arose from a too partial Fondness for that Language, in which formerly the Service of the Church, the Translation of the Bible, and most other Books were printed. . . . Men, however, too often sacrifice their Understandings at the shrine of Ancient Custom. Thus the Practice of sending Youths to learn English at a Latin

at length on the unwisdom of compelling a lad to learn "the Roman Language" when he is at the same time designed for a "trade."³⁶ There can be little doubt that the seeming practicability of English grammar and of the so-called English education in general—a contention first advanced by Locke—was the most powerful argument for the vernacular.

After thus setting forth his reasons Byerley sketches his plan for "An English Grammar School which will be opened the first of next month."³⁷ This title, like Hughes's, which was called "An English Grammar and General School, indicates that there were attempts to establish English schools on the same order as the secondary grammar schools heretofore known in the colonies.

In the lowest Class will be arranged the Children who have been but imperfectly taught to read; with whom the Utmost Care shall be taken to correct ill Habits in Reading; and to form a just Pronunciation.

In the next Class the Scholar shall be initiated in the grammatical Institutes; and these strongly fixed on the Mind by frequent Parsing of the most approved Lessons.

The third will introduce the scholar to an Acquaintance with the Syntax and Ellipsis; each of which shall be inculcated in a Course of reading such books as may engage the young Attention, and have a moral Tendency; as Æsop's Fables, The Moral Miscellaney, The British Plutarch, Gay's Fables, Beauties of History, or Pictures of Virtue and Vice.

In this Class the Scholar will be frequently exercised in the Declension of irregular and defective Verbs, and the Exercises of Parsing will be continued.

The fourth Class will be formed out of those Scholars who being most proficient in their grammatical Exercises are ready to be instructed in a proper and elegant Method of reading Prose.

The books used in this Course, will be chiefly History of the World, History of English, Introduction to Polite Learning, Seneca's Morals, Ancient History, History of America, Derbam's Physics, and Astro-Theology, Economy of Human Life.

In the fifth Class the scholar will be initiated in the Proprieties and Beauties of reading Poetry, exemplified in the Works of Thomson, Gray, Pope, and Milton.

The Scholars of the fourth and fifth Classes will be occasionally instructed in the Art of familiar Letter writing.

SUMMARY OF METHODS IN THE LATIN AND ROTE PERIODS.

What then may be concluded concerning the methods of the years 1750 to 1823 in America?

School continued, without any inquiries about the Propriety of it, till Mr. Locke ventured to censure the conduct of a Father who should waste his own Money and his Son's Time in Setting him to learn the Roman Language." . . .

Byerley was a disciple of Locke in matters of discipline also. At the end of his advertisement he gives "Rules," "on the Model of Mr. Locke, a New Mode of Reprehension for Irregularities and a loitering Study, will be adopted. The several Methods at present taken in most Schools . . . are oftener attended with bad than with good Consequences. It shall be my care to reason or shame them out of their Faults by affectionate Arguments with them; or in the Extremity, a public Disgrace among their Fellows."

³⁶ The title Hughes's English Grammar and General School appears in 1773 announcement. N. Y. G. and W. M., Nov. 8.

³⁷ Byerley advertisement in N. Y. G. and W. M., Aug. 23, 1773.

1. The textbooks in most general use were modeled strictly after the Latin, and their authors advised methods of instruction which had been used in teaching Latin grammar for 300 years.

2. The common conception of grammar—as the art of writing and speaking a language with correctness and propriety—was one which confused the nature of grammar with the laudable purpose of teaching it and obtained, with few exceptions, throughout the two periods.

3. Instruction proceeded without exception from the wrong unit—the word. This was the natural result of the seemingly logical process of beginning with the simplest elements and proceeding to the complex. In reading and in grammar, because of this procedure, the A-B-C method was destined to remain fixed until the revival led by Horace Mann. All the grammars began with the parts of speech.

4. There was but little connection between the parrotlike repetition of rules and any real understanding of them.³⁸

5. Relatively little effort in writing or speaking was made to apply the rules of grammar. William B. Fowle, the editor of *The Common School Journal*, writing of his own education about 1800, said:

We were educated at one of the best schools . . . but, although we studied English grammar seven years and received a silver medal for proficiency, we never wrote a sentence of English at school, and never did anything that had to do with writing or conversation.³⁹

The common procedure was in theory from rules to practice; but it was practice involved in the application of formidable exercises of syntax, etymology, and parsing and endless exercises in correcting false syntax. It is true that in dictation, writing exercises, and speaking we have seen, in embryonic form, the beginnings of our modern composition and literature; but these were strictly subordinated to the all-powerful trilogy of methods—memorization, parsing, and false syntax.

In short, from the viewpoint of the best modern practice, before 1823, English grammar was badly taught in every respect. The nature of the textbooks themselves is enough to warrant that conclusion; but when the evidence is added of the wretched incompetence of teachers⁴⁰ and the corroborating testimony of every man who was a student of grammar during that period assurance is rendered doubly sure. In almost the same terms Brinsley uses for his own school in 1620 he might have described the practices of Hughes's and Byerley's schools a century and a half later.

³⁸ An observer, speaking of 1820, says: "Grammar has been extensively introduced. . . . Children are required to commit the grammar to memory. This was the study of grammar. . . . It may be said . . . that scarcely anyone understood anything he passed over."

³⁹ Editorial, *C. S. J.* (1849), 258. Fowle was the editor of two rather obscure grammars in the period which turned the study toward the science of sentences and the practice of writing.

⁴⁰ See Chap. IV, pp. 92 et seq.

Chapter VI.

GRADUAL CHANGES IN METHOD BEFORE 1850.

In the preceding chapter we have seen the methods used in teaching Latin grammar transferred with slavish imitation to English. In brief, grammar was looked upon as the art of speaking and writing correctly. This art was to be acquired by learning page after page of rules by rote,⁴¹ of which no application whatever was made by the pupils.⁴² Memorizing came to be supplemented by parsing according to strict Latin methods⁴³ and by correcting endless examples of false syntax.⁴⁴ Moreover, the question-and-answer method, putting a premium on verbatim recitation of memorized parts, prevalent before 1800, had not entirely disappeared in 1830.⁴⁵ Grammar was begun by very young children and was accompanied by no oral discussion and by no composition. Teachers were very deficient.⁴⁶ The result of these methods was little more than a mystification of the pupils, with no appreciable improvement in grammatical accuracy.⁴⁷ In short, the early instruction in grammar in America up to the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century proceeded on the wrong basis—that of inflections; it began with the wrong unit—the word, and it followed entirely erroneous methods of study in proceeding from theory and rules to practice instead of reversing the process.⁴⁸

⁴¹ J. T. Buckingham, *Am. J. of Ed.*, 13, 132; Noah Webster, *ibid.*, 26, 196; W. K. Oliver, *ibid.*, 213.

⁴² Wallis, *Com. Sch. J.* (1850), 5.

⁴³ As indicating the Latin extreme, Murray's Grammar makes possible 60 forms in the pluperfect tense of the subjunctive mood.

⁴⁴ This seems to have been introduced by Lowth's Grammar in 1758.

⁴⁵ Wallis, *op. cit.*, 85; Wickersham, *Hist. of Ed. in Pa.*, 206; *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1832), 268.

⁴⁶ See Chap. IV, p. 92.

⁴⁷ Rept. Committee Common Schools, Conn., *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1832), 247.

Horace Mann said in 1827: "It is not a perfect knowledge of a treatise on grammar or a surprising fluency in parsing that will serve to produce . . . correctness in expression." *Am. An. of Ed.* (1827), 681-2.

⁴⁸ W. C. Woodbridge, a prominent schoolman of Boston, says: "Nothing is more common than for children to recite it (the grammar), in course, *two* or *three* times. In many of our schools, a portion of the day, through the greater part of one winter term of three or four months, is devoted to committing to memory the rules and definitions of etymology." He makes the following amusing calculation: "The average time spent in committing grammar, *as it is called*, to memory, is at least one month to each pupil concerned; and this time is entirely lost. New England contains 1,954,562 inhabitants, about one-fourth of whom are between 4 and 16 years of age. One scholar in ten . . . commences the study of grammar every year. The amount of time lost annually is equivalent to 4,072 years." Then, estimating the cost of schooling as \$1.50 a week, he adds: "The value of the time would thus be \$317,616. . . . Let this waste be continued every year for 30 years, and the amount is nearly ten millions of dollars." *Am. J. and An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1831), 170-1.

The ensuing period between 1823 and 1847, called above the parsing period, was a time of conflict between the traditional ideals and methods just mentioned and innovations fostered largely by the trend toward inductive study which characterized some school practices of that day. During this period four grammatical textbooks dominated the field. In 1823 Samuel Kirkham published in New York his "New and Systematic Order of Parsing" and in 1825 his "English Grammar in Familiar Lectures." In the same year and State Gould Brown published his "Grammatical Institutes." Peter Bullion's Grammar of 1834 was the third. Roswell Smith's two books—his grammars on the inductive and on the productive systems, respectively—had appeared in 1829 and 1831. Smith was a Massachusetts author; Bullion lived in New York. These four texts we have seen were fairly successful in outdistancing all rivals by 1830, almost entirely displacing Murray and Webster⁴⁹ with their imitators.

At the end of the period upon which we are entering William H. Wells, with his "School Grammar," of 1846, and Samuel S. Greene, with "The Analysis of Sentences," of 1847, appeared upon the scene. These men produced the first of those texts which, after the middle of the century, were to bring about still another revolution in principles and school practice. They were the culmination of the influences which we shall see at work during the 25 years preceding them, ushering in permanently the conception of grammar as a science of sentences.⁵⁰

The present chapter endeavors to trace the most important influences which produced the breaking away from the conception of grammar as an art and prepared the way for the conception of it as a science, a state finally attained by 1850. It will treat also the accompanying changes in methods of teaching before that date.⁵¹ The second quarter of the last century was by far the most interesting and important period in grammatical instruction, surpassed in inter-

Woodbridge is writing of the year 1830. In a Virginia elementary school of 1847 the rule in grammar was: "Commit the big print the first time; on the second review the big and little print, *verbatim*. So I went through Smith's Grammar on the Productive System. (What it produced in me Heaven only knows.) Almost all lesson-getting was by heart." E. S. Joynes, quoted, Heathwold, Hist. of Ed. in Va., 111.

⁴⁹ See Chap. IV, p. 86. Smith's Grammars were used more than all others combined in Massachusetts during these decades. Bullion, Brown, Smith, and Kirkham divided the grammatical field of New York about evenly among them.

⁵⁰ Wells defines grammar as "the science which treats of the principles of grammar. English grammar teaches [not is] the art of speaking and writing the English Language correctly." Sch. Gram., 25. Greene says: "English grammar teaches the principles of the English Language." Analysis, 203. By 1850 the conception of grammar as a science was firmly fixed in school practice. Even Gould Brown, who in 1823 had defined "English Grammar is the Art of Speaking and writing the English language correctly" (Institutes, 15), modified his definition to conform to the newer conception in 1851. Gram. of Gram., 45.

⁵¹ The advance in methods after 1850, beginning with Wells and Greene, carried on later by Swinton, Swett, and others, is reserved for another study.

est only by the movement on foot at the present time, by which grammar is being relegated to its proper place as a purely incidental study.

1. THE NATURE OF THE DOMINATING TEXTBOOKS, 1823-50.

Samuel Kirkham's two books, particularly his "Grammar on the Productive System," reached enormous popularity, especially in New York and adjoining States.⁵² In several important respects Kirkham's textbooks differ from Murray's, which they did so much to displace. They made a decided advance in methods of teaching. First, Kirkham illustrates in a series of familiar talks the various rules and definitions in an endeavor to bring them within the comprehension of the learners;⁵³ second, he introduces an imposing new system of parsing.⁵⁴ The chief innovation in his parsing, as differing from Murray and Webster, is that Kirkham introduces it very early in his study, immediately after his treatment of nouns and verbs, while the older grammarians postpone the subject until the pupil had mastered 160 pages (in Murray) of etymology and syntax.⁵⁵ Kirkham's third innovation is his use of a series of devices for recognizing the various parts of speech and their functions in a sentence.⁵⁶

These three innovations are designed to accomplish two purposes which seem to have been largely unrecognized by the grammars of the preceding periods, namely, the intelligent understanding by the pupil of the parts he was learning and immediate self-activity on the pupil's part in practicing the new principle just as soon as he has acquired it. Remembering now that "stick close to the book" was the order of the day, it is easy to infer what the influence of Kirkham's methods must have been in school practice.

⁵² See Chap. IV, p. 84.

By 1835 the second book is said to have reached its one hundred and seventh edition in New York. Barnard, *Am J. of Ed.*, 14, 763.

The writer is using a book called "English Grammar by Lectures," Joseph Hull (first edition, Boston, 1828), seventh edition, Mayfield, Ky., 1833. In a note the author says that Kirkham stole his plan of procedure from him. Hull uses the same order of parsing as Kirkham, namely, by transposition. He says: "This order and these rules have been copied by some writers on English Grammar and presented as original. But a reference to the date of the author's copyright . . . in the forty-sixth year of the Independence of the United States (1821) will prove it to be a plagiarism." Preface, XIV. We do not pretend to pass on the merits of the claim. There is evident truth that either Hull copied Kirkham, or vice versa; the grammatical treatment of both is on an entirely different plane from that of earlier writers we have seen. However, although the case looks bad for Kirkham, it was certainly he, not Hull, who was influential in spreading the new movement.

⁵³ For example: The nominative case is the actor, or subject of the verb: as, John writes. In this example, which is the *verb*? You know it is the word *writes*, because this word signifies *to do*: that is, it expresses *action*; therefore according to the definition, it is an *active* verb. And you know, too, that the noun *John* is the *actor*, therefore John is in the *nominative* case to the verb writes. *Eng. Gram. in Fam. Lect.*, 43.

⁵⁴ "The Order Of Parsing a Relative Pronoun is—a pronoun, and why?—relative, and why?—gender, and why?—Rule.—Case, and why?—Rule.—Decline it." *Ibid.*, 113.

⁵⁵ It is only fair to say that editions of Murray's Abridgment after 1820 also place parsing immediately after each exercise but in a much more rudimentary way.

⁵⁶ Any word that will take the sense of "the" before it is a noun. Any word which will make sense when preceded by "to" is a verb, etc. *Ibid.*, 31, 44.

Kirkham remarks concerning his innovations: "All (earlier writers) overlooked what the author considers a very important object, namely, *a systematick order of parsing*; and nearly all have neglected to *develop* and *explain* the principles in such a manner as to enable the learner, without great difficulty, to comprehend their nature and use."⁵⁷ He disclaims originality in subject matter, admitting frankly that he copied Murray, but claims great credit for changes in presentation and in method.⁵⁸ We may conclude that Kirkham's main attack was on purposeless rote memorization, aiming, as he did, to make the pupils understand what they learned, and that while he retained parsing and the correcting of false syntax he made definite attempts to compel practice to accompany learning step by step.

Smith's *Inductive and Productive Grammars*, 1829 and 1831, were produced frankly on the leading principles of Pestalozzi. This principle Smith states as follows:

The child should be regarded not as the mere recipient of the ideas of others, but as an agent capable of collecting, and originating, and producing most of the ideas which are necessary for its education, when presented with the objects of facts from which they may be derived. . . . Such is the productive system, by which the powers of the pupil are called into complete exercise by requiring him to attempt a task unaided, and then assisting him in his own errors. . . . They distinguish carefully between knowledge and the means of perceiving it. . . ."⁵⁹

The pretentious idea of the productive system, when worked out in practice, is not at all impressive. Throughout the book the productive method amounts to putting in the text explanations which the teacher might have made orally.⁶⁰ The productive approach to rule

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁵⁸ "The systematick order laid down in this work, if pursued by the pupil, compels him to apply every definition and every rule that appertains to every word he parses without having a question put to him by the teacher. . . . The author is anxious to have the absurd practice . . . of causing learners to commit and recite definitions and rules without any simultaneous application of them to practical examples immediately abolished." *Ibid.*, 11.

⁵⁹ Preface, stereotype ed., Philadelphia, 1838, 5, 6.

Smith's *Productive* is really three grammars in one. Part I, covering 40 pages, contains the parts of speech and treats 11 rules of syntax. Part II, intended for the next higher class, covers (pp. 41-96) exactly the same 11 rules, going into much more detail, with more elaborate parsing, and adding exercises in syntax, together with sentences to be corrected. It adds more rules, completing 22 rules of syntax. Part III is entitled "Syntax" and is really a rearrangement of Murray's large grammar. Murray's 22 rules are given in order, with his treatment of each. Above each of Murray's rules Smith places the number of his rule which corresponds, adding nine to the list. This part might have been used by a pupil in his third year of grammar. The fact that it included three grammars in one may have accounted for the popularity of the book in part; under one cover is material for three consecutive years of grammatical study, the second and the third each being an elaboration of the preceding.

⁶⁰ I. Of the Noun.

Q. What is your name?

Q. What is the name of the town in which you live?

Q. What does the word noun mean?

Ans. The word noun means name.

Q. What then may your name be called?

9—two negatives in the same sentence are equivalent to an affirmative—runs in this wise:

Negative means denying; and affirming, asserting or declaring positively. A sentence in which something is denied is a negative one, and a sentence in which something is affirmed . . . is an affirmative one. . . . The phrase, "I have nothing," has one negative, and means, "I have not anything." The phrase "I have not nothing" . . . must mean . . . "I have something."

Then follows the rule. Smith's idea is good, but when the objects dealt with are words which are mere symbols of meanings, when the objects dealt with are grammatical relationships and merely logical concepts, the method for a textbook becomes extremely laborious. It is formal, stiff, and heavy. However, his efforts at explanation and self-activity on the part of the pupil were pioneer attempts in a difficult field. At the close of this period much of the laborious explanation placed in the books of Kirkham and Smith is left to the teacher in the form of "Oral Instruction."⁶¹

In quite another direction lies the real merit of Smith's innovations. He has one set of exercises running throughout his text, which constitutes a decided step in advance. This is a series entitled "Sentences to be written." For example, "Will you write one sentence describing the business of an instructor?"⁶² One, the business of a doctor? One, the business of a lawyer? One of a surgeon. . . . One, of the directors of a bank."⁶³ This pioneering in the field of sentence building renders him worthy of a place of high honor. Of course composition was not unknown, but the writer has seen no serious attempts earlier than Smith to use it in close association with grammatical instruction. This sentence building is one of the most promising innovations in any textbook up to 1831.

Smith adds one other feature worthy of mention. At the foot of each page he places a set of questions covering the principles developed on the page. Presumably many a class recitation consisted in the teacher's reading these questions and receiving corresponding answers by the pupils. This in reality was a backward step. The very necessity of framing a suitable question compels the teacher to think, provided of course the recitation consists of anything more than memorizing work. Smith scatters parsing and false syntax throughout his books, as do all the important texts of the period with which the writer is familiar. All follow Kirkham's example.

Bullion's Grammar of 1843 contains nothing new; his one effort at advance in method seems to have been to make parsing shorter and

Ans. A noun.

Q. What may all names be called?

Ans. Nouns.

Q. Boston is the name of a place; is Boston a noun, and if so, why?

Ans. Boston is a noun because it is a name, etc. *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶¹ See p. 146.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁶² His spelling is incorrect.

simpler. His grammar parses the sentence "I lean upon the Lord," as follows: "I, the first personal pronoun, masculine or feminine, singular, the nominative; lean, a verb, neuter, first person singular, present, indicative; upon, a preposition; the, an article; Lord, a noun, masculine, singular, the objective, governed by upon."⁶⁴ In parsing, the pupil is urged to state everything belonging to the etymology of each word "*in as few words as possible,*" always "*in the same order*" and "*in the same language.*"

Bullion's idea of simplifying any part of the process in grammar was certain to arouse the bitter opposition of Gould Brown, who is at once the most scholarly, the most interesting, and the most exasperating grammarian encountered in this study. He is exasperating because of his sarcastic condemnation of the grammatical work of every prominent writer with whose books his own came in competition. Upon this simplifying plan of Bullion, Brown heaps the bitterest scorn, pointing out that Bullion omits (1) definitions of terms applied; (2) distinction of nouns as common and proper; (3) the person of nouns; (4) the words, number, gender, case; (5) the division of adjectives into classes; (6) the classification of words as regular and irregular, redundant or defective; (7) the division of verbs as active, passive neuter; (8) the words, mode, and tense; (9) the distinction of adverbs, as to time, place, degree, and manner; (10) the distinctions of conjunctions as copulative or disjunctive; and (11) the distinction of interjections as expressions of varying emotions.

The omission of these 11 points in parsing was highly irritating to Brown, who still remained in 1851⁶⁵ a worshiper of formalism. To Roswell C. Smith and Pestalozzianism in general Brown pays his respects in no gentle terms. Of "The Grammar on the Productive System" he affirms:

The book is as destitute of taste, as of method: of authority, as of originality. It commences with the inductive process, and after forty pages . . . becomes a "productive system," by means of a misnamed "Recapitulation" which jumbles together the etymology and the syntax of the language through seventy-six pages more. It is then made still more "productive" by the appropriation of a like space to a reprint of Murray's Syntax and Exercises, under the inappropriate title, "general observations." What there is in Germany or Switzerland that bears *any resemblance* to this misnamed system of English grammar, remains to be seen. . . . The infidel Neef, whose new method of education has been tried in this country, and with its promulgator forgot, was an accredited disciple of this boasted "productive school," a zealous coadjutor with Pestalozzi himself, from whose halls he emanated . . . to teach the nature of things sensible, and a contempt for all the wisdom of books. And what similarity is there between his method of teaching and that of Roswell C. Smith, except their pretense to a common parentage, and that both are worthless?⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Prin. of Eng. Gram., 74.

⁶⁶ Gram. of Gram., 92-3.

⁶⁵ The date of his Grammar of Grammars.

Thus does Brown discredit Pestalozzianism, with its oral and objective teaching, and vigorously assail those who began to doubt "the wisdom of books." Thus does he resent any effort to simplify or render more expeditious the mastery of grammar, whose principles he regarded with almost worshipful reverence. His own influence on school practices was decidedly conservative; he is the last of the old guard, the champion of traditional methods, believing that a knowledge of "the book itself will make anyone a grammarian." He declares:

The only successful method of teaching grammar is to cause the principal definitions and rules to be committed thoroughly to memory, that they may afterward be readily applied. Oral instruction may smooth the way and facilitate the labor of the learner; but the notion of communicating a competent knowledge of grammar without imposing this task is disproved by universal experience. . . . It is the plain didactic method of definition and example, rule, and praxis; which no man who means to teach grammar well will ever desert. . . . The book itself will make anyone a grammarian *who will take* the trouble to observe and practice what it teaches.⁶⁷

Thus, in an almost ludicrous way the champion of what he calls the "ancient positive method, which aims directly at the inculcation of principles"⁶⁸ is blind to that fatal error of the traditionalists who thought that the book itself would make anyone a grammarian. They were right, if the assumption upon which the statement was made were true. The error of the traditionalists lies in this assumption. The connection between knowledge of the book, especially mere verbal knowledge and skill in practice, is remote. That this connection was not made in early American schools, was never made in any schools, and is not generally made to-day is the supreme criticism of the methods and practice of teaching grammar throughout its entire course in America.

No better summary of the tide of protest that was swelling up between 1825 and 1850 against this older conception can be desired than the following statement of Brown himself, made at the close of the period. His monumental "Grammar of Grammars," 1851, was written frankly to stem innovations in teaching the subject. Examining the common argument that the memorizing of definitions and rules, the knowledge of the arrangements and divisions of a highly Latinized grammar, has very little function in acquiring skill in the art of language, Brown says:

It [this argument] has led some men . . . to doubt the expediency of the whole method, under any circumstances, and either to discountenance the whole matter, or to invent other schemes by which they hoped to be more successful. The utter futility of the old accidence has been inferred from it and urged . . . with all the plausibility of a fair and legitimate deduction. The hardships of children, compelled to learn what they did not understand, have been bewailed

⁶⁷ Institutes, preface, VI.

⁶⁸ Gram. of Gram., 86.

in prefaces and reviews, and prejudices . . . have been excited against that method of teaching grammar, which after all, will be found . . . the easiest, the shortest, and the best. I mean, especially, the ancient positive method, which aims directly at the inculcation of principles.⁶⁹

Of the four leading grammarians of the period, then, we may say that Brown was distinctly a traditionalist. His contributions lay in a more accurate presentation of the subject matter of grammar in general. He was the last of the grammarians who would foist upon a concordless tongue all the intricacies of inflected languages and insist that a mere knowledge of abstract grammatical principles is effective in making good writers and speakers. He looked upon grammar as formal discipline par excellence. Bullion's contributions to new methods were very meager. Kirkham and Smith, forerunners of radical changes, attempted to employ principles of inductive teaching.

From almost the beginning of grammatical instruction in America there had been sporadic attempts to make grammar easy for young pupils. No fewer than 13 texts which were published before 1820 appear under the titles "Rudiments," "Grammar Made Easy," "Elements," "English Grammar Abridged," "Epitome of English Grammar," and the like. But this endeavor to make grammar easy is to be sharply distinguished from the attempts of grammarians whom Brown refers to as simplifying grammarians—men who, after 1823, endeavored to present by means of easily understood devices theoretical intricacies as found in Murray and Webster.

Even before the period under consideration Greenleaf, in 1819, published "Grammar Simplified, or Oracular Analysis of the English Language." Other titles indicative of this second line of endeavor are: Anonymous, 1820, "The Decoy, An English Grammar"; McCrady, 1820, "An English Grammar in Verse"; Ingersoll, 1821, "Conversations in English Grammar"; Hurd, 1827, "Grammatical Chart, or Private Instructor"; Patterson, 182-, "Grammar without a Master"; anonymous, 1830, "Pestalozzian Grammar"; anonymous, 1830, "English Grammar with Cuts"; anonymous, 1832, "Interrogative Grammar," and the like. In short, after 1820 there was manifest a distinct tendency, both among leading grammarians and humbler workers, to modify what had hitherto been an occult and laborious subject, to the end that it might be understood as well as learned verbatim.⁷⁰

⁶⁹ Ibid., 86.

⁷⁰ Gould Brown speaks characteristically of this entire tendency. "The vain pretensions of several modern simplifiers, contrivers of machines, charts, tables, diagrams, vincula, pictures, dialogues, familiar lectures, oracular analysis, productive systems, tabular compendiums, intellectual methods, and various new theories, for the purpose of teaching grammar, may serve to deceive the ignorant, to amuse the visionary, and to excite the admiration of the credulous . . . but no contrivance can ever relieve the pupil from the necessity of committing them (rules and definitions) thoroughly to memory. . . . The teacher . . . will be cautious of renouncing the practical lessons of hoary experience for the futile notions of a vain projector." Ibid., 91.

We have been speaking above of new tendencies and not of realizations in schoolroom practices. Abundant evidence is present that schools were very slow in conforming to the new methods. A few examples of the conditions which prevailed between 1823 and 1850 indicate that the larger part of grammatical instruction remained a slavish verbal repetition of rules and a desperate struggle with complicated parsing formulæ. This is the reason why it is appropriate to call the period "parsing period." Throughout there was devotion to what a Boston school committee of 1845 called more suggestively than elegantly "the osteology of language."⁷¹

2. OTHER AGENTS AND AGENCIES IN THE INDUCTIVE APPROACH.

It is not generally known that Warren Colburn, known chiefly for his work in the field of arithmetic, prepared also a series of juvenile readers consisting chiefly of excerpts from Maria Edgeworth's stories.⁷² To each of the series Colburn attached a few of the principles of grammar, and as the child completed his reading books he completed likewise a portion of grammatical knowledge suitable for young pupils. Colburn's principles of grammar took the form of instructions to teachers; they in turn imparted them to pupils. It will be noted that this is in essence the inductive approach, a decided

⁷¹ Bos. Sch. Rept., 1845, 16.

1822. Charlotte Academy, North Carolina: "Some who began to memorize Grammar since the commencement of the session parsed blank verse with uncommon ease and propriety." Coon, N. C., Sch. and Acad., 1790-1840, 230; Western Carolinian, July 9, 1822.

1827. A class in Lincolnton Academy was examined on "Memorizing English Grammar." *Ibid.*, 212. This is but little in advance of the practice of Wayne Academy in the same State, where (in 1818) "the fifth class was examined on English Grammar from the verb 'to have' to Syntax; the sixth class as far as the Substantive; the seventh as far as the Article, and the eighth to the verb 'to be.'" *Ibid.*, 634, Raleigh Register, Oct. 9, 1818.

1828. Report of a committee on common schools, Connecticut. "Children may be found who have committed to memory their Grammar, their Geography, and the Introduction to the Spelling Book half a dozen times each and yet no wiser for practical purposes than before. . . . Grammar and Geography are committed to memory rather than taught for after years of study; . . . the pupils often have little or no practical knowledge of either, especially the former. This is due to the fact that the books themselves are not usually adapted to the pupils' capacity, partly to the ignorance of inexperience of the teacher." *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.*, 1832, 247-8.

1842. Fifth report of Horace Mann. "If the teacher is conversant with no better way than to put a common textbook of Grammar into the hands of beginners and to hear lessons recited by them day after day concerning definitions and rules while as yet they are totally ignorant of the classes of words defined . . . he surely has no aptness to teach grammar. The question is often asked, When or at what age children should begin to study grammar? If it is to be studied in the way described above, one would almost be tempted to reply, never." *Com. Sch. J.*, 1842, 337.

1845. Boston school committee gave an examination to find grade of work done. "It would seem impossible for a scholar to parse a stanza of Childe Harold correctly and yet fail to see the force of the metaphors, etc., . . . yet this is done sometimes. Such is the power of close attention to the osteology of language, to the bones and articulations, in forgetfulness of the substance that covers, and the spirit that animates them." *Bos. Sch. Rept.*, 1845, 16.

⁷² These books were First, Second, Third, and Fourth Lessons in Reading and Grammar. Boston, 1831, 38, 44.

improvement over Roswell Smith's plan and in signal contrast to the traditional procedure. Colburn's four series of lessons in reading and grammar were not so widely used as his arithmetics. They did not lend themselves to the scheme of making grammar a separate study and were primarily for beginners. However, the prestige of his name and success in arithmetic attracted attention to his grammatical labors. His Pestalozzian methods, with emphasis on objective, oral, visual, explanatory, and simplified instruction, did much to lay the foundation for the educational revival which sprang up along inductive lines before 1850.⁷³

Colburn was influenced by one man whose importance is often neglected, his most intimate friend, James G. Carter.⁷⁴ Of him Barnard declares "to him more than any one person belongs the credit of having first arrested the attention of the leading minds in Massachusetts to the necessity of immediate and thorough improvement of the public schools."⁷⁵ Carter was instrumental in inducing Colburn to adopt inductive methods.⁷⁶ His advanced position in the philosophy of teaching grammar, as early as 1824, is remarkable. After setting forth the faulty practices of his day he adds:

The system proceeds upon the supposition that the language was invented and formed by the rules of grammar. Nothing is more false. A grammar can never be written till a good knowledge of the language is attained; and then, contrary to what the pupil supposes, the grammar is made to suit the language. Now, why neglect this natural method in teaching language to young learners?"⁷⁷

Again, "The schoolbooks . . . are certainly not written on the inductive method, and these are our instructors. . . . The essential principle, on which they are written, is the same through all changes. This is wrong and should be corrected."⁷⁸ The significance of this language lies in the fact that it was published in 1824, shortly before Roswell Smith, Colburn, and others attempted to put into grammatical textbooks the changes which Carter champions.

Reference has already been made to the fact that Neef, a representative of Pestalozzi, who was brought to America in 1806 and

⁷³ Barnard, Ed. Blog., 208.

⁷⁴ After Colburn's death Carter wrote to Mrs. Colburn: "No man ever drew out my heart as did Warren Colburn. No one has ever filled the aching void of his loss." Ibid., 217.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 182.

⁷⁶ Letters to Prescott, last three chapters. Carter also was instrumental in establishing the office to which Mann was elected in Massachusetts.

⁷⁷ In "Letters to Prescott" (pp. 72-4) Carter argues that facts are to be learned first; that rules are merely the verbal generalization of facts. "They are abstract principles, the truth of which can neither be perceived, understood, nor believed till some single instance . . . presents itself to the learner. . . . The rule . . . is obtained by a patient induction of particular instances and is put in words, not to teach us anything, but to classify what has already been learned. . . . The abstract principles of a language give no more adequate idea of the particulars from which they have been formed than the labels give of the nature and obligation of a note. . . . The facts of a language . . . are always first learned. . . . The rules in the learner's memory are perfectly useless till he has learned the particulars or facts of the language."

⁷⁸ Ibid., 66.

established a school in Philadelphia, was naturally outspoken in his opposition to the prevailing methods of teaching grammar. He asserted that "grammar and incongruity are identical things," and attempted to reach correct use of the vernacular by direct means associated with object teaching, rejecting practically all that had been taught under the name of grammar.⁷⁹

Three other men prominent in the educational revival, especially as its changes affected the teaching of grammar, are Asa Rand, Henry Barnard, and Horace Mann. Rand was the author of "The Teachers' Manual for Instructing in English Grammar."⁸⁰ Rand applies in this pedagogical manual the fundamental fact about grammar, stated so effectively by Carter above: "In forming a system of rules for a written and cultivated language, its principles were obtained by discovery, not by invention." It is significant that this passage is from a lecture on methods of teaching grammar and composition before the American Institute of Instruction in 1833.⁸¹ The lessons published by Rand are quite in keeping with the methods of inductive approach.

But to Henry Barnard and Horace Mann are to be ascribed the influences which most contributed to the reform that culminated in the transfer of emphasis from the word to the sentence as the unit of grammatical study, in the growing conception of grammar as a science of sentences, not as the art of writing and speaking. For five successive years (1838-1841) Barnard, then State superintendent of schools of Connecticut, sent a series of questions to every teacher of English grammar in the State. The queries involve all the essential features of inductive teaching, discussed in more detail in the following section. There is no way of estimating the influence of Barnard's constant emphasis on these new principles; the effects on school practices must have been great. Representative queries sent out by Barnard were as follows:

1. Do you make your pupils understand that the rules of grammar are only the recognized uses of language?
2. Do you give elementary instruction as to the parts of speech and rules of construction in connection with reading lessons?
3. Do you accustom your pupils to construct sentences of their own, using different parts of speech, on the blackboard?
4. Have you formed the habit of correct speaking, so as to train, by your own example, your pupils to be good practical grammarians?
5. At what age do your pupils commence this study?⁸²

As early as 1827 William C. Woodbridge wrote in his journal:

It is not a perfect knowledge of a treatise on grammar or a surprising fluency in parsing that will be sure to produce . . . correctness of expression. . . .

⁷⁹ Monroe, Pestalozzian Movement, 47.

⁸⁰ Published in Boston, 1832. A series of lessons in teaching grammar were the substance of this manual. The lessons are also printed in *Am. J. and An. of Ed. and Ins.*, I, 162, etc.

⁸¹ *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1833), 160.

⁸² Barnard, *Am. J. of Ed.*, I, 692.

The evil usually to be guarded against is that of trusting too much to the didactic exposition of grammar as given wholly in school books, and not using sufficient diligence to make the whole subject intelligible and familiar by *plain conversion* and *constant practical exercise*. What is needed in teaching grammar is full oral explanation, to prepare the learner; . . . next to this is frequent practice in writing (let the composition be ever so humble).⁸³

Barnard and Mann at the head of State school systems were in positions of advantage for pushing the reforms they advocated. But even before Mann's influence was felt as a State officer in Massachusetts we find here and there a progressive school committee which had caught the new spirit in regard to grammar. Samuel Shattuck, of the school committee of Concord, Mass., reported to the town meeting, November 6, 1830, that—

Grammar, taught according to the usual system, is productive of little practical good. A mere knowledge of parsing does not give a person the use of language. The inductive method, which commences with learning to express the most simple and proceeds to the more complex ideas, arriving at just rules for their construction at each step of its progress, seems to be the most natural in gaining a knowledge of language. The scholar should be required to make the application of every rule, *in writing*, not merely in the examples laid down in his textbook but in describing other objects.⁸⁴

This statement is highly suggestive of both the method of parsing prevalent in 1830 and the new processes which we shall consider in the following section.

After Mann had aroused the State we find very frequent statements from the school committees of the various counties indicating the pressure that was being brought to bear against the "big three" of grammatical instruction. Charlestown committee, in 1840, says:

Young men go from school with skill in parsing, or analyzing sentences, that would make the eyes of grammarians glisten with delight, and yet . . . prefer . . . the bastinado rather than compose a piece of reasoning. . . . Yet the object of learning grammar is to write and speak the English language with propriety; . . . to make the mind capable of forming independent opinions. . . . Can not something more be done for this than now is done?⁸⁵

With amusing errors in diction, the school officials of Dracot, in the same State and year, inveigh against formalism as follows:

Long lessons, correctly recited from memory, though they may sound well, and may be listened to with much interest, do not necessarily imply knowledge. They may show that a scholar has been industrious in getting his lessons. . . . Against this hollow, deceptive practice . . . your committee have taken a decided stand; . . . have given teachers strict charge . . . to go, not over them [lessons] but into them; not round them but through them. . . . In doing this, our object has been to learn . . . scholars to reason as well as to commit to memory.⁸⁶

⁸³ Am. An. of Ed. (1827), 681-2.

⁸⁴ Am. J. and An. of Ed. and Ins. (1831), 138.

⁸⁵ Mass. Sch. Ret. (1840), 49.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 55, 6.

3. CHIEF FEATURES OF THE INDUCTIVE MOVEMENT APPLIED TO GRAMMAR.

The chief features of the inductive movement as they were applied to grammar have been suggested in the preceding sections. They were three in number: First, the attempt to make learners understand thoroughly every step of their progress; second, the use of oral and visual instruction as a means of removing the tedium of book learning; and, third, the addition of the pupil's own activity in actually applying principles as he learned them, not only by means of additional exercises for parsing and correcting false syntax but also of exercises in sentence building and composition. All these were to be taught in close association with grammar.

REVOLT AGAINST MEANINGLESS INSTRUCTION.

The revolt against instruction meaningless to pupils was led by Horace Mann, whose guiding principle was the zealous advocacy of oral as against exclusive textbook instruction, of the word as against the traditional alphabet method, of the objective, illustrative, and explanatory method of teaching as against the abstract and subjective.⁸⁷ Mann's leadership is clearly seen in the thinking of school committees of Massachusetts, in the decade between 1840 and 1850. They frequently objected to teaching the signs of thought, rather than the thought itself.⁸⁸ In 1840 the committee of the town of Athol expressed the opinion: "Confessedly one of the most serious defects existing in the system of education . . . is the communication, to the mind of the youth, of the signs of thought more than the thought themselves."⁸⁹ This struck to the very heart of the error of teaching in both reading and grammar up to 1850. The word was the unit of approach, the idea signified of secondary importance. Favorable comment upon the results of normal training for teachers with special reference to making the pupils understand is not uncommon. For example, in the Lancaster report of 1840 we find:

The practice of calling the attention of classes to the meaning of what they study is of the greatest value, but it is comparatively new in our schools and by

⁸⁷ Anderson, *Hist. of Com. Sch. Ed.*, 227.

⁸⁸ A letter from a teacher who signs himself "Expertus sum." giving an imaginary conversation with a pupil in grammar, is indicative of numerous ideas found in educational journals of the period.

"You say that you read in the English Reader; do you study grammar?"

"Yes, sir; I have been through it several times, but I never parsed any yet."

"Whose system do you study?"

"Oh, I study my own grammar; but it is almost worn out. I shall have to borrow then, for father says he can't afford to buy me any new books this summer."

"I meant who is the *author* of the grammar which you use?"

"Author? I don't know what you mean." *Am. J. and An. of Ed. and Ins.*, I, 476.

⁸⁹ *Sch. Ret.* (1840), 87.

no means yet fully used. We believe that if words are good for anything it is for their meaning. . . . Let memory be joined with understanding.⁹⁰

In close association with the agitation against the teaching of meaningless terms was the growing demand that children must understand the meaning of the grammatical principles they were called upon to acquire. This is in the mind of the committee of Carver, Mass., in 1839, when they reported: "We can not say that there are many who get a thorough knowledge of grammar in our schools at the present day, but we think that there are many who derive a considerable understanding of it," whereupon they contrasted it with the grammar teaching of the committee's youth.⁹¹ Not so favorable were the opinions of the committee of Cummington County:

Your committee wish to notice that . . . the method of instruction is too formal and mechanical, and not sufficiently directed to the understanding. Teachers do not sufficiently illustrate the subject in which the scholar is engaged. The scholar commits to memory a certain number of words, without attaching them to a single idea, whereas ideas instead of words ought to be learned.⁹²

In a similar manner the school authorities of Amesbury demanded in teachers "the *ability* of communicating in an understanding and profitable manner what they are called upon to teach."⁹³ Those of Essex suggested "the propriety of being cautious when engaging teachers, to procure, if possible, . . . men who have some *tact* for awakening and bringing out the powers of youth."⁹⁴ More forcefully than elegantly the Athol committee expressed much the same sentiment.

A teacher is not like a jug, which holds back its contents from necessity, or like a cow which holds up her milk from inclination, the nearer full they are; he should rather be like a rain cloud, which sends down blessings in showers, and like a fountain ever flowing over.⁹⁵

⁹⁰ Ibid., 103.

The school committee of Weston, in 1841, inveighed against verbal instruction: ". . . the understanding of the scholar is not . . . properly exercised. A correct verbal recitation seems the principal, if not the only, object to be attained; . . . while the scholar garners up a multitude of words, his mind adds nothing to his stock of ideas. Let the young be taught to think." Ibid., 1841, 69.

The Westerfield committee, in the same year, voiced the oft-repeated complaint: "The efforts of too many of our teachers have been confined to impart to the scholars' *memory* a series of *words*, rather than to open their *understanding* to the reception of *ideas*." Ibid., 128.

⁹¹ Ibid. (1839), 413.

⁹² Ibid., 4.

⁹³ Ibid., 1840, 143.

The Springfield committee felt the same need: "Let the rules of grammar . . . be not only committed to memory, but let their principles be understood, . . . let the subjects be so incorporated into . . . the thought . . . that their contents may be reproduced and transmitted." Ibid., 172. That of Ashby also reported: "Another point noticed was the want of familiar explanation; . . . some teachers seemed to be content with receiving the answers given in the book. . . . Such parrot-like recitations can be anything but interesting to the teacher or pupil. Let the teacher, by familiar inquiries and explanations, know that the subject . . . is fully understood." Ibid., 1841, 40.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 8.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 75.

A glimpse into one of the progressive schoolrooms of 1829 shows us grammar being taught far in advance of its time. William A. Alcott, afterwards associated with Woodbridge in the editorship of the *American Journal of Education* and the author of many articles on methods of teaching, as a young man taught a district school of Southington, Conn. Here he made marked advances especially in the teaching of etymology. The account of his method of teaching pupils the meaning of a verb reminds one of the actions often seen to-day in the classrooms of modern-language teachers who pursue what is known as "the direct method." Without any preliminary information in regard to what he was going to do, Alcott would ask the pupils to take their slates and pencils. Then stamping the floor or clapping his hands he would require them to write down what they saw him do. This process he would have repeated with the actions of the pupils as well as his own. "Now," he would say, "what have you been doing?" He would point out that the words they had written described actions. "These words describing actions are verbs. Now, what is a verb?" In this manner the children were said to acquire as much knowledge in 10 lessons as in an entire term under the older methods.⁹⁶

The second feature of the educational revival which affected instruction in grammar was the attention given to visual and oral instruction. In 1839 the school committee of Roxbury, Mass., struck a note not frequently heard, namely, that the force of the teacher's example in speaking and writing is the most important agency of instruction. Their statement was that—

teachers should take care not to undo all their efforts to teach grammar by the bad example of using false grammar themselves. They should watch over their own . . . modes of address, as well as those of the children, for example's sake. . . . It is necessary that teachers be . . . exemplary in conversation. . . .⁹⁷

ATTENTION TO VISUAL AND ORAL INSTRUCTION.

The teacher's example is not a direct phase of what is known as oral instruction. The term means rather that children are taught principles by word of mouth; that is, the explanatory talks which Kirkham had included in his text are to be presented in simple explanations by the teachers themselves. This practice was so unfamiliar in some towns that it attracted the notice of visiting committees, as that of Newbury, Mass., which wrote, in 1839: "Another improvement we noticed was the method of some teachers of communicating knowledge . . . by familiar conversation and by questions on common subjects."⁹⁸ The Egermont committee of 1843 found occasion to praise—

⁹⁶ Barnard, *Ed. Blog.*, 261; also *Am. J. of Ed.* IV, 641.

⁹⁷ *Sch. Ret.* (1839), 365.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1839, 33.

the example in the winter school of district No. 2, of much *oral* instruction instead of the common practice of very rigid confinement to the lesson book; . . . a good teacher can *talk* into a child, in the space of three or four months, an amount . . . of practical knowledge . . . which the child could not *read* into himself in the space of as many years."⁹⁹

Horace Mann, reviewing Edward's "First Lessons in Grammar," 1843, asserts:

If a child is made to feel that the subject [grammar] is hard to understand and that he is expected to grope his way in darkness . . . he will be very likely to construct a prejudice against it. . . . Many a teacher has felt that there must be a better way of teaching grammar. . . . Edward's "First Lessons" is not the old process of committing to memory and repeating. . . . A method is given by which a teacher explains whatever is difficult to the learner. . . . The book is the substance of lessons in grammar given orally by the author in school.¹

This same note is struck by an editorial by William B. Fowle in 1850:

Grammar can be taught by oral instruction, by correcting the ungrammatical language of the pupils, and by the example of the teacher much more easily and more effectively than by committing to memory and reciting. . . . An accomplished teacher may do more for a class of 20 in one hour, by exercises on the blackboard, than he can do in a whole day for an individual who studies and parses from a textbook.²

The first 24 pages of William H. Wells's "School Grammar," 1846, are devoted to a section on oral instruction in English grammar, prepared at the request of Barnard, at the time commissioner of public schools in Rhode Island, and already published as one of his series of educational tracts.³ This section is not a part of the grammar itself but is frankly given over to explicit directions to teachers as to how to use the inductive methods and how to use illustrative exercises in composition.⁴ One hundred and fifty thousand of these textbooks were sold in the first five years. We have seen that his books

⁹⁹ Ibid. (1843), 188.

¹ Com. Sch. J., 1843, 167-8.

"After the part of speech . . . had been defined by the teacher and clearly comprehended by the pupils, they went to their seat to write examples in a book kept for that purpose. It was sometimes found that listening to an explanation . . . and conversing . . . were not sufficient . . . on which account a textbook was required. This constructive exercise is extremely interesting; children are pleased with *doing* something." Ibid.

² Com. Sch. J. (1850), 146.

³ Wells, Sch. Gram., preface, IV.

⁴ A sample of Wells's advice concerning instruction in the parts of speech may be quoted: "The *classification* of words may be introduced by referring to the different kinds of trees: to the different kinds of animals; or to any other collection of objects that admit of a regular division into distinct classes. Thus when we go into a forest, we find that the number of trees about us is greater than we can estimate. But we soon observe that a certain portion of them have certain resemblances, while they differ essentially from all the rest; . . . by extending our observation, we find . . . all trees . . . belong to a few very simple classes, . . . *Oak* trees, . . . *Pine* trees. . . . Just so it is with the words of our language. . . . By some introductory illustration the curiosity of a class of beginners may be excited. . . . The teacher should lead his pupils to take an active part in these lessons from the beginning." Ibid., II, 12.

were scattered through various States. Wells himself later became superintendent of schools in Chicago. It is probable that his influence more than that of any other man really introduced oral instruction and explanation into classroom instruction in English grammar.

Visual instruction was also brought into the field of teaching grammar after 1825. As late as 1835 the idea of using slates and blackboards was exceedingly novel; in only a few schools does it appear to have been attempted before that time. William A. Alcott, whom we have seen above dispensing with grammar books as far as possible, testifies that in 1830 "the idea of studying grammar with slates and pencils was so novel that I found no difficulty in gaining general attention." Children wrote names of different objects held before them; they read the lists aloud, classified them, and wrote new lists of objects of which they could think. Thus was employed a combination method of visual instruction and pupils' activity.⁵ Rules and regulations for the schools of Salem, Mass., require that "every lesson (in grammar) shall be accompanied by operations on the blackboard and slates (from the younger pupils), and exercises in parsing shall be required from the older classes."⁶ In an article on normal schools, in 1843, the advice is given that—

the first principles should be taught orally and by the blackboard and slate. So taught, they are easy and pleasant, and throw valuable light upon the arts of reading and composition. The use of the blackboard is very important. Write on the board, "It is she," not "It is her!" Require the pupils to make for themselves, and write on their slates, ten examples of similar mistakes, and their corrections. The rule is learnt better than by months of repeating the rule in parsing, where the mind is little better than passive.⁷

Again, James Ray, a prominent teacher of this decade, in 1830 advises:

In the study of Grammar the blackboard may be used to exhibit the inflections of the various parts of speech; it may also be used in syntax, to point out the connection of the principal words to each other. The method of doing this is by writing on the board the sentence to be parsed, and then connecting by curved lines those words that have any grammatical connection with each other. The instructor at the same time pointing out what that relation is. It may be observed that in teaching grammar the use of the blackboard is confined to the teaching the elementary principles of the science, [and] is used by the teacher for the purpose of illustrating these principles.⁸

The foregoing is the earliest reference the writer has seen pointing to the use of diagrams, which, after the middle of the century, came into great prominence in the analysis of sentences.

Massachusetts school committees often spoke in commendation of the new movement for blackboards facilitating instruction in gram-

⁵ Am. An. of Ed. and Ins. (1837), 165.

⁶ Com. Sch. J. (1842), 78.

⁷ Ibid. (1843), 331

⁸ Ray, Transactions of College Teachers, VI, 104.

mar. For instance, the Dighton committee said, in 1843: "The blackboard has been introduced into several schools. . . . By means of this the study of Orthography and English Grammar has been facilitated."⁹

Samuel J. May gives a hint concerning the very earliest appearances of blackboards, when, describing a visit to the school of Rev. Father Francis Brosius in Boston, in 1814, he said: "On entering his room we were struck at the appearance of a *Blackboard* suspended on the wall. . . . I had never seen such a thing before . . . and there I first witnessed the process of analytical and inductive teaching."¹⁰ It is quite certain, however, that not for two decades after 1814 did the rank and file of Massachusetts schools adopt this device now regarded as so indispensable for visual instruction. William C. Woodbridge, in the report of a Boston school committee on improvements, in 1833, strongly recommended slates and cards in the primary schools. He added that means for visual instruction were positively forbidden in Boston by the general committee.¹¹ In the common schools of Connecticut as late as 1832 "slates, blackboards, and apparatus are almost entirely unknown in the district schools," a committee on common schools testified.¹² Massachusetts counties in general waited for the boards until after 1840.¹³

INTRODUCTION OF CONSTRUCTIVE WORK.

The third prominent feature of innovating methods before 1850 was the introduction of constructive work on the part of the pupils, which gradually took the form of composition. Of course dictation and copying exercises were very old,¹⁴ and disputations dated far before the beginnings of instruction in the vernacular. Moreover, writing of a sort had accompanied work in grammar in the days of Murray's dominance in American schools. But composition as an adjunct to the study of grammar did not become prominent until Barnard, Fowle, Mann, Carter, Rand, and others championed and advanced it. Fowle, in an editorial of 1852, says that—

even now, a large number of our schools have no composition taught in them. No wonder, for not one teacher in 10 can write with tolerable ease and correctness. In an institute in Massachusetts (1850) we required 117 teachers to write what they could in fifteen minutes on "happiness." At the end of fifteen minutes, but seven teachers had done anything, and four of these had requested to be excused from writing. The three more periods of fifteen minutes were given, and only twenty teachers had been able to write anything in the end.

⁹ An. Rept. Supt. Ed. (1843), 234.

¹⁰ Barnard, Ed. Biog., 38.

¹¹ Am. An. of Ed. and Ins. (1833), 587.

¹² *Ibid.* (1832), 248.

¹³ Ashbunham comments, in 1841: "Schoolrooms have been more generally furnished with blackboards." Rept. Supt. Ed. (1841), 71. See also *ibid.*, 78; 1843, 234; 1841, 27.

¹⁴ See Chap. V, p. 127.

Fowle then pertinently asks: "How can such teachers give instruction in English Grammar?"¹⁵

The Massachusetts school reports are especially clear in indicating that composition as such was a product of the decade 1830 and 1840. In 1840 Sterling reported that "the exercise of composition has been introduced into some schools with encouraging success. This important branch has been too much neglected in former years. . . . English Composition should come next in order . . . to grammar."¹⁶

The committee of Carver, in 1839, explained that 20 years earlier the art of composing and writing received no attention:

It is true we were set to making marks, and dashing and pointing them with our pens (writing) . . . but . . . there are but few now, who were scholars then, that can compose, write and fold a letter, in a handsome form, as large numbers of our children from ten to fifteen years of age can.¹⁷

The Rockport committee "urged upon the more advanced scholars, who are acquainted with grammar, the importance of writing composition. . . . This should be a standing exercise in our schools. . . . This exercise is too much regarded as a matter of form."¹⁸ Here it is to be noted that composition first came into the curriculum only after the pupil had some acquaintance with grammar. Later periods reversed the order, composition preceding grammar. This constitutes a very important consideration. The committee of Dana, in 1843, commended oral composition in the following language:

The practice was particularly recommended by the committee, of urging the classes, instead of giving arbitrary rules from the book, to explain their operation, and to give their reasons in their own language. . . . Exercises in composition have been attended to in some of the schools.¹⁹

Only one Massachusetts committee, in 1843, found a satisfactory condition:

In the juvenile department in this school there was a new thing exhibited at the examination, about fifteen letters, and pieces of original composition, written by little children under ten years of age, and written with a simplicity, correctness and beauty, which surprised as much as it delighted us.²⁰

The list of questions which Barnard sent to the Connecticut teachers (1838-1841, inclusive) are indicative of the most advanced thought of the day.²¹

1. Do you classify your pupils in reference to teaching composition?
2. Do you accustom your youngest pupils to write or print words and short sentences on the slate, from your dictation?
3. Do you ask them to print or write something about what they have seen in coming to school, or read in the reading lesson?
4. As a preliminary exercise in composition, do you engage them in familiar *talk* about something they have seen in their walk, or has happened in or about

¹⁵ Com. Sch. J. (1852), 375.

¹⁶ Mass. Sch. Ref. (1840), 123.

¹⁷ Ibid. (1839), 413.

¹⁸ Ibid. (1841), 27.

¹⁹ Ibid. (1843), 83.

²⁰ Ibid. (1843), 215.

²¹ Am. J. of Ed., I, 692.

the school? and when they have got ideas, and can clothe them orally in words, do you allow them as a privilege to write or print the same on the slate or paper?

5. Do you give out a number of words, and then ask your pupils to frame sentences in which those words are used?

6. Do you require your older pupils to keep a journal or give an account of the occurrences of the day, as an exercise in composition?

7. Do you instruct your pupils as to the most approved form of dating, commencing, and closing a letter?

8. Do you require your pupils to write a letter in answer to some supposed inquiries about some matter of fact?

9. Do you request your older pupils to write out what they can recollect of a sermon or lecture they have heard, or of a book they have been reading?

10. At what age do your pupils usually commence writing easy sentences or compositions?

The exceeding reluctance with which authors of treatises on grammar and teachers of this subject came to the realization that constructive written work on the part of pupils ought to accompany every stage of their progress is clearly marked in America before 1850. Priestley as early as 1772 recommends the practice in his preface,²² but neither his nor contemporary textbooks are constructed with this purpose in mind. Even earlier than Priestley we have seen the Philadelphia Academy and other schools of advanced ideas employing composition, but not primarily as an adjunct to grammar.²³ But the fact is that the practice was not prevalent in American schools. This is evident not only from the complete absence of suggestions for composition in the earlier grammars but also from frequent testimony.²⁴

²² "We must introduce into the schools English grammar, English composition, and frequent English translations from authors in other languages. The common objection to English Compositions, that it is like requiring brick to be made without straw (boys not being supposed to be capable of so much reflection, as is necessary to treat any subject with propriety) is a very frivolous one since it is very easy to contrive a variety of exercises introductory to themes upon moral and scientific subjects, in many of which the whole attention may be employed upon language only; and from thence youth may be led on in a regular series of compositions, in which the transition from *language* to *sentiment* may be as gradual and easy as possible." Priestley, 3d ed., preface, XXI.

²³ See Chap. III, p. 46.

²⁴ "We were two or three years in grammar; . . . we were never required to write a sentence of English, and we never did write one as a school exercise." Wallis, speaking of Boston schools about 1800. *Com. Sch. J.* (1850), 5.

"We were educated at one of the best schools . . . but, although we studied English grammar seven years and received a silver medal for our proficiency, we never wrote a sentence of English at school and never did anything which implied a suspicion on our part that grammar had anything to do with writing or conversation." *Ibid.*, editorial (1849), 258.

"Composition was unknown to us. We were supposed to acquire 'the art of writing the English Language with propriety' by a textbook study of Orthography, Etymology, Syntax and Prosody, without writing even a sentence." Swett, speaking of the period, 1830-1840, *Am. Pub. Sch.*, 122.

"We think it would be but a counterpart to our grammars for children if some philosopher were to publish a treatise as a mode for discovering the center of gravity, and the laws of motion, in order to teach the children how to walk and run." *Review of Everst's English Grammar*, 1835, *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1835), 429.

It is significant, then, to find grammars after 1820 deliberately planning exercises in composition. They do not attempt "themes upon moral and scientific subjects," as Priestley advised; indeed, their suggestions for written work may not properly be called composition at all. Roswell Smith's title, "Sentences to be written," is far more exact. Kirkham had nothing to contribute to this advance, contenting himself with elaborate parsing and false syntax. Goold Brown follows Murray in placing exercises after each of the four divisions of his grammar, urging that the pupils "should *write out*"²⁵ their answers. Smith is entitled to the credit of making the first distinctive step toward the practice of sentence building. Scattered through his text are numerous headings entitled "Sentences to be written." The purpose is to employ the constructive activities of pupils as a means of fixing the grammatical principles they have just been studying.²⁶ Remembering the dates of Smith's books—1829 and 1831—we see that he stands in point of time at the head of the movement for composition in Massachusetts discussed above.²⁷

Wells, in 1846, urged that teachers write models on the board, and that they also write lists of words and have the pupils compose sentences embracing them. He goes a step in advance, advising: "After the pupils have in this manner exemplified the various modifications of the parts of speech, they should be required to write several compositions of considerable length."²⁸ Naturally we find Greene, in his "Analysis of Sentences," taking even more advanced ground. In his preface he affirms that "the only successful method of obtaining a knowledge of that art (writing and speaking correctly) is by means of construction and analysis."²⁹ In the text proper construction exercises begin on page 13, a footnote saying: "These exercises may be written or recited orally. It is recommended that the practice of writ-

²⁵ English Grammar, 100.

²⁶ Sentences to be written:

"Q. Will you compose two sentences, each having a different adjective pronoun? One, having a demonstrative pronoun? One, having an indefinite pronoun used as a noun?" Eng. Gram. Prod. Sys., 58.

²⁷ Richard G. Parker's book, "Progressive Exercises in English Composition," Boston, 1832, enjoyed a remarkable sale. It reached its forty-fifth edition in 1845. New editions were published in 1855 and 1856. Parker published a "Sequel" in 1835 and, in 1844, "Aids to English Composition," which reached its twentieth edition in 1850. The sale of these series is indicative of the trend toward composition. Parker, collaborating with C. Fox, in 1834, published also "Progressive Exercises in English Grammar," Part II, 1835, Part III, 1840. A favorable review of the first book describes it as being "without a formidable array of long definitions and unintelligible rules." Am. An. of Ed. and Ins. (1835), 47.

²⁸ Sch. Gram., 24.

²⁹ Analysis, 4. Contrast this with Goold Brown's statement: "The only successful method of teaching grammar is to cause the principal definitions and rules to be committed thoroughly to memory, that they may ever afterwards be readily applied." Brown, preface, VI. The contrasted statements indicate the two radically different conceptions of grammatical instruction, one of which was passing, the other of which was entering, in 1850.

ing lessons should be adopted as a general rule." ³⁰ Moreover, Greene desires that "the exercises, after being corrected, should be copied into a writing book." ³¹

As may be expected, it is impossible to assign a date at which constructive work, closely associated with grammatical study, entered school practice. However, it appears safe to say that it was the outcome of the influences we have seen at work in the period between 1825 and 1850. ³² The discussion may be fittingly closed by citing the practice of two schools, which for their generation were exceedingly progressive. A teacher of 1830, describing methods which he has found profitable, recommends voluntary composition, the pupils to continue their work on their own account by keeping journals. The variety of exercises suggested includes writing abstracts from memory; taking notes on lectures; abridgments; dialogues, real and imaginary; stories for children; narratives of personal adventure; discussion of questions; and the like. The voluntary reading of articles at stated periods is also recommended. ³³ Of course this procedure is exceedingly advanced; it is practically composition as we understand the term to-day. A more representative program of the period in question is found in the following account of a female school of Boston in 1832:

Care has been taken to improve all *occasional* opportunities of directing the attention of the pupils to the etymology, the signification, and the appropriate use of words, as they occur in connection, and while the interest felt in their meaning is still fresh in the mind. Exercises in the defining of words and in the distinguishing synonyms are occasionally prescribed. The practice of substituting equivalent words, phrases, sentences, and thoughts is likewise employed. The analysis of figurative language to the same end. A practical course in grammar is comprehended in the daily exercises in composition and a systematic view of the principles of the science has been taken. ³⁴

GENERAL SUMMARY.

Methods of teaching grammar have now been traced for about 100 years from its beginnings in America about 1750 to the middle of the nineteenth century. For the first 75 years instruction centered almost

³⁰ Analysis, 13.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 18, 1.

³² John Flint, who published "First Lessons in English Grammar upon a Plan Inductive and Intellectual," in 1833, deserves credit for pioneer work in sentence building, antedating Greene 12 years. An editorial in the *American Annals* says: "Decidedly the best introductory work we have seen. The pupil's knowledge is given by examples and sentences in which he finds words corresponding to definitions, and the pupil writes sentences as soon as may be." *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1833), 334. Dyer H. Sanborn's "Analytical Grammar," 1836, receives similar commendation. *Ibid.* (1837), 143. F. W. Felch's "A Comprehensive Grammar," 1837, affirms on the title page: "Designed to make the study of grammar and composition one and the same process." *Ibid.* (1837), 525. Of Wells and Greene a committee on Boston free schools declared, in 1851, that they were adopted "all over the land" as a protest against teaching Murray's Latin grammar for English." *Com. Sch. J.* (1851), 36.

³³ *Erodore*, *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.*, I, 266-9.

³⁴ *Am. An. of Ed. and Ins.* (1832), 215.

entirely around memorizing, correcting false syntax, and parsing. Of these all three were transferred directly from practices customary in studying Latin grammar. About the year 1823 changes began to creep into class instruction. Although the three traditional methods still predominated, especially parsing and memorizing, influences were at work which made the need of remedies felt in the educational revival of the second quarter of the century. Most conspicuous among the innovations were, first, earnest efforts to make the pupils understand; second, visual and oral instruction; and, third, the beginnings of constructive work. Most conspicuous among grammarians were Kirkham and Smith, Wells and Greene; among educational leaders, Carter, Rand, Barnard, and Mann. The results of their labors were indeed a veritable revolution, both in the conception of grammar and in the methods of instruction, a revolution the nature of which is well illustrated by comparing Gould Brown's statement of 1823 with the corresponding statement of Greene in 1847:

The only successful method of teaching grammar is to cause the principal definitions and rules to be committed thoroughly to memory. (Brown.)

The only successful method of obtaining a knowledge of the art is by means of construction and analysis.⁵⁵ (Greene.)

⁵⁵ Consideration of methods after 1850 is reserved for another study. Between 1850 and 1920 we may distinguish three fairly marked periods: That of 1847-1873, which may be termed the inductive period, characterized by the methods whose origin has just been presented; that of 1873-1891, which may be termed the rhetorical period, marked by Swinton's "Language Lessons," White's grammars (1871), the Harvard entrance requirements of 1873, and the Connecticut order dropping grammar in 1891; and that of 1891-1920, which may be termed the elimination period or the incidental study period, the chief tendency of which is the gradual subordination of formal grammar to its proper place as incidental to the study of composition and literature.

APPENDIX A.

CHRONOLOGICAL CATALOGUE OF ENGLISH GRAMMARS IN AMERICA BEFORE 1800.

Henry Barnard, speaking of his list of early American textbooks,³⁶ indicates the viewpoint in which the present list is compiled. He says: "This information in many cases is very imperfect and unsatisfactory, but it will at least serve as the clue to further inquiry; . . . many errors . . . and omissions will doubtless be detected in regard to those books which the compiler has not seen, and whose titles, dates, and places of publication and authorship have been gleaned from numerous sources not always reliable."

GRAMMARS USED IN AMERICA BEFORE 1850.

1706. Greenwood, James. *Essay Toward a Practical English Grammar*. 2d ed., London, 1711, 12°, 315 pp.
1724. Jones, Hugh. *A Short English Grammar: An Accidence to the English Tongue*. London.
- See Chapter II for further description of the first 10 grammars in this list.
1740. Dilworth, Thomas. *A New Guide to the English Tongue, Containing a Brief but Comprehensive English Grammar*. London.
1751. Harris, James. *Hermes, or a Philosophical Inquiry Concerning Universal Grammar*. 6th ed., 1806, 468 pp., 8°.
- Harris's work was not a textbook, but was influential in shaping most of the grammars earliest in America. Murray acknowledges his indebtedness. (Introduction, 5.) Harris was an innovator and simplifier among grammarians, using only four classes of words, after Aristotle. Book reprinted in Philadelphia. Wickersham, *Hist. of Ed. in Pa.*, 202. Reached 7th ed., 1825. *Com. Sch J.*, III, 209.
- 175— . Wiseman, ———. *English Grammar*.
- Advertised, *Boston Evening Post*, Oct. 27, 1760.
1753. Fisher, A. *A Practical New Grammar*. 28th ed., London, 1795, 176 pp., 12°.
- Follows Harris with four kinds of speech; no cases, no moods, only three tenses. Brown used "A New Edition, Enlarged, Improved and Corrected, 1800."
1758. Lowth, Robert. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*. 1st Amer. ed., London, 1775, 132 pp. 12°.

³⁶ Barnard's list, *Am. J. of Ed.*, XII, XIII, XIV; also William H. Wells's list in the preface of his "A Grammar of the English Language." Boston, 1852, edition. A writer who signs himself W. H. W. (probably William H. Wells) began a series of articles on English grammars in *The Common School Journal*. Illness compelling him to cease his labors, another writer who signs his articles "Wallis" (probably W. M. Fowle), continued the series under the title "Grammars Published in America before 1804." *C. S. J.*, IX, X, XI, XII. A fourth list, "American Textbooks," anonymous, is found in Barnard's *American Journal of Education*, 14, 600. For all books published in America before 1792 Evans's "American Bibliography" is the standard source. Evans is not infallible, however; a few books before 1792 have apparently not come to his attention. Gould Brown, in his "Grammar of Grammars," 1851, presents a list of some 350 authors or compilers of grammatical textbooks.

The present writer has added several items of information, mostly fragmentary, from announcements of publishers, from book reviews in the early educational journals, and from stray references in town histories, reports of school societies, addresses in educational conventions, and pedagogical tracts.

1760. [Anonymous.] *The British Grammar*. 1st American ed., 1784, 251 pp., 8°.
1760. Gough, James. *English Grammar*. 212 pp., 18°.
Advertised, *Providence Gazette*, Oct. 24, 1767. 1760 is date of 2d ed. "A publication of little merit, much of it borrowed from earlier writers." W. H. Wells, *Com. Sch. J.*, III, 210.
1762. Priestley, Joseph. *The Rudiments of English Grammar*. 3d ed., London, 202 pp., 18°.
Reprinted in Philadelphia. Wickersham, *op. cit.*, 202. Simplifier, like Harris and Fisher. "A production of little merit." Wells, *op. cit.*, 229.
1763. Ash, John. *Grammatical Institutes, or an Easy Introduction to Dr. Lowth's English Grammar*. London, 163 pp., 24°.
First American reprint, 1774, by Hugh Gaine, New York. Evans, 5, 5.
1765. Johnson, Samuel. *An English Grammar; the First Easy Rudiments of Grammar Applied to the English Tongue By One Who is Extremely Desirous to Promote Good Literature in America, and Especially a Right English Education for the Use of Schools*. New York, 36 pp., 12°.
This appears to have been the first English grammar prepared by an American and published in America. Evans, *Am. Bibl.*, 4, 18, 10025. See Chap. II, p. 35.
1766. Burn, John. *A Practical Grammar of the English Language*. Glasgow, 18°.
1767. Buchanan, James. *A Regular English Syntax*. 194 pp., 12°.
First American reprint, 1780. Evans, 6, 68. "A most egregious plagiarism, borrowed from the *British Grammar*, half the volume copied verbatim." Wells, *op. cit.*, 3, 237.
1772. Adam, Alexander. *Latin and English Grammar*. Edinburgh.
"An English Grammar that was connected with Adams's Latin Grammar . . . far more English than Murray's." Wallis, *Com. Sch. J.*, XII, 118.
1773. Byerley, Thomas. *A Plain and Easy Introduction to English Grammar*. New York.
- 177— . Hall, James. *English Grammar*.
Hall founded a school (1778) in Bethany, N. C. He conducted classes in English grammar; wrote and published a book that had wide circulation. Raper, *The Church and Private Schools of North Carolina*, 55, citing Foote's *Sketches*, 336.
1779. Curtis, Abel. *A Compend of English Grammar, Being an Attempt to Point Out the Fundamental Principles of the English Language*. Dresden (Dartmouth College). 49 pp., 16°.
- Benezet, Anthony. *An Essay Toward the Most Easy Introduction to the Knowledge of the English Grammar*. 6 pp., 12°.
Compiled for the Pennsylvania Spelling Book. Evans lists the grammar also as a separate book. Evans, 6, 4.
1784. Webster, Noah, jr. *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language*. In three parts. Part 2, *Containing a Plain and Comprehensive Grammar Grounded on the True Principles and Idioms of the Language*. Hartford. 139 pp., 16°.
- Kenrick, William. *A Rhetorical Grammar of the English Language*. Philadelphia.
1785. Bingham, Caleb. *The Young Ladies Accidence; or a Short and Easy Introduction to English Grammar; Designed Principally for the Use of Young Learners, More Especially Those of the Fair Sex, though Suitable to Both*. Boston, 45 pp., 16°.
1786. Mennye, J. *An English Grammar*. New York.
1787. Ussher, George M. *The Elements of English Grammar*. London.
American edition, 1790, Portsmouth, N. H. Evans, 8, 98. Printed for J. Metcher, especially for young ladies. 3d Am. ed. in 1804, Exeter, N. H.

1787. Harrison, Ralph. Rudiments of English Grammar. Philadelphia, 102 pp., 18°.
Mentioned by Wickersham as one of the first used in Pennsylvania. Hist. of Ed. in Pa., 202. An English book, 9th ed., Philadelphia, 1812.
- 178— [Anonymous.] A Comprehensive Grammar. Philadelphia, 173 pp., 18°. 1789 is date of 3d ed. Evans, 7, 305.
1790. Webster, Noah. The Rudiments of English Grammar. Hartford, 80 pp., 16°.
The Rudiments was first printed as part 2 of the Little Readers' Assistant; then, at the request of the Hartford school authorities, was twice printed as a separate book, in 1790. Evans, 8, 105.
1791. Hutchins, Joseph. An Abstract of the First Principles of English Grammar. Hartford, 24°.
Mentioned by George A. Plimpton. Murray, Hist. of Ed. in N. J., 51. "Compiled for the use of his own school." Title page, Evans, 8, 164.
1792. Alexander, Caleb. A Grammatical System of the English Language. Boston, 96 pp., 12°.
"Comprehending a Plain and Familiar Scheme of Teaching Young Gentlemen and Ladies the Art of Speaking and Writing correctly their Native Tongue." Evans, 8, 242. 10th ed., Keene, N. H., 1814.
- [Anonymous.] The Young Gentlemen and Ladies' Accidence, or a Compendious Grammar of the English Tongue, Plain and Easy. Boston. Attributed to Noah Webster.
- Humphries, Daniel. The Compendious American Grammar, or Grammatical Institutes in Verse. Portsmouth, N. H., 71 pp., 12°.
- Tichnor, Elisha. English Exercises. 2 pp., 18°.
1792 is 3d ed. "All the rules of Parsing . . . facilitates grammatical knowledge." Evans, 8, 363.
1794. Knowles, John. Principles of English Grammar. 3d ed.
1795. Carroll, James. American Criterion of English Grammar. New London, Conn.
— Dearborn, Benjamin. The Columbian Grammar. Boston, 12°.
George A. Plimpton assigns date, 1792. Murray, Hist. of Ed. in N. J., 51. Used the question-and-answer method.
- Miller, Alexander. Concise Grammar of the English Tongue. 119 pp., 12°.
- Murray, Lindley. English Grammar, Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners. London.
1796. An English Grammar.
Barnard lists, by printer; information very fragmentary.
- 179— Bullard, Asa. An Abridgment of Murray's English Grammar, by a Teacher of Youth. Boston.
10th ed. in 1817. Succeeded Bingham's Young Ladies' Accidence in Boston schools.
1897. Burr, Jonathan. A Compendium of English Grammar. Boston, 72 pp., 18°.
1797. Macintosh, Duncan. An Essay on English Grammar. Boston, 239 pp., 8°.
- 179— Marshall. English Grammar.
Written by an American author, contemporary of Webster; date uncertain. Mentioned in Education in New Hampshire, Am. Ann. of Ed. and Ins., 1833, 435.
1799. Stanford, Daniel. A Short but Comprehensive English Grammar. 18°.
2d ed. in 1800, 4th in 1807. "Fell into the traces of Murray." Wallis, Com. Sch. J., 12, 203. Brown says 1st ed. 1807, 96 pp., 12°.
1800. Woodbridge, William. Plain and Concise Grammar.
George A. Plimpton, Hist. of Ed. in N. J., 51.
1801. Gurney, David. English Grammar. Boston, 18°.
2d ed., 1808, Brown. Barnard calls it "Columbian Accidence."
1802. Cochran, Peter. An English Grammar. Boston, 71 pp., 18°.

APPENDIX B.

A COMPARISON OF THE ENGLISH PROGRAMS OF TURNBULL AND FRANKLIN.

TURNBULL.

(From Observations on Liberal Education (1742), 1762, ed., 4-9.)

FRANKLIN.

(Smyth, Writings of Benj. Franklin. II, 391 et seq.)

GRAMMAR.

“One exercise should be daily to write a page of English, and after that to examine every word by the grammar rules, and every sentence they have composed, to oblige them to give an account of the English syntax and construction.”

“The English Language might be taught by Grammar.”

COMPOSITION.

“. . . who thinks it worth while learning to write this (mother tongue)? Every one is suffered to form his own stile by chance; to imitate the first wretched model which falls in his way, before he knows what is faulty, or can relish the beauties of a just simplicity. . . . Right education would have . . . taught them to acquire habits of writing their own language easily under right direction; and this would have been useful to them as long as they lived.”

“The Stiles principally to be cultivated being the clear and the concise. . . . To form their Stile, they should be put on Writing Letters to each other, making Abstracts of what they read; or writing the same Things in their own Words; telling or writing Stories lately read, in their own Expressions. All to be revis'd and corrected by the Tutor.”

LITERATURE.

“I need not advise you to give them a taste of our best poets.”

“Some of our best Writers, as Tilletson, Addison, Pope, Algernon Sidney, Cato's letters, etc., should be classiks.”

SPEAKING.

“. . . obliging them to speak every day their unwritten thought on any subject in English. Let them read an Oration on Tully or Livy . . . then shut the book, and speak the sense of it ex tempore.”

“Repeating Speeches, delivering Orations.”

DECLAMATION.

“Make them read aloud gracefully, an accomplishment that many men . . . cannot perform, because they are either unexperienced or bashful.”

“To form their Pronunciation they may be put on Declamations. . . .


Reading should also be taught and pronouncing, properly, distincting, emphatically.”

FOR PROFESSIONS.

“Where is *English* taught at present? Who thinks of it of use to study correctly the language which he is to use in daily life? . . . It is in this that nobility and gentry defend their country; . . . it is in this that lawyers plead, the divines instruct, and all ranks of people write their letters and transact all their affairs.”

“It is therefore propos'd that they learn those Things that are likely to be *most useful*. . . . Regard being had to the several Professions for which they are intended.”

Between the passages in Turnbull and in the proposals of Franklin there is one striking dissimilarity. The former is outspoken in his condemnation of Latin as a medium of universal education. Franklin, who in other places voices the same sentiment, in his proposals contents himself merely with strong emphasis upon English as the “most useful” and “most natural.” Smyth, *op. cit.*, 386-96. The explanation is simple: Turnbull was writing a book frankly to substitute the vernacular and the realities for classical instruction, while Franklin was propounding the program for a school he wished to establish. The former could afford to denounce the opposition, the latter could not. As always the practical man is cautious, conciliatory, compromising. The student of Franklin's early advocacy of the mother tongue is frequently struck by the extreme diplomacy with which he sought to bring it forward.



LIST OF AUTHORITIES CITED IN THIS DISSERTATION.

I. PRIMARY SOURCES.

A. COLONY AND STATE LAWS, ARCHIVES, RECORDS, AND SCHOOL DOCUMENTS.

- Connecticut. Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut (1636-1776). Compiled by J. H. Trumbull and C. J. Hoadley. 15 vols. Hartford, 1850-90.
- Acts and Laws of the State of Connecticut in America. Hartford, printed by Hudson & Goodwin, 1796.
- Delaware. Laws of the State of Delaware from the 14th day of October, 1700, to the 18th day of August, 1797. In 2 vols. Vol. II, Samuel and John Adams. New Castle, 1747.
- Louisiana. A New Digest of the Statute Laws of the State of Louisiana to 1841, inclusive. Compiled by Bullard and Curry. Vol. I. New Orleans, E. Johns & Co., 1842.
- Maine. The Revised Statutes of the State of Maine, Passed October 22, 1840. Augusta, William R. Smith & Co., 1841.
- Massachusetts. Acts and Resolves, Passed by the Legislature of Massachusetts in the Year 1839, 1841. Published by the Secretary of the Commonwealth. Dutton and Wentworth, Boston, 1839 and 1841.
- The Perpetual Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts from the Establishment of its Constitution to the Second Session of the General Court, in 1798. In 2 vols. Vol. II, Isaiah Thomas. Worcester, 1799.
- Laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Dutton and Wentworth. Vols. X and XIII. Boston, 1828 and 1836.
- Records of the Town of Braintree, 1640 to 1793. Edited by Samuel A. Bates. Randolph, Mass., 1886.
- The Records of the Town of Cambridge (formerly Newtowne), Massachusetts, 1630-1703. Cambridge, 1901.
- Watertown Records, prepared for publication by the Historical Society. Vols. 1-4. Watertown, 1894.
- Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society. First series, 10 vols. Boston, 1792-1809. Reprinted, 1806, 1809.
- Annual Reports of the Board of Education, together with Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Board. Boston, 1837-52.
- Boston. Rules of the School Committee and Regulations of the Public Schools, etc. City Documents, Nos. 22, 23, 28, 40. Boston, 1841, '46, '47.
- Springfield. Reports of the School Committee for 1853-61. Springfield, 1854-62.
- Massachusetts Bay. Records of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay in New England (1628-86). Edited by N. B. Shurtleff. 5 vols. Boston, 1853-4.
- Acts and Resolves, Public and Private, of the Province of Massachusetts Bay (1692-1780). Vols. I, II. Boston, 1869-1910.
- Michigan. System of Public Instruction and Primary School Law. Prepared by Francis W. Shearman. Lansing, 1852.
- Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1855, '56, '57. Lansing, 1858.

- New Hampshire. Annual Reports upon the Common Schools of New Hampshire. Vols. 1-9, 1847-51. Concord, 1852-6.
- Documents and Records Relating to the Province, Town, and State of New Hampshire (1623-1800). Edited by N. Bouton and others. 31 vols. Concord, 1867-1907.
- Laws of New Hampshire. Edited by Albert S. Batchelor. Vol. 1, Province Period. Manchester, N. H., 1904.
- The Laws of the State of New Hampshire, Together with the Declaration of Independence, etc. Portsmouth, printed by the order of the General Court, John Melcher, 1792.
- The Laws of the State of New Hampshire, with the Constitutions, etc. Exeter, published by authority, C. Norris & Co., 1815.
- New Haven. Records of the Colony and Plantation of New Haven from 1638 to 1649. By Charles Hoadley. Hartford, 1857.
- New Jersey. Archives of the State of New Jersey. Edited by W. A. Whitehead and others. 1st series, documents relating to the colonial history (1631-1800), 27 vols.
- New York. Annual Reports of the Regents of the University of New York. Albany, 1837-73.
- Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Common Schools. Albany, 1830-52.
- Columbia University. Charters, Acts, and Official Documents, etc. Compiled by John B. Pine. New York, printed for the college, 1895.
- Albany Co., N. Y. The Annals of Albany. By Joel Munsell. Albany, 1850-59.
- Laws of the State of New York, Passed at the Sessions of the Legislature, 1797, '98, '99, and 1800, inclusive. Republished by the Secretary of State, 1885. Vol. IV. Albany, Weed, Parsons & Co., 1887.
- Laws of the State of New York, Passed at the 50th Session of the Legislature (1827). Albany, printed by E. Crosswell, 1827.
- Ohio. Annual Reports of the Secretary of State on the Condition of Common Schools. 1848. 1851, '52, '53, '54, '55, '56, '57, '58. Columbus, 1849, 1852, '53, '54, '55, '56, '57, '58, '59.
- Cincinnati. Common School Report for Years 1860-62. Cincinnati, 1860-62.
- Pennsylvania. Laws of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania (1854). Harrisburg, A. B. Hamilton, 1854.
- Reports of the Superintendent of Common Schools. Harrisburg, 1851-55.
- Colonial Records (1683-1790). Philadelphia and Harrisburg, published by the State, 1851-53.
- Plymouth. Records of the Colony of New Plymouth in New England (1620-90). Edited by N. B. Shurtleff and others. 12 vols. Boston, 1855-61.
- Vermont. Annual Reports of the Secretary of the Vermont Board of Education. 1858. Burlington, 1858.
- Annual Reports of the Common Schools, 1847, '48, '49, '51. St. Albans, 1857, '58, '59, Montpelier, 1851.
- Laws of the State of Vermont to the Close of the Session of the Legislature in the Year 1816. Vols. I, III, Fay, Davidson & Burt. Rutland, 1817.
- Virginia. The Statutes at Large of Virginia, from October Session, 1792. to December Session, 1806, inclusive. In 3 vols. Vol. III by Samuel Shephard. Richmond, 1836.

B. CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL TREATISES.

- Ascham, Roger. *The Schoolmaster: or a Plain and Perfect Way of Teaching Children to Understand, Write, and Speak the Latin Tongue.* (1591.) James Upton, A. M. ed. London, 1711.
- Ash, John. *Sentiments on Education, Collected from the Best Writers.* 2 vols. London, 1777.
- Brinsley, John. *Ludus Literaris, or The Grammar Schoole; Shewing How To Proceed from the First Entrance into Learning, etc.* (1612.) London, imprinted by Felix Kyngston for Richard Meighen, 1627.
- Carlisle, Nicholas. *A Concise Description of the Endowed Grammar Schools in England and Wales, etc.* Vol. I. London, Baldwin, Craddock & Jay, 1818.
- Carter, James G. *Letters to the Hon. William Prescott on the Schools of New England, with Remarks on the Principles of Instruction.* Boston, 1824.
- Comenius, Johann Amos. *The Great Didactic of John Amos Comenius; now for the First Time Englished, etc., by M. W. Keating.* London, 1896.
- Fordyce, David. *Dialogues Concerning Education.* 2d ed. London, 1745.
- Franklin, Benjamin. *The Works of Benjamin Franklin.* By Jared Sparks. 10 vols. Boston, 1840.
- *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin; Collected and Edited, with a Life and Introduction, by Albert H. Smyth.* Vol. II, X. New York, London, 1905-7.
- Herbart, Johann F. *Outlines of Educational Doctrine.* Translated by Alexis F. Lange . . . annotated by Charles DeGarmo. New York, London, 1901.
- Hoole, Charles. *A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching School.* Reprint. Introduction and notes by T. Mark. Syracuse, 1912.
- Locke, John. *Some Thoughts Concerning Education.* (1693.) 6th ed. enl. London, 1709.
- Mulcaster, Richard. *(The) Educational Writings of . . . (1532-1611), etc.* James Oliphant, ed. Glasgow, 1903.
- Priestley, Joseph. *Miscellaneous Observations relating to Education, etc.* London, 1778.
- Seager, F. *The Schoole of Vertue, and book of good Nourture for Chyl dren, and Youth to learne theyr dutie by, etc.* London, 1557. Reprinted, *The Babees Book*, Frederick J. Furnivall, M. A., ed. London, 1868.
- Sheridan, Thomas. *British Education: or, The Source of the Disorders of Great Britain, being An Essay towards proving that the Immorality, Ignorance, and false Tastes, are the natural and necessary Consequences of the present Defective System of Education, etc.* London, 1754.
- Turnbull, George. *Observations upon Liberal Education in all its Branches, etc.* London, 1742.
- Walker, William. *Some Improvements To the Art of Teaching, Especially in the First Grounding of a Young Scholar in Grammar-Learning.* London, 1730.
- Wynne, R. *Essays on Education by Milton, Locke, and the Authors of the Spectator, etc.* London, 1761.

C. TEXTBOOKS IN GRAMMAR.¹

- Alexander, Caleb. *A Grammatical System of the English Language: Comprehending a Plain and Familiar Scheme of Teaching Young Gentlemen and Ladies the Art of Writing and Speaking Correctly their Native Tongue.* 1792. 5th ed. Boston, 1799.

¹ Various other minor texts consulted, named in Appendix B.

- [Anonymous.] *The British Grammar, or an Essay in Four Parts, Towards Speaking and Writing the English Language Grammatically and Inditing Elegantly.* London, 1760. Edition 1762.
- [Anonymous.] *A Grammar of the English Tongue, with the Arts of Logic, Rhetoric, Poetry, etc., giving the Grounds and Reasons of Grammar in General.* London, published by John Brightland for the use of schools of Great Britain and Ireland, 1706. 7th ed., 1746.
- Brown, Goold. *The Institutes of English Grammar, Methodically Arranged, with Examples for Parsing, Questions for Examination, False Syntax for Correction, Exercises for Writing, etc.* New York, 1823. Stereotype ed., New York, 1833.
- *Grammar of English Grammars.* New York, 1850.
- *The First Lines of English Grammar; Being a Brief Abstract of the Author's Larger Work. Designed for Young Learners.* New York, 1826.
- Bullion, Peter. *The Principles of English Grammar, Comprising the Substance of the Most Approved English Grammars Extant, with Copious Exercises in Parsing and Syntax.* New York, 1834. 5th ed., New York, 1843.
- Dilworth, Thomas. *A New Guide to the English Tongue, Containing a Short but Comprehensive Grammar of the English Tongue.* London, 1740. Boston, printed for J. Perkins, 1771.
- Fisher, A. *A Practical New Grammar, with Exercises of Bad English, or, an Easy Guide to Speaking and Writing the English Language Properly and Correctly.* London, 1752. 10th ed., 1765.
- Greene, Samuel S. *A Treatise on the Structure of the English Language, or the Analysis and Classification of Sentences and their Component Parts.* Boston, 1847. Edition, H. Cooperthwaite & Co., Philadelphia, 1857.
- Greenwood, James. *An Essay Towards a Practical English Grammar, etc.* London, 1706. 2d ed., 1722.
- Johnson, Samuel. *A Dictionary of the English Language . . . To which are Prefixed a History of the Language, and an English Grammar.* London, 1775.
- Jonson, Ben. *The English Grammar, made by Ben Jonson for the Benefit of all Strangers out of his Observation of the English Language now Spoken and in Use.* London, 1640. Reprint, Alice V. Waite, ed., New York, 1909.
- Kirkham, Samuel. *English Grammar in Familiar Lectures: Embracing a New and Systematic Order of Parsing, a New System of Punctuation, Exercises in False Syntax, etc.* New York, 1823. 45th ed., Rochester, N. Y., 1839.
- Lilly, William. *A Short Introduction of Grammar.* London, 1542. 1726 ed., John Ward, ed. London, 1726.
- Lowth, Robert. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar, with Critical Notes.* London, 1762.
- Murray, Lindley. *English Grammar Adapted to the Different Classes of Learners.* London, 1795. From 28th English ed., Utica, N. Y., 1822.
- Priestley, Joseph. *The Rudiments of English Grammar.* 3d ed., London, 1772.
- Smith, Roswell C. *English Grammar on the Productive System: a Method of Instruction Recently Adopted in Germany and Switzerland.* Boston, 1832. Stereotyped ed., Philadelphia, 1838.
- Staniford, Daniel. *A Short but Comprehensive Grammar, Rendered Simple and Easy by Familiar Questions and Answers, Adapted to the Capacity of Youth.* Boston, 1797.
- Webster, Noah. *A Grammatical Institute of the English Language; comprising an Easy, Concise and Systematic Method of Education. Part 2. Containing a Plain and Comprehensive Grammar, Grounded on the True Prin-*

ciples and Idioms of the Language. Hartford, 1784. 6th Connecticut ed., Hartford, 1800.

Wells, William H. A Grammar of the English Language, for the Use of Schools. Andover, 1846. Cleveland, Ohio, ed., 1852.

Wharton, J. A New English-Grammar: Containing all Rules and Directions Necessary to be Known for the Judicious Reading, Right Speaking and Writing of Letters, Syllables, and Words in the English Tongue, etc. London, 1655.

D. MISCELLANEOUS.

American Annals of Education and Instruction. Ed. by William C. Woodbridge. Vols. I-VIII. Boston, 1831-7.

American Journal of Education. Ed. by Henry Barnard. Vols. 4, 5, 13, 14, 15, 24, 27. Hartford, Conn., 1857, '58, '63, '64, '65, '73, '77.

American Journal of Education. Ed. by Horace Mann. Vols. I-V. Boston, 1826-30.

An Account of the Charity Schools Lately Erected in Great Britain and Ireland with the Benefactions Thereto, etc. 9th ed. (Joseph Downing), London, 1710.

Common School Journal. Ed. by Horace Mann. Vols. 1-10; by William B. Fowle, Vols. 11 to 14, inclusive. Boston, 1839-52.

Coon, Charles L. North Carolina Schools and Academies, 1790-1840. A Documentary History. Raleigh, 1915.

Evans, Charles. American Bibliography, a Chronological Dictionary of all the Books, Pamphlets, and Periodical Publications Printed in the United States of America, etc., 1639-1820. 8 vols., 1639-1792. Chicago, printed privately by the author, 1903-14.

Franklin, Benjamin. The Autobiography, 1771. Nathaniel Griffin, ed. Chicago, 1915.

Glimpses of Colonial Society and the Life at Princeton College, 1766-1773. By one of the class of 1763 (William Patterson). Ed. by W. J. Mills. Philadelphia and London, 1903.

Jones, Hugh. The Present State of Virginia. London, 1724. New York, reprinted for J. Sabin, 1865.

Parsons, Mrs. Elsie W. (Clews). Educational Legislation and Administration of the Colonial Governments. New York, 1899.

Winterbotham, Rev. W. American Schools and Education, Contemporaneous Account, 1796. Reprinted from Barnard's Am. J. of Ed., 24 (1873), 136-57.

II. SECONDARY AUTHORITIES.

A. HISTORIES OF EDUCATION, BIOGRAPHIES OF EDUCATORS, HISTORIES OF INSTITUTIONS.

Anderson, Lewis F. History of the Common School Education. New York, 1909.

Barnard, Henry. American Educational Biography. Memoirs of Teachers, Educators, etc. First published in 1859; Bardeen reprint, Syracuse, N. Y., 1874.

Battle, Kemp P. History of the University of North Carolina. 2 vols. Raleigh, N. C., 1907.

Beardsley, E. Edwards. Life and Correspondence of Samuel Johnson, D. D. New York, 1874.

- Birchenough, Charles. *History of Elementary Education in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day.* London, 1914.
- Boese, Thomas. *Public Education in the City of New York; its History, Condition, and Statistics.* New York, 1869.
- Boone, Richard C. *Education in the United States, its History from the Earliest Settlements.* New York, 1899.
- Bronson, Walter C. *The History of Brown University, 1764-1914.* The University, Providence, R. I., 1914.
- Brown, Elmer E. *The Making of Our Middle Schools, etc.* New York (1903). 2d ed., London and Bombay, 1905.
- Bush, George C. *A History of Education in the United States.* New York and London, 1898.
- Dexter, Edwin C. *A History of Education in the United States.* New York and London, 1904.
- Dulles, Charles W. *The Charity School of 1740; the Foundation of the University of Pennsylvania.* From the *University of Pennsylvania Medical Bulletin*, Philadelphia, 1904.
- Hazlitt, W. Carew. *Schools, School Books, and Schoolmasters.* London, 1888.
- Heathwole, Cornelius J. *A History of Education in Virginia.* New York, 1916.
- Hinsdale, Burke A. *Horace Mann and the Common School Revival in the United States.* New York, 1898.
- Hodgson, Geraldine T. *Rationalist English Educators.* London [etc.], Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. New York, 1912.
- Hough, Franklin B. *Historical and Statistical Record of the University of the State of New York, 1784-1884.* New York, 1885.
- Jenks, Henry F. *Catalogue and Historical Sketch of the Boston Public Latin School.* Boston, 1886.
- Kemp, William W. *The Support of Schools in Colonial New York by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.* New York, 1913.
- Laurie, Simon S. *John Amos Comenius, Bishop of the Moravians; his Life and Educational Works.* Boston, 1885.
- Leach, Arthur F. *English Schools at the Reformation, 1546-8.* Westminster, 1896.
- Littlefield, George E. *Early Schools and School Books of New England.* Boston, printed by the Club of Odd Volumes, 1914.
- McCrary, Edward. *Education in South Carolina Prior to and During the Revolution.* Historical Society of South Carolina, Charleston, S. C., 1883.
- Maclean, John. *History of the College of New Jersey, from its Origin in 1746 to the Commencement of 1854.* 2 vols. 1877.
- Mark, Harry. *An Outline of the History of Educational Theories in England.* Syracuse, N. Y., 1899.
- Martin, George H. *The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System.* New York, N. Y., 1894.
- Meriwether, Colyer. *Our Colonial Curriculum.* Washington, D. C., Capital Publishing Co., 1907.
- Monroe, Will S. *Comenius and the Beginnings of Educational Reform.* London, 1900.
- Montgomery, Thomas H. *A History of the University of Pennsylvania from its Foundation to A. D. 1770.* Philadelphia, 1900.
- Murray, David. *History of Education in New Jersey.* Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1899.
- Powell, Lyman P. *The History of Education in Delaware.* Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1893.
- Quick, Robert H. *Essays on Educational Reformers, etc.* Cincinnati, 1885.

- Quincy, Josiah. *History of Harvard University*. 2 vols. Cambridge, 1840.
- Rice, J. M. *The Public School System of the United States*. New York, 1893.
- Slafter, Carlos. *A Record of Education. The Schools and Teachers of Dedham, Massachusetts, 1644-1904*. Dedham, Mass., privately printed, Dedham Transcript Press, 1905.
- Small, Walter H. *Early New England Schools*. Ed. by W. H. Eddy. Boston & London, 1914.
- Steiner, Bernard G. *History of Education in Maryland*. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1894.
- Swett, John. *American Public Schools, History and Pedagogics*. New York, 1900.
- Thorp, Francis N. *Benjamin Franklin and the University of Pennsylvania*. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1893.
- Tolman, William H. *History of Higher Education in Rhode Island*. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1894.
- Updegraff, Harlan. *The Origin of the Moving School in Massachusetts*. New York, 1907.
- Watson, Foster. *The Beginnings of the Teaching of Modern Subjects in England*. London, 1909.
- *The English Grammar Schools to 1660; their Curriculum and Practice*. Cambridge, England, 1908.
- Wickersham, James P. *A History of Education in Pennsylvania*. Lancaster, 1886.
- Wood, George B. *The History of the University of Pennsylvania, from its Origin to the Year 1827*. In *Memoirs of the Pennsylvania Historical Society*, 3, 169-280. Philadelphia, 1834.

B. STATE AND LOCAL HISTORIES.

- Atwater, Edward F. *History of the Colony of New Haven to its Absorption into Connecticut*. New York, 1881.
- Bailey, S. L. *Historical Sketches of Andover, Massachusetts*. Boston, 1880.
- Bicknell, Thomas W. *A History of Barrington, Rhode Island*. Providence, 1898.
- Corey, Deloraine P. *The History of Malden, Massachusetts, 1633-1785*. Malden, published by the Author, 1899.
- Currier, John J. *History of Newbury, Massachusetts, 1625-1902*. Boston, 1902.
- Felt, Joseph B. *Annals of Salem*. 2 vols., 2d ed. Boston, 1845.
- Judd, Sylvester. *History of Hadley, Massachusetts*. Northampton, 1863.
- Love, William D. *The Colonial History of Hartford, Gathered from the Original Records, etc.* Hartford, 1914.
- Mann, H. *Historical Annals of Dedham, from its Settlement, 1635, to 1847*. Dedham, 1847.
- Nash, Gilbert. *Historical Sketch of the Town of Weymouth, Massachusetts, from 1622 to 1884, etc.* Boston, 1885.
- Orcutt, William D. *Good Old Dorchester, A Narrative History of the Town, 1630-1893*. Cambridge, 1893.
- Proud, Robert. *The History of Pennsylvania, in North America, from the Original Institution and Settlement, etc., Written Principally between the Years 1776-1780*. 2 vols. Philadelphia, 1797.
- Temple, J. H., and Sheldon, George. *A History of the Town of Northfield, Massachusetts, for 150 years, etc.* Albany, N. Y., 1875.
- Winthrop, John. *The History of New England from 1630 to 1649*. New ed. by James Savage. 2 vols. Boston, 1853.

C. MONOGRAPHS AND ARTICLES.

- Barbour, F. A. *The Teaching of English Grammar; History and Method.* Boston, 1902.
- Barnard, Henry. *First Public Schools of New England.* *American Journal of Education*, I; 27, 39, 97, 105, 121.
- *History of the Common Schools of Connecticut.* *American Journal of Education*, IV; 657-70; and V; 114-54.
- Broome, G. C. *A Historical and Critical Discussion of College Admission Requirements.* New York, 1903. (Columbia University Contributions, V, Nos. 3-4.)
- Bush, George C. *First Common Schools in New England.* Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1898. (U. S. Bureau of Education. Circular of Information No. 3.)
- Fitzpatrick, Edward A. *The Educational Views and Influence of De Witt Clinton.* New York, 1911.
- Germantown Academy; *Centennial Anniversary of the Foundation.* Philadelphia, 1860. (A pamphlet.)
- Inglis, Alexander J. *The Rise of the High School in Massachusetts.* New York, 1911.
- Jernegan, Marcus W. *The Beginnings of Public Education in New England.* *School Review*, XXIII; 319-30, 361-80.
- Snow, Louis F. *The College Curriculum in the United States.* New York, 1907.
- Updegraff, Harlan. *The Origin of the Moving School in Massachusetts.* New York, 1907.


D. MISCELLANEOUS.


- Bigelow, John. *The Life of Benjamin Franklin, etc.* 3d ed. 3 vols. Philadelphia, 1893.
- Dexter, F. B. *Influences of the English Universities in the Development of New England.* *In Proceedings Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1879-80.
- Eggleston, Edward. *The Transit of Civilization from England to America in The Seventeenth Century.* New York, 1901.
- Fithian, Philip V. *Journal and letters, 1767-1774; Student at Princeton College, 1770-72, etc.* Ed. by John R. Williams, Princeton, for the University Library, 1900.
- Ford, Paul L. *The New England Primer; a History of its Origin and Development, etc.* New York, 1897.
- Hinsdale, B. A. *Foreign Influence on Education in the United States.* *In Annual Report of the U. S. Commissioner of Education*, 1897.
- Huey, Edmund B. *The Psychology and Pedagogy of Reading, etc.* New York, 1908.
- Tuer, Andrew W. *History of the Horn-Book.* London, The Leadenhall Press, 1907.
- Monroe, Paul, *ed.* *A Cyclopedia of Education.* Vols. 1-5. New York, 1911.
- Reeder, Rudolph R. *The Historical Development of School Readers and Method in Teaching Reading.* New York, 1900.


INDEX.


- Academy and Charity School of Philadelphia, history, 38, 43-49; influence, 49-55.
- Alcott, William A., on study of grammar, 148.
- Barnard, Henry, and reform in study of grammar, 142-143, 150-151.
- Bearing of grammar on modern problems, 8-10.
- Beginnings of grammar, 8.
- Bible, emphasis on instruction, New England colonies, 16-17.
- Bibliography, 155-168.
- Bingham, Caleb, school in Boston, 78-79; textbook, 79, 81.
- Blackboard, use, 149.
- Boston, Mass., introduction of grammar in schools, 25.
- Brinsley, John, on memorizing rules, 113, 117; parsing, 120; study of Latin, 109.
- Brosius, Rev. Francis, school in Boston, 149.
- Brown, Gould, on grammar as an art, 107, 111, 114; memorizing rules, 138-139; parsing, 121; textbooks, 84.
- Brown University, *See* Rhode Island College.
- Buchanan, James, on study of grammar, 114.
- Byerley, Thomas, methods of teaching grammar, 129-130.
- Carew, Richard, on teaching English, 59.
- Charity schools, Great Britain and Ireland, curriculum, 14.
- Clajon, William, and instruction in English grammar at Annapolis, Md., 30.
- Colburn, Warren, series of readers, 140-141.
- Colet, on study of Latin, 107-109, 111.
- College of New Jersey. *See* Princeton College.
- Colleges. American, early instruction in grammar, 36-42. *See also* Higher education.
- Colonial schools, reading and writing stressed, 17-18.
- Colonies, educational treatises, 55-56.
- Columbia College, early instruction in grammar, 37. *See also* King's College.
- Connecticut, legislation regarding grammar, 74.
- Constructive work, 149-153.
- Coote, Edmund, vernacular textbook for "pettie" schools, 12-13.
- Curriculum, Franklin's academy, 45-46; influence, adding grammar to, 43-69.
- Dame schools, New England, 18-19.
- Educational theories supporting grammar in America up to 1775, 55-69.
- Educational treatises in the colonies, 55-56.
- England, character of vernacular instruction (1596-1622), 12-15.
- English grammar, before 1775, 21-33; before 1784, 33-36; before 1800, chronological catalogue, 155-157; early appearance in America, 21-42; intensive study, 6-8.
- "English grammar school," earliest uses of the name, 24-25.
- English schools, significance of rise, 76-77.
- English tongue, standardizing and preserving, 61-66.
- English vernacular, early instruction, 11-12.
- False syntax, 122-124.
- Formalism in grammar, protest, 143.
- Fowle, William B., on influence of Webster and Bingham, 79; study of English grammar, 131; study of grammar, 147, 149.
- Franklin, Benjamin, on instruction in English, 65; influence of his school, 49-55; scheme for English academy in Philadelphia, 49-55.
- Franklin and Turnbull, comparison of English programs, 158-159.
- Georgia, instruction in grammar, 31-32.
- Germantown Union School, Pa., instruction in grammar, 28.
- Gough, William, school in South Carolina considered doubtful, 31.
- Grammar, definitions, 105-107. *See also* English grammar.
- Greenwood, James, on study of English grammar, 112.
- Griffith, John, announcement of instruction in English grammar, 25.
- Harvard College, early instruction in grammar, 37-38.
- High schools, status of grammar in 1867, 101.
- Higher education for the masses in 1650 and in 1750, 66-67. *See also* Colleges.
- Hoole, Charles, description of vernacular instruction at the end of the sixteenth century, 13-14.
- Hughes, Hugh, methods of teaching grammar, 128-129.
- Inductive approach, agents and agencies, 140-143.
- Inductive movement, applied to grammar, chief features, 144-153.
- Instruction, absence of grammatical, in English, 24; revolt against meaningless, 144-146; visual and oral, 146-149.
- Johnson, William, English grammar school, in Charleston, S. C., 32, 64.
- Jones, Hugh, first American author of a textbook in English grammar, 33, 36-37.
- King's College, first advertisement of English instruction, 64; instruction in grammar, 36-37. *See also* Columbia College.
- Kirkham, Samuel, popularity of textbooks, 134-135; textbooks, 84, 87.
- Lancastrian system, 114-115.
- Latin, burden of learning, 56-58; revolt against, headed by John Locke, 11.
- Latin and rote periods, summary of methods, 130-131.
- Latin grammar, methods of study in seventeenth century, 107-111; traditional methods of teaching transferred to English grammar, 103-131.

- Latin methods, carried directly to English grammar, 111-120.
- Legislative recognition of grammar, 70-77.
- List of authorities cited, 161-168.
- Locke, John, and revolt against the Latin curriculum, 11-12.
- Lowth, Robert, on false syntax, 123; learning grammar, 113-114.
- Mann, Horace, and reform in study of grammar, 142-145, 147.
- Maryland, instruction in grammar, 30, 53.
- Massachusetts, education in Colonial period, 15-17; instruction in grammar, 71-73; legislation regarding grammar, 85-87; textbooks in grammar, 85-87.
- May, Samuel J., on early use of blackboards, 149.
- Memorization, rules, 113-116; devices to aid, 116-118.
- Methods before 1850, gradual changes, 132-154.
- Methods used in grammar schools, New York, 128-130.
- Michigan, instruction in grammar, 98-99.
- Milton, John, on teaching English, 59.
- Murray, Lindley, on false syntax, 124; memorizing rules, 117; textbooks, 79-80, 83-84.
- New England, early education, 15-17; legislation regarding grammar, 70-73; rapid rise of grammar after Revolution, 70-76; teaching grammar before 1775, 23-25.
- New England Primer, first book printed, 19.
- New Hampshire, instruction in grammar, 88, 97-98; legislation regarding grammar, 74-75.
- New Jersey, instruction in grammar, 26-28, 94-95.
- New York, first legislation to definitely speak of grammar, 73-74; grammar as part of curriculum of academies, 82-85; instruction in grammar, 25-26, 95-96; methods of teaching grammar, 128-130 textbooks in grammar, 83-85.
- North Carolina, instruction in grammar, 90-92.
- Ohio, instruction in grammar, 96-97, 88-90.
- Oratory, instruction, 61-63, 65.
- Parsing, 120-122. *See also* False syntax.
- Pennsylvania, instruction in grammar, 29-30, 92-93; Pestalozzianism, and Roswell C. Smith, 135-138; criticisms by Gould Brown, 137-138.
- "Pettie schools," vernacular textbook, 12-13.
- Philadelphia Academy. *See* Academy and Charity School of Philadelphia.
- Princeton College, instruction in grammar, 38-39.
- Priestly, Joseph, argument for simplicity in teaching grammar, 119; false syntax, 124.
- Purposes of the study, 5-6.
- Queen's College, instruction in grammar, 40.
- Rand, Asa, on memorizing rules, 114.
- Rapid rise of English grammar after 1775, 70-102.
- Ray, James, on study of grammar, 148.
- Revolution, rapid rise of grammar after, 70.
- Rhode Island College, instruction in grammar, 39-40.
- Rate periods and Latin, summary of methods, 130-131.
- Rules of grammar. *See* Memorization.
- Rutgers College. *See* Queen's College.
- Schoolmasters teaching English grammar before 1775, 21-33.
- Schools and schoolmasters, teaching grammar before 1775, 21-33.
- Seventeenth century, education in the classics, 11.
- Sheridan, Thomas, on revival of the art of speaking, etc., 61-63.
- Simplifying terms, 118-119.
- Smith, *Provost*, on English instruction, 65.
- Smith, Roswell C., textbook, 84, 87, 135.
- See also* Pestalozzianism.
- Somerset Academy, Maryland, 53.
- South Carolina, first school teaching the mother tongue "grammatically," 43.
- Standardizing and preserving the English tongue, 61-66.
- Status of grammar (1850-1870), 92-102.
- Steele, Richard, on instruction in grammar, 58.
- Textbooks, flood after 1784, 77-82; in Colonies, 68-69; nature of dominating (1823-1850), 134-140; representative States (1800-1850), 82-92.
- See also* Bibliography.
- Turnbull and Franklin, comparison of English programs, 158-159.
- University of North Carolina, early instruction in grammar, 40-41.
- University of the State of New York, regents' report on English grammar, 73.
- Vermont, instruction in grammar, 87-88; legislation regarding grammar, 73.
- Vernacular instruction, character in America (1620-1720), 17-20; character in England, (1596-1622), 12-15; reasons for early emphasis in America, 15-17.
- Vernacular school, first important, 8.
- Virginia, instruction in grammar, 31-32.
- Visual and oral instruction, 146-149.
- Ward, Joseph, on absence of grammatical instruction in English, 24; value of English to masses, 59.
- Ward, William, on memorizing rules, 115.
- Wassamacaw, S. C., first school teaching mother tongue "grammatically," 43.
- Waterland, William, teacher of grammar in South Carolina, 31.
- Watson, William, on school in Charleston, S. C., 60.
- Webster, Noah, rhetorical school in Hartford, Conn., 77; textbooks, 77-78.
- Wells, William H., on oral instruction in grammar, 147-148.
- Woodbridge, William C., on study of grammar, 142-143.









RETURN TO the circulation desk of any
University of California Library
or to the

NORTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
Bldg. 400, Richmond Field Station
University of California
Richmond, CA 94804-4698

ALL BOOKS MAY BE RECALLED AFTER 7 DAYS
2-month loans may be renewed by calling
(415) 642-6753

1-year loans may be recharged by bringing books
to NRLF

Renewals and recharges may be made 4 days
prior to due date

DUE AS STAMPED BELOW

JAN 21 1992

AUG 09 1994

YC 48987.

