

to show it to be non essential to the simple statement; merely tell the pupil to translate the ablative under the circumstances as though in the nominative; nor need it be added that the construction expresses time, cause, manner, and means, concession, condition or attendant circumstances. Again, in teaching the gerund and the gerundive, unless your aim is scientific fulness and accuracy, don't teach the latter as the future participle passive, and don't try to translate them literally, especially seeing that these points are in such dispute among scholars. The rule for translation is sufficient: Render, first, the nominative or (without a preposition) the accusative by "eo and so must be praised, etc."—if of the gerundive; "he (we, etc.) must obey, etc."—if of the gerund. Second, the genitive, dative, and ablative of either by "of praising or obeying," "to or for praising or obeying," "with from or by praising or obeying." Besides these points of syntax there are at least two forms that are taught, it must be, solely for the sake of scientific completeness, being almost useless for ordinary reading purposes. I mean the imperative mood and the vocative case. Both of these are, to say the least, exceedingly scarce outside Leighton, Harkness, etc. I don't think we have met a single instance of either in our two books of Cæsar. Even if there is one, is the pupil to be compelled, by its recurrence in his exercises, to carry it in his memory from away back at page 74 in Leighton? The imperative mood and the vocative case are necessary to a just and comprehensive view of Latin grammar; they are not necessary to reading Cæsar. I have yet to speak of the two most important subjects in which the grammatical aim appears dominant. The one is the use of the cases, the other the use of the subjunctive.

In both, if the reading aim is the one proposed, much of the formal classification and definition invariably given may be dispensed with at first. As for the former—the uses of the cases—it is sufficient to tell the pupil first, that, generally speaking, the genitive is to be translated "of so and so;" the dative, "to or for;" the ablative, "with, from or by;" that often, however, a different preposition has to be used. Second, as the way to decide the right preposition on any occasion, the pupil must always ask himself a certain question: "Vir summo ingenio—what has the great ability" to do with "the man?" "A man?" "of great ability," "possessed of," "with," "having;" any preposition whatever that will express the relation. This relation or meaning I find they see clearly and readily enough, even though, perhaps, they can't always name it exactly. Similarly with "profectus est Romam." What has "Rome" to do with his setting out?

Knowing that "from" requires the ablative, no pupil will go astray. "Differunt inter se legibus institutisque" if they apply their stock question they will easily translate this; and they will be anything but helped in translating by being told and required to remember that this is "the Ablative of Respect or Specification," and by then being led to put this along with the other uses of the accusative in a formal classification to be thoroughly memorized. Then "Longam vitam vixit," or "Ciceronem consulem creaverunt." Why, if mere reading is the end and object, why spend time bringing the pupil to see and name them as "the Cognate Accusative—the double accusative of two persons?" Solely, it must be answered, in order to develop grammatical skill. Lastly, the uses of the subjunctive. Leighton, after telling the pupil that the subjunctive is used