

stances, if we do not weary the reader will irrefutably prove this.

To begin with the definition of an adjective (p. 28) is adapted from the old edition of Mason, and is quite different in form from that given in the new one. Mason calls *a* or *an* a Quantitative Adjective; in Miller's Swinton, it is called a Demonstrative one. On page 46 we have the statement that there are *two kinds* of phrases, instead of three, and the basis of the classification is not given. On page 52 we have an explanation of "complete" and "incomplete" verbs which, though quite rational, is altogether different from what is found in Mason. The latter author always speaks of verbs of *complete* or *incomplete* predication, and it is desirable that the phraseology, if possible, should have been retained. On page 57 *he, she, and it*, are called demonstrative pronouns, which is in harmony with Mason, but is probably a faulty classification. On page 58 we have the statement that the various *forms* taken by a pronoun are called *its cases*. A pupil would be apt to conclude from this that the pronoun *it* has only *two* cases. Again, on page 68 we have a definition of a "Compound Tense"—which is different altogether from Mason's. Moreover, it does not show what is necessary to make up a compound tense. Mason has nine primary tenses, and three of continued action. Here we have only six. The definitions on p. 75 do not harmonize in form with those of Mason. On page 79 we have the statement that there are three participles in English—the Present, the Past, and the Perfect. On pages 76, 147 they are called Imperfect, Perfect, and Compound Perfect—different names, quite unnecessary to apply to the Participles, and inevitably confusing. The Participles on pp. 69, 73, formed by inflection are indicated as two only, while on p. 79 we find it stated that

there are three. Mason (p. 63) mentions but two. On p. 88 we have the statement, "In the sentence, 'Columbus discovered America,' the simple predicate is *discovered America*." According to Mason, the predicate is *discovered* only. (See Mason, p. 137).—The use of the term *complement* in the book is quite different from that of Mason. (See pp. 89, 91). Finally, on p. 102, the word *mist* is not parsed correctly, according to Mason; (See the latter, on p. 147); and it is even in that authority not correctly parsed.

There are many other points of contrast between the two books, which as strongly tell against the editing attempted in the Miller Swinton as any we have spoken of, but to these it is unnecessary to refer in detail. Some redeeming features are, of course, to be met with in the editor's work, but these are so few as not to invalidate our contention that the claims of excellence for Mr. Macmillan's adaption are insufficiently grounded, and in the interest of education may be said to be reprehensibly misleading. The mechanical dissimilarity of the books, from another point of view, is not the least noticeable feature of difference that strikes the reviewer's eye. Some of the chapters particularly suffer in this respect, that "On the Kinds of Words," on p. 11, for instance, where the visual effect of the page, in the original, in impressing the lesson, is wholly lost to the pupil by reason of its mutilation in the Canadian reprint.

In this latter respect the author's later edition is again an improvement over both the Miller reprint and the edition from which it is reprinted. As a text-book, in its professional and educational aspects, moreover, it stands on a higher plane of excellence than the older book, which it far surpasses, not only in the plan upon which it has been prepared, but in the more systematic arrangement and orderly