

as the least likely of the four, I cannot, for lack of time, treat of at all except incidentally. The ones for special consideration are: the aim of preparing the pupil to read Latin, and the aim of training skill and accuracy in the science of grammar.

As the latter aim is seldom or never professed, and consequently not likely to be sufficiently realized in its meaning and extent on first hearing, I must first at some length point out the surprisingly large part of our elementary Latin that seems to me traceable solely to this aim, and to be eliminated should this aim be dropped.

*First.*—It is this aim that till very recently has led teachers to insist upon taking up the different parts of the subject in strictly scientific order; first Accidence then Syntax; and in each of these, first the noun, then the adjective, then the pronoun, and lastly the verb. Where the order is rigidly observed what strange, what unLatin exercises have to be manufactured; if, on the other hand, the aim is to read Latin, surely these parts should be so mixed that, from the very outset, the Latin read in the primer shall be the Latin the pupil is afterwards to meet.

*Secondly.*—The grammatical scientific aim has invariably led, and still, with scarcely an exception, is leading teachers of elementary Latin to insist upon not only the scientific order but also on the scientific method consisting in formal definitions and classifications. Now if the pupil is to merely read Latin, this is as unnecessary as studying English grammar is necessary to his understanding his native English. To read Latin is to get the author's meaning—not to understand the verbal machinery employed for its expression. If the aim is to read Latin the best method is the Empiric method, not the Scientific method. For example, tell the pupil

that "batur" means "he was being praised, advised, etc."; don't at this point make him study the nature of tenses or their classification into tenses expressing completed action and tenses expressing incomplete action; possibly it is too early for even the technical names of the tenses. This latter is exceedingly sharpening and educative; but if the aim is to read Latin it is quite unnecessary. Indeed, it is a hindrance. Take two boys taught, the one in one way and the other in the other, and ask them to translate "Vincebantur." While the one is asking himself, "What tense is this?" or "What kind of time is this?" or "What voice is this?" or perhaps, "What mood is this?" The other, by his rule of thumb, says, "Vinco—conquer;" "bantur—they were being;" "Vincebantur—they were being conquered." Though by a certainly less educative process the latter boy has got the meaning practically as fully and accurately as the former and in much less time. Since then the grammatical method is not necessary as a means to attaining the reading aim, and in this case is even a hindrance, how important it is that we should no longer combine the two aims and methods, but should at once decide between them and then confine ourselves strictly to the one of our choice. Similarly of what help for reading purposes is Leighton's elaborate classification of conjunctions as co-ordinate—five classes; and subordinate—eight classes. Or again, the wordy explanation of the difference in nature and use between a participle and a finite verb—a difficult point, which is at this stage best disposed of by the simple dogmatic rule: Translate "Laudatus"—having been praised, or after he had been praised; "Laudatus est"—he was or has been praised. So too with the ablative absolute. No need just yet