gentleman would not now have any cause for the exhibition of so much temper. But to our task.

The only really good opportunity this book presents for the exemplification of the authors' literary style is in the Introduction, after reading which we feel profoundly thankful that they gave us so little of their own in the Readers. This introduction consists of two pages of bad English, and worse pedagogy.

The first sentence says: "...: it is naturally expected that considerable attention will be given to the lessons prescribed... for this [the entrance] examination." An admirable word is "naturally" here, but why "expected"? We can excuse a hod-carrier, for saying he expects that it will rain to-morrow, but we cannot extend our charity to an author, especially one of the species dominie, who expects when he ought to infer, or suppose, or take for granted.

In the next sentence is the colloquialism "read over," and the extremely weak infinitive, " to find out."

The opening sentence of the second paragraph declares that in "the teaching of literature, as of any other subject, the first business of the teacher is to assign the lesson." We submit that "business" in this place is a little too slangy, and we would venture to suggest duty as the word that is wanted. Still there seems to be some mistake as to this "first business of the teacher," for in the next sentence but one we read that "the teacher must first have studied the lesson himself, before he can assign it intelligently to his pupils," so it seems there are in reality two first "businesses." It is novel also to be instructed thus.

We can see no reason why the mere assigning of a lesson implies that the teacher "must first have studied it himself." Perhaps the writers meant to speak of how a lesson should be intelligently introduced, and if so we agree with them; but they should say as nearly as possible what they mean in a "Companion" to a Reader. "Not as clear and full as it should be," would read better with a so in place of the first "as." "Notion" seems out of place, and "very vague

and indistinct." are like the whole of the piece—wordy, wordy. In three consecutive lines of the paragraph, we have "first business," "first appear," and "first have studied."

The English of the third paragraph is quite as loose as that of the preceding ones, as any reader may see for himself. Then follows, "How to assign the lesson," and here it is perfectly evident that it is an introduction the writers mean.

In "How to teach the lesson," amid many good points, there is an equal number that are "very vague and indistinct." We take only one: "Give another word pronounced like mien, and use it correctly in a sentence." Now if there is another word pronounced like mien, we should like to hear it. Mean is the nearest we know; but the quantity of the vowel-sound is so appreciably less that, instead of pupils being taught that the words are alike in sound. the difference ought rather to be pranted out. It should have been mentioned that the lesson selected for illustrative purposes is Boadicea.

The paucity of the writers' language may be gathered from the fact that on one page we have "clearly understood" twice, "clearly understand" and "clearly comprehend."

With regard to the notes themselves, while there can be no doubt as to their ! elpfulness in a large number of instances, they can never be accepted by any intelligent teacher as a vade mecum. There is just enough of reliable information to mislead the unwary in o the belief that it is all trustworthy. Take, at random, the note: "Hooghly- . . a branch of the River Ganges . . . " Now most pupils have been taught that a branch of a river is a tributary's ream; but here we are informed that one of the divisions forming the delta of the Ganges is a branch of that great river. Of course the compilers knew better, but they were in great haste to make a book.

For "Bunks" (p. 97) the wrong definition is given, as applying to a lumberman's shanty, except in rare instances.

We have marked many more, but these