

pils, particularly in Cæsar, and had better in places be mixed with the old method for hunting for, first, the verb and then the subject and so on, still I have by no means made up my mind against it, especially if it is taken up early, rigidly and systematically. At any rate pupils should not be allowed to get the idea that construction is a sort of Chinese puzzle—pick here and you get it, pick there and you don't get it. Third, it seems unnecessary to say that a Latin primer should use parts in the common way and with the common meaning. Nevertheless it is a fact that throughout his whole book Harkness tells and drills the pupil, as its regular meaning, to translate the subjunctive by "he may," "he might," "he may have," "he might have." As a result, just the other day in a written examination from a matriculation candidate who tried the matriculation last July, I had "quum jussissent" translated "after he might have ordered." Similarly with the infinitive. The most faithful student in Harkness would be simply helpless before the infinitive in its commonest use—with the accusative after verbs of saying and thinking, etc. He has learned only the meaning it has after the comparatively small class of model verbs. The same is true of the nouns. Through the greater part of the book none but the meanings "of," "to," or "for," etc., are given for the various cases, and these quite uncorrected with the necessary qualifications so as to become positively misleading. At the very end of the book, beginning at page 122, the proper uses are hurriedly gone through, but not early enough or thoroughly enough to really correct the long deep-seated misapprehensions. Fourthly and lastly, the attention, in the way of explanation and drilling, given to the different parts of accidence and syntax, must be better proportioned to the relative

commonness of these parts in actual Latin. In elementary Latin there are two things of prime importance—the declension and concord of nouns and adjectives, and the forms and uses of the verb. Neither of these are really sufficiently drilled. Leighton, for example, who in general is too simple, too short, and too few in his exercises, is particularly so in one part of the verb. The gerund and gerundive, the participles and the infinitives, both forms and uses, are all hurried off together with two short exercises and two sight passages in less than fifteen pages; and as is the case in other parts as well, they are not particularly reverted to or kept in review afterwards. Too much drilling on the nouns and verbs is simply impossible, I care not how dull it may be. This is the place for English-Latin exercises; besides their value as a means of drill it has often seemed to me that they are specially useful in acting as a sort of cold corrective to impatient headlong guessing in the Latin-English exercises. Impromptu oral exercises too are particularly adapted to this work; indeed, large parts of Leighton's exercises are too simple altogether for written home work and had better be left for impromptu oral drilling. In drilling the nouns the preposition is exceedingly convenient. Besides an almost infinite amount of combined declension, the case endings of the different declensions should be tabulated and memorized for all eternity, both vertically and horizontally; and the pupil should be required first to note, then to memorize, the different cases a given ending may be and the different nominatives from which it may come. Finally, two minor ways in which the relative importance of parts may be better observed: the one, by giving less attention to adjectives in "er" than to the altogether commoner classes in "us" and