

exercise of the utmost practical value, and it has the further merit of avoiding those absurdities in literal translation which are at once a libel on the Latin author and a means of disgusting the student with the subject. If it be objected that literal translations are necessary to enable the teacher to test the pupil's knowledge of the Latin construction, it may be said that this object can be attained equally well by putting a few well-chosen questions on the grammar of the sentence.

In poetry and in rhetorical prose such as Livy the order of the words can often be followed in translating with great advantage in the way of accurate expression of the meaning. In Livy, in particular, by a simple change in the voice of the verb, or by using a noun in English to represent a Latin verb and *vice versa*, we may often follow the Latin order in translating with good results. And what a world of difference in meaning sometimes results from attention to the position of an adjective in Horace we all know. Why should we not more commonly strive to follow the Latin order in working out the translation? Assuredly the Roman mind must have proceeded in that way toward the apprehension of the thought. Is it not because we are hampered by rules of grammar which require us to proceed, for instance, from the subject to the predicate, and thence to the object? Granted that in many cases the order is such that our minds, accustomed to the English mode of arranging the ideas, refuse to work in the Latin way, yet when we find, as so often in Livy, the order of the sentence virtually reversed (as *we* should say), *e.g.*, "Augebant ingentis spiritus virune Sicilia Sardiniaque amissæ," we can

surely secure a better translation by following the *order*—"The proud spirit of the man was grieved at the loss of Sicily and Sardinia," than by following the *construction* and saying, "The loss of Sicily and Sardinia grieved this man of proud spirit." Again, in Horace, though much less reliance can be placed on the meaning of the position of words in poetry, shall we not come nearer the meaning of "dabimusque divi thura benignis," if we notice the position of the adjective at the end of the line—an emphatic position—and translate, "and we shall give incense to the gods because they are kind," than if we place the adjective before the noun and translate "the kindly gods"?

Many points in Latin syntax may be made to afford interesting comparisons between the Latin and our own language, in regard to the matter of clearness of thought. In these cases it will be found, usually, that the Latin has the advantage of English in this respect. The relations of time, for instance, were more clearly perceived by the Romans than by us. Hence the "If I go to Toronto, I will get you the book you speak of," must be transformed into "If I shall have gone to Toronto, I will get you the book you speak of," before it can don its Latin dress. The subtleties of the subjunctive mood, too, almost unknown in English, will open a field for thought and investigation, and will tend to place before the student ideals in the matter of expressing fine shades of meaning which the study of his own language would never bring. Parsing, too, often a bugbear with those who know no other language than English, becomes comparatively easy to the student who has gained a knowledge of Latin sentences where almost every other word is