

things to be omitted in an elementary Latin book. I mean those words and forms which are sufficiently explained in the ordinary vocabulary, and those rules of syntax which are easily enough understood by the pupil himself when met in actual reading: First, unnecessary words and forms—"Mensarum"—the vocabulary says only "*mensa mensæ*, a table." We must learn the meaning of this ending, "*arum*." But the numerals, cardinals, ordinals and distributive, why require the pupil to prepare these beforehand? And why the formation of the three degrees of the adverb: "*fortiter*," "*fortius*," "*fortissime*," are all given in the vocabulary? To be sure English-Latin exercises could not be done without the rule of formation; "*bravely*," "*more bravely*," "*most bravely*" are not given in the English-Latin vocabulary, but the aim at this stage is Latin-English not English-Latin translation. Even if "*fortiter*," "*fortius*," and "*fortissime*" were not given, teaching the pupil to merely recognize forms can and should be made much shorter and simpler than the present custom of teaching him to form them. Similarly with the comparison of adjectives. Lastly, the two pronouns "*iste*" and "*idem*," what peculiarity of either form or use is there, that the ordinary pupil would not be equal to, provided he knew "*ille*" and "*is*"? Second, the points of syntax to be omitted. The presence and absence of "*ab*" in the expression of agency and instrumentality respectively, the absence of "*ad*," "*ex*," and "*ab*" with the names of towns and cities, and the case construction of "*utor*," "*potior*," etc., of "*doces*," "*posco*," etc., and of "*dignus*," "*indignus*," etc., etc.; all these rules the pupil should be left to recognize and formulate for himself. Then he may practise the rule by English-Latin exercises. Similarly at this stage,

Why more than the most passing notice of the gender rules? The gender of each Latin word is given in the vocabulary, and this is quite sufficient for the immediate object. English-Latin exercises I will speak of later. I would use them and use them abundantly, but, at this stage, only a limited kind.

As I pass from this partial and merely typical list of things to be omitted, let me again say that the change I propose is entirely one of order and method. Pupils in the long run by the time, say, of their matriculation, are to get up just about so much grammar, and just about as much composition as at present, but at a different time—during and after reading instead of before reading; and in a different manner—by personal observation and inference instead of by passive reception from the teacher or the grammar. Let the primer give grammar and composition certainly, but let it reserve them for the back of the book so as not to unnecessarily impede the path of reading.

If the fruit bearing stage is to be reached as early as possible, not only must we omit many things not necessary for reading Latin, but we must also, in what we decide to retain, be guided more by the character of the Latin the pupil will afterwards read. First, the vocabulary should be thoroughly Cæsarian from start to finish. What a cruel leap we used to find it to Cæsar from Harkness' or Arnold's "*Balbus sees the goat and the goat sees Balbus*," or "*Balbus strikes the head of the daughter of the good judge*." Second, from start to finish the order of words in sentence should be equally Cæsarian. As for translating the words exactly in the order in which they stand—a thing so essential to proper appreciation—while Hale's method is perhaps somewhat impracticable with younger pu-