In his introduction Morwood says that this book 'aspires..., however inadequately, to be a new Kennedy' (vii). He is correct to note that the latter (B.H. Kennedy and J. Mountford, The Revised Latin Primer, London 1962) is in need of a successor. He is also, regrettably, correct to condition the claim with the words 'however inadequately'. The book is inadequate for its intended role, and I will draw attention to its shortcomings in order to suggest what a new Kennedy might be like.

The book's main fault is that it is too superficial to serve as a reference work for students who have encountered a form or construction they do not understand. For instance, it has no mention of the declension of Greek nouns, even that such forms occur, although they are frequent in the poetry taught at schools. There is no mention of the prolate infinitive, though you may stumble on an oblique reference under gerunds (108-9). And the use of the independent subjunctive (besides jussives) is covered only in the most introductory sense (34).

The superficiality is compounded by the slanting of many explanations towards explaining how to translate English into Latin (e.g. 'Verbs of Fearing', 102). This is not to say that English into Latin is not useful, but that a book such as this would be better designed as a reference work to help students to read Latin—something the Scottish Classics Group's The Latin Language: A Handbook for Students (Edinburgh, 1989) does with some notable success.

Morwood observes that the modern student does not have time to learn the minutiae of Latin (vii). However, such students, in a hurry and not always familiar with grammatical concepts, are ill-served by the superficiality of much of this work. I would argue they need more explanation to compensate for their background and I will suggest later some of the ways this could be provided. As it stands Morwood is greatly outclassed by many introductory texts, which provide much more comprehensive and useful explanations of Latin grammar.
The book seems somewhat unfinished. It has some mistakes: crēdē for crēdō (8), the dative singular of cornū as cornū (17) and less significantly ‘command’ for ‘command’ in the header of 89-91. Books are generally not as well proof-read now as earlier, but grammars of foreign languages need particularly careful checking—learners are unlikely to spot errors.

This lack of finish to the presentation is illustrated in a number of ways by the section on pronouns (26-9). Hic, ille, is, ipse and idem are all presented under the heading ‘deictic pronouns’. Deictic is not explained in the glossary and the student may be lucky to locate an explanation in the back under ‘Some Literary Terms’ (151). No explanations or examples are given of how these pronouns are used. And the whole section is concluded in a haphazard vocabulary list headed, ‘Interrogatives, Demonstratives, Relatives, etc.’. The ‘etc.’ seems to disavow any attempt to organise these further. Nor is any consistency maintained in the use of the terms ‘deictic’ and ‘demonstrative’. If the work appears unfinished in places, in other places it looks to have included some space-filling material. In particular, the practice sentences and the accompanying vocabulary lists seem redundant in a reference work, and the memory rhymes from Kennedy (180-6) seem the least useful part of that work to reproduce. The exercises raise the question whether this is a reference work or a textbook. As it covers most topics in less depth than many textbooks it seems to fail as a reference work, and thus to be superfluous, unless as a brief summary.

An area that could have used more space is the illustrative examples. The quotes in Kennedy from classical authors are to my mind one of its most appealing features. Morwood often has no examples (as with the section on pronouns just mentioned, or the section on prepositions that follows, 29-30; the examples on page 30 are idioms not illustrative examples; compare Kennedy 143-5); or he has made-up examples. His examples of the use of the conjunction cum meaning ‘whenever’ (123) do not even have a main clause, when this would provide a valuable illustration of the tense of the main verb in such sentences.

Is there, then, anything good to be found in this book? Its glossary is a useful addition. The list of ‘Words Easily Confused’ (137-8) is also good, and points to one area the book could have developed. Additional
aids to learning vocabulary would be to list some false friends (such as those in H.V. Taylor, *Conспектus, or Latin at Sight*, London, 1915, xxvii-xxix), to replace the vocabulary lists with a list of the most frequent vocabulary (as found in K.C. Masterman, *A Latin Word List*, Melbourne 1967, among others), and to replace the memory rhymes with an updated version of Kennedy’s ‘Derived and Compounded Words’ (209-13). The chapters in the Scottish Classics Group on ‘Word Building’ and ‘Word Families’ (78-88) suggest one approach.

In general as a beginner’s reference grammar Morwood is outclassed by the Scottish Classics Group. Their tables (152-3) on how the principal parts of the verb relate to the various forms are excellent. Their chapters on important conjunctions, such as *ut* (93-5), which describe a strategy for recognising which construction is being used, are likewise excellent, as are many other chapters in Part II of the book, especially the chapter on ‘Case Recognition’ (71-4). Chapters like these make the Scottish Classics Group an attractive book to teach from.

Morwood could have adopted some of the ideas from the Scottish Classics Group and improved on them, and it would not have been hard. That book’s biggest fault is its failure to use macra. Had it done so it could have explicated confusing areas of Latin morphology. Using macra helps students to see that the case endings of, for example, *manus* are more varied in speech than in writing, and that the -īs of the first and second declension dat. and abl. pl. contrasts with the -īs of the gen. s. of the third declension (e.g. *domīnis* vs. *rēgīs*). It also illustrates similarities across declensions: the nom. and acc. pl. *manūs* shares a long final vowel with the same cases of the third and fifth declensions.

Morwood heads his tables of declensions and conjugations ‘stems in -a’, etc., without any additional comment. This is only to invite confused queries from students such as, ‘Where is the o in the -o stem?’ At the very least, the reader would be helped by a comment to the effect that sound changes and the fusing of the stem with the case endings have obscured some of the distinctiveness of nominal stems. It is even more helpful to discuss the stem vowels of verbs. The three conjugations with long stem vowels (-ā, -ē and -ī) share many similarities and contrast with the third and mixed conjugations that have short stem vowels (-ē and -ī, Charles Elerick, ‘Modern Phonology and the Teaching of Latin’, *Classical Journal*
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75, 1979, 156-162, has a very good discussion of this). The length of the stem vowel frequently leads to a contrast in the placement of accent between conjugations (e.g. second declension *vidēre* vs. third declension *dīcere*, or fourth declension *audīmus* vs. mixed declension *fācimus*), and between tenses (e.g. present *venīmus* vs. perfect *vēnīmus*). A grammar that highlighted these points might help students who only see in the conjugations forms that are frequently the same across conjugations, but sometimes erratically and inexplicably different (a model to follow might be John F. Collins, *A Primer of Ecclesiastical Latin*, Washington D.C. 1985, which is perhaps the best textbook I have seen for explaining how the tenses are formed for each conjugation).

There is a demand for an introductory grammar that meets the needs of modern students. Regrettably, Morwood has not filled it and until something better comes along, I will continue to recommend Kennedy for its morphological tables and the Scottish Classics Group for some of its strong points mentioned above.
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