

or that the fat globules (written "lobules" in numerous instances) run together to form butter under such conditions? Or what value can you attach to the statement, based on a glimmering of the truth, that milk is "fairly divided up into everything"? Or that when you look at a piece of spinal cord cut across you see "a round-shaped thing with four horns, but on closer inspection the round article is seen not to be round, but &c., &c."? Or that "the spinal cord consists of a soft substance something like lanoline, and about the same thickness"? One wonders what sort of practical acquaintance can underlie such answers as these.

The examiner must repeat his warning that if Physiology is not to be taught practically it had better be abandoned as a subject for the Junior. For it is the ease with which many of the structures and mechanisms of the body can be demonstrated, and the interest which can be excited in the minds even of the very young by their demonstration which gives to Physiology its value as an educational subject. In the absence of such intelligent demonstrations the subject becomes only an instrument of cram.

The examiner notices this year, with satisfaction, less prolixity, though the same old tendency to drag in irrelevant matter is not absent; the spelling, too, shows an improvement, though in this respect it is sometimes astonishingly bad. The errors frequently extend to the actual words appearing in the questions, and it may be mentioned that three or four candidates, the facts of whose answers would have entitled them to pass, failed on this account. There is no excuse for such inaccuracies, and very little for similar errors in the common and oft-recurring technical words of the subject.

Twenty-two candidates, or a fifth of the whole, obtained less than 20 per cent. of marks, and out of this number seven obtained less than 10 per cent. Surely most of these must have an exceedingly sanguine temperament.

Senior Examination.

Senior English Literature.

The chief defect in the answers has been a want of thoroughness. It is shown in two ways, one of them the explaining and elaborating of what is perfectly obvious. This is especially common in the answers to Nos. 2 and 5. Such questions require candidates not merely to explain but to show their intelligence by discovering the words and metaphors requiring explanation. The

other way is want of depth. One does not expect too much from the answers to a question like that on pathos, but it is a pity that candidates should have thought so little on such a matter and yet be filled with a mass of knowledge that they must very soon forget. In this connection the notes that I have made on the Higher Examination may be found of use. Among those guilty of positive error, two defined pathos as the feeling of passing from the sublime to the ridiculous; one says that "pathos is a hard subject to introduce into poetry, especially as it does not seem to fit with poetry"; and another, "Pathos in poetry is the feeling of sadness which comes over one as he reads the poem and sees that the poet is speaking about himself and complaining about the way he is treated, and his hard lot". Most, however, were not wrong, but merely defective or superficial, and in only two or three of the best papers was there any thought of different forms of pathos.

Senior History.

In the Senior as well as in the Junior papers many answers were spoiled by carelessness in reading the questions. In Question 4 students were asked to give the changes in the forms of government in England from 1649 to 1660, yet one student began with Henry VII's reign, another began with the death of Cromwell, and two candidates continued the answer down to William and Mary's reign.

Another fault was that the sense of due proportion in an answer was often wanting; there was frequent reiteration, with a want of clear arrangement in the answers; important points were passed over lightly, and undue weight given to less important details, thus—to refer to Question 4 again—more was sometimes written about Richard Cromwell's government than about the various changes under Oliver Cromwell.

Most of the papers showed careful and intelligent study of the text-book, and it was only occasionally that the examiner was confronted with such wild statements as "The House of Lords was first established by Oliver Cromwell", "After the death of Charles I the country was governed by a Council of State chosen by the late king."

The question on the character of Charles I, which gave scope for applying the facts learned in the text-book, was not well done. Most candidates seemed to think they had given Charles's character when they had written a page or two of violent denunciation, ascribing nearly every possible fault to him, and finding no extenuating circumstances; very few, indeed, seemed to recognize