

Question 3.—The function of a stem in displaying most advantageously the leaves of a plant was in many cases overlooked, otherwise this part of the question was satisfactory. In the latter part of the question the essential morphological difference that the stem bears leaves (however modified) and a root does not was often lost sight of in a mass of more or less irrelevant information.

Question 4 was satisfactorily done by most candidates, though many did not understand the meaning of the terms they employed. The fruit of the bean was described by several as succulent, and indehiscent.

Question 5, where attempted, was fairly well done.

Question 6.—For the past three years practically this same question has been set, and each year it brings the same faults to light, though this year with less disaster than in previous years. There is still a frequent use of Latin terms, which are obviously not understood by the children. There is nothing implied in these terms which could not be equally well described in *plain English*, which is desirable for children of this age, and in fact *necessary* if the work is to be understood. At the risk of wearying through repetition one must say again that it is not the amount of ground covered but the attention to detail and accuracy of observation and description which is of value in the study of botany.

Senior Examination.

Senior English.

The result was good on the whole, but there was a dearth of papers that could be called excellent. There was an improvement in the reproduction, but the old faults of carelessness and inaccuracy were still common. Spelling and punctuation were often very weak. 'Mirabeau's death-bed' was the favourite subject for an essay, and in some cases it was very well treated. A good essay, however, was often spoiled by too long an introduction, which left no room for the actual deathbed scene. It was gratifying to notice that in many cases Carlyle's striking phrases had seized the imagination of a candidate. But how many understood the allusion in 'There is a Nessus-shirt on this Hercules'? It was unnecessary to describe at length the feelings of the crowd before the house or at the funeral. Those who wrote on 'The abuse of nicknames' were not intended to

draw on their imagination, but to reproduce in their own language some of the thoughts contained in Hazlitt's essay. Very few did this even tolerably well. Questions 3 and 4 were fairly well done, but it was the exception for the adjectives to be used with appropriate nouns, all of which might have been found in the text-books. The character of Puck showed that many had studied their Shakespeare notes with care, and some gained credit by showing their knowledge of Milton's poem, but one would rather see a more exact knowledge of the text, and less familiarity with the notes of the editor.

Senior Modern History.

The examiner feels obliged once more to comment most strongly upon candidates memorizing their text-books instead of studying them intelligently *with an atlas*. The answers to Question 2 brought out this failing very clearly. The exactness that would be needed for a geography examination is not expected, but some approximation to a correct outline should be given; a rough oblong is not a sufficient representation of England and Wales. One candidate put Ireland off the east coast; another divided England into six squares, and labelled them alternately Whig and Tory. This wrong method of study was shown most clearly in a paper which gave a map resembling Italy in outline rather than England, and not containing a single name, while the rest of the answer was book perfect even to the days of the month of the battles, and much of it in the actual words of Gardiner; it was of course impossible to mark this answer highly. There were some good essays sent in on the growth of puritanism in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. One essay gained full marks; but many candidates wandered off into an essay on Roman Catholicism instead of Puritanism, and others wrote of Queen Elizabeth as the puritan Queen. One candidate wrote seven pages for this essay, five were introductory, and the other two very rambling and insufficient. When will candidates realize that much writing does not atone for lack of knowledge?

Questions 3 and 4 were fairly well done, but with the usual faults of much irrelevant matter. Question 5 does not call for special comment.

There is always a certain number of candidates in this subject who ought not to have been sent up. The candidate who explained at the end of his paper that he was hoping to be accepted that day for the war, and therefore could not collect his thoughts, may perhaps be pardoned, though his paper could