

ing; questions testing memory-training may be judiciously used on the ground that the memory is a most important faculty.

(b) A question should not be ambiguous, obscure, or faulty in English.

(c) Technical terms may be used when they are such as every good student should know; but needless technicalities and such as are not in very common use should not be employed.

(d) Only such questions as admit of a definite answer should be asked in scientific subjects. In æsthetic subjects opinions may differ as to the correct or best view, and yet the question may be valuable.

Doubtless many other guards may be suggested against poor questioning, and some of these may need correction and qualification.

In setting papers in English the writer has found that certain faults are very common, and would give expression to a special abhorrence of

(a) The use of the word "analyse" without a clear explanation of its meaning. It may mean (1) Divide a compound sentence into simple sentences; (2) Divide a complex sentence into principal and subordinate clauses; (3) Divide a clause into subject and predicate; and even (4) divide the subject and predicate in such a manner as to show the relations and functions of the separate words and phrases, though this last exercise is really the important part of parsing: and it often means all four at once; it is a mere careless and indefinite use of words to say "analyze ten lines" of some extract, and leads to endless confusion in competitive examinations; is it not much better to ask a few simple definite questions instead? as, for example, (1) Show the kind and function of the subordinate clauses; (2) Write out the principal statements of this sentence. The best answer to the question,

"What kind of table of analysis should be used?" is, "in examinations, a full analysis never serves the examiner's purpose so well as questions aimed directly at the difficult points of the syntax."

(b) The use of the word "parse." There is hardly a master in Ontario High Schools who is not afraid to tell his pupils to state the parts of speech and the relation, and no more, when asked to parse, and yet that is what is usually required by the examiner. Most pupils writing for matriculation tell in full simplicity all they know about the word; for example, that "houses" is plural and "woman" feminine. Would it not be better to ask for the part of speech and the relation; or, if desirable, for the inflections, than to use the ambiguous "parse" in order to save time? It is through such mechanical use of terms that grammar is so dull a study to so many.

(c) The use of the word "conjugate." If a pupil is asked to conjugate a verb he may give the principal parts, the tenses of all words in the first person singular, or, indeed, all the forms of the verb, and pronouns to match. Everyone knows that this word is of very uncertain definition yet it is seen every time, always leading to the failure probably of some unfortunate, for he who writes most, usually obtains better marks than he who takes the easiest meaning of the question.

(d) The use of the word "classify." What common sense is there in asking a pupil to classify any group of things without stating the ground of classification? "Marbles" may be classified on the ground of material, colour, size; to ask a boy to classify "marbles" and then to "pluck" him for failing to guess which ground you were thinking of would be unjust and discouraging to the boy. How often a pupil could classify if he only knew