

reargue this stalest of all fallacies, which seems to have a peculiar fascination for the episcopal mind. But we may venture to point out that, however gifted by nature, Dr. Creighton is not yet perfect in the art of teaching. Whether history teaching should begin with the policeman or the Witenagemot is a moot point; and, though, in our opinion, the weight of argument is in favor

of beginning with ancient history, the Bishop is entitled to his opinion. Can we, however, conceive a trained teacher beginning his history lesson; 'Suppose your father was drunk'? *Maxime debetur pueris reverentia* is a lesson instilled into every Board school teacher, though he may never have heard the name of Juvenal."

CURRENT EVENTS.

Dr. Paulsen points out the following as the deplorable and unwished-for results of public examinations:

(1) The examination changes the mental attitude of the student to the subject. His attention is drawn from the subject of study and fixed upon the examination. The constraint of an examination brings with it a dislike of the subject, and what one likes is dismissed from the mind as soon as the necessity for outward expression ceases. It is this distaste arising from compulsory examination that is responsible for the large amount of "learning by heart" from short and superficial works.

(2) The examination gives to previous study a tendency to be superficial and directed to what lends itself to recitation. The knowledge that can can be "shown off" counts for the most. Formulas, definitions, rules, forms, facts and dates lend themselves to repetition; in short, all that is external, that can be learned and recited, but not what one thinks or feels. It cannot be otherwise; examination questions are necessarily more tests of the memory than of judgment. The effect is that an undue importance is attached to mere facts. It is undoubtedly a fact that the student who, by "cramming," has primed himself with superficial knowledge and external facts, without much reflection,

takes an examination with greater prospect of success than one who has read and studied with genuine interest the subject, and, perhaps, with far better results, to his own culture, but who has neglected the more recitable facts.

(3) Examinations tend to produce uniformity and mediocrity. An examination that takes into account, not only the standing of the scholars, but is also designed as a test of the master and the school, has necessarily the effort of producing uniformity. While in the intellectual life uniformity and equality are far less important than originality and variety, examinations tend to produce a mediocre standard for all students in all subjects. In every examination of a large number of persons, the clever ones find little opportunity for doing themselves justice; the questions must be chosen to suit the average candidate.

To sum up: State examinations tend to suppress individuality, to destroy independence, to promote superficial knowledge and to stamp out all attempt at original thought. The superficiality which at present goes under the name of education, the glib readiness to discuss all subjects, are undoubtedly the outcome of the technical public examinations. Examinations require knowledge that has no relation to the positions to be filled and do not take into account the special fitness of the