

criticism of Shakespeare would be out of place even in first year work at the University, it can perhaps not be held so soundly that those who never enter the University and yet who hold responsible places as teachers should learn no more than the elementary studies in poetry give them. Generally of course second hand criticism by High School teachers is not likely to do so much good even to this class of pupils as thorough honest work of a simpler nature, still a glimpse of the truth that there is a higher level of criticism, even though acquired by reading "books about books," may give a needed impulse to one who might without it sink into a mere child among children. Truth honestly realized expands the mind as surely as truth honestly acquired: Gervinus or Moulton will stimulate many to do better work for themselves. Surely first-class candidates have the mental habit of induction, if scientific training will ever impart it, and when once that mental habit is fixed the more they read around their subjects the better for them. The examiner in poetry has, *me judice*, given us the best paper on Shakespeare and Chaucer from the University point of view that we have had so far; possibly it is equally well-suited to the real needs of the teacher's certificate class, but it might be wise to give a few questions for their answering, such as would encourage a somewhat more comprehensive grasp of the drama. It is earnestly to be desired that no change shall be made in the provision for these papers, even were the papers not excellent it would be better to retain an examiner of experience; there is no danger of sameness arising from this course, at least not for several years.

In English composition the subjects for essays were chosen with much insight and felicity; there was a very happy suiting of the theme to the powers of the various grades of

candidates. But on the other hand nothing could do more violence to taste and judgment (on the present level) than requiring primary candidates to hack and patch the inimitably smooth and graceful, may I say the too sweetly perfect, English of Irving's *Columbus*. Many of us regard Irving as our ideal in the elegant style. We ask our ideal Irving whether he would use a word thus, or turn a phrase thus, just as we ask our ideal Shakespeare to criticize a new book of poems. If Irving's English is to be improved by ignorant children then we are training pigs to be openly irreverent and conceited and to quote the dictionary and the word-book against those whose sense and taste give such books their only authority. Enough has been said about synonyms and grammar-questions in the more general part of this paper. Enough has been said all over the province about the objectionable last-century English extract in the junior grammar paper. In spite of a high literary sense and a great deal of feeling for good English the examiner would seem to have missed totally the present spirit of grammar teaching. Among those who say grammar is useless, those who say it should be untechnical, those who "believe in Latin roots," those who think all grammar questions should be based on extracts from literature, those who think the subject an inductive science and nothing else, among all these the examiner has played the part of the conciliatory old gentleman in the fable who wishing to please all pleased none, and lost his beast into the bargain. His natural response to such criticism will be: No two masters agree on the desiderata of grammar, the English masters denounce it heartily and the University authorities almost ignore it; how then am I to please anyone but myself?

Now it is not necessary for examin-