

thoughtful character of the answers given by the Sixth to a question on the mental conditions of Lear and Hamlet, and the scholarly way in which the Fifth dealt with the difficulties of the play of Romeo and Juliet, have equally delighted me. The whole work testifies to an amount of scholarship and a power of imparting knowledge in the teacher which is deserving of the heartiest recognition. After referring to this genuine triumph of teaching in the most difficult department—namely, literature—I have only to add that the results in history and geography were equally satisfactory; and the parents of boys at the school have every reason to congratulate themselves that the English education of their sons is in such thoroughly competent hands.

#### Results.

(a.) *Spelling*.—The spelling was remarkably good, even in the lowest Form that I examined—namely, the Lower Fourth.

(b.) *Parsing and Analysis*.—The parsing and analysis of sentences were equally good all through, and the nature and object of these processes were well explained by the Fifth Form.

(c.) *Historical English Grammar*.—Historical grammar produced the least satisfactory results. As I have already mentioned, this subject is only studied in the Fifth Form, and, so far as my opportunities of judging go, with very little success. I may add that I do not think boys should be set to read Chaucer when they know so little of the growth of their language as must be the case with the Sixth Form.

(d.) *Composition and Paraphrasing*.—The composition is decidedly promising, and the difficult subject of paraphrasing was treated with a spirit and power that testify to most accomplished teaching. I consider it one of the greatest successes of the teaching of the higher Forms that it has produced creditable results in a department in which boys are usually lamentably defective.

(e.) *Literature*.—The Lower Fourth took up the Merchant of Venice, and did creditably within the very narrow limits laid down for them. In reporting on the Girls' School I have given my reasons for thinking that Shakespeare should not be attempted by junior Forms. The Upper Fourth showed very good results in Julius Cæsar. They took up, in addition, L'Allegro and Il Penseroso; but, not having had time for proper revision, they were naturally not up to examination standard in this subject. The Fifth were examined in Romeo and Juliet, and I think it will not be too much to say that I have never examined a Form that produced such generally good results. They not only thoroughly understood the text, but quoted long passages from different parts of the play with the greatest freedom. The Sixth took up King Lear, Hamlet, and the Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. They had also read the Tempest, but, as this had not been revised, I set no questions on it. The whole work was excellently done. The comparison between the mental states of Hamlet and of Lear was the best and most scholarly piece of class work in this department that I have ever seen. The explanations of difficult passages were good on a lower level. The paraphrasing, to which I have previously referred, showed real appreciation of the spirit of the original. The Chaucer seemed to be thoroughly known, and a question on one of the most recent results of scholarship, the pronunciation of the final "e" in Chaucer, produced answers which showed that the boys had been brought thoroughly abreast of modern knowledge.

*History*.—In the Lower Fourth a fair amount of history has been read, and, as all the questions were answered by the bulk of the Form, the results may be considered satisfactory. The Upper Fourth, which has been reading the same text-book—the Royal History—did its work much more fully than the Form below. All the great events and all the great men of the period taken up seemed to be familiar to the boys; and there was a notable absence of silly mistakes. The Fifth particularly distinguished themselves in this subject. They gave their answers with a fulness and accuracy far beyond what I had expected. However little I may think of their text-book, which is the same as in the Forms already mentioned, I believe that they have been exceedingly well trained, and have acquired to a considerable extent that power of assimilating the contents of the books they read which is the abiding result of the study of history. The Sixth took up no history; and I must repeat that it is not creditable to such a school that its historical course should stop short at the Royal Reader.

*Geography*.—The geography was very fairly done by the Lower Fourth, and showed a satisfactory growth in fulness in the higher Forms, the Fifth doing really creditable work. Nothing in the shape of physical geography seems to have been undertaken, but the results that have been attained in the subject as limited by the course must be pronounced very good.

*Conclusion*.—The chief faults that I find in the school are those of the curriculum, to which I have referred at the commencement of the report. I have not examined any Form below the Lower Fourth; but in the case of the Forms I have examined, and particularly in that of the Fifth and Sixth, I am very favourably impressed by the character of the work done.

I have, &c.,

The Chairman, Board of Governors.

MAINWARING BROWN,  
Examiner in English.

#### REPORT OF THE EXAMINATION IN MATHEMATICS AND ARITHMETIC.

SIR,—

Dunedin, 23rd December, 1885.

I have, as requested, examined the Otago High Schools in the subjects of mathematics and arithmetic, and have now the honour to submit my report. In both cases the Lower School was examined orally, and the higher Forms, comprising the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth, by means of written papers. Every facility was offered by the principals and teachers of applying any legitimate test. In both schools the results, in my opinion, are very good, and in some classes they leave nothing to be desired.