

The Independent.

Entered at the Post-office at New York, as Second-class Mail Matter.

"EVEN AS WE HAVE BEEN APPROVED OF GOD TO BE INTRUSTED WITH THE GOSPEL, SO WE SPEAK; NOT AS PLEASING MEN BUT GOD WHICH PROVETH OUR HEARTS."

VOLUME XLIII.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JANUARY 8, 1891.

NUMBER 2197.

The Independent

For Table of Contents see Page 14.

AFTER THE SNOW AND THE SHROUD.

BY JOAQUIN MILLER.

WHAT if we all lay dead below;
Lay as the grass lies, cold and dead
In God's own holy shroud of snow,
With snow-white stones set foot and head.
With all earth dead and shrouded white
As cloud that cross the moon at night?

What if that infidel some night
Could then rise up and see how dead,
How wholly dead and out of sight
All things with snows sown foot and head
And lost winds walling up and down
The emptied fields and emptied town?

I think that grand old infidel
Would rub his hands with fiendish glee,
And say: "I knew it, knew it well!
I knew that death was destiny;
I ate, I drank, I mocked at God;
Then as the grass was, and the sod."

Ah me, the grasses and the sod
They are my preachers. Hear them preach,
When they forget the shroud, and God
Lifts up these blades of grass to teach
The resurrection! Who shall say
What infidel can speak as they?

OAKLAND, CAL.

TWELVE DAYS AT SEA.

A RONDEL IN PRAISE OF A SLOW STEAMER.

BY LOUISE CHANDLER MOULTON.

THERE is a ship on which I love to sail
Across the tossing splendors of the sea—
Whether the skies are fair and winds are free
Or in the teeth of the contending gale.

When night's at deep I hear the mermaids wail;
By day I watch the shining sea-gulls flee.
There is a ship on which I love to sail
Across the tossing splendors of the sea.

Let others at the stormy ocean rail,
And chide the days, and say how long they be;
This ship, this captain, and this crew for me!
I am content, tho' swifter barques we hail.
With this good ship, on which I love to sail.

ON THE "PAVONIA," November, 1890.

A LYRIC.

BY R. H. STODDARD.

FOOLISH, who thinks by words alone
To catch her love, whenas he flies:
Ulysses whose weak wits were flown—
We do not hear he shut his eyes.
He had not passed the Siren Isles
An they had cast the net of smiles!

Odysseus was not wise that hour.
Like Helen saved, like Priam slain,
Who worshiped and destroyed their power,
Love's life that will not come again!

Take, he doth say,
Those eyes away,
Begotten of clay,
In a dolorous day,
With a smile of scorn,
Lights that mislead the Morn,
And poor Marianna,
Forsook of Diana,
Paramour of change,
In the shade of the Moated Grange:
At Stratford, Oxford, London,
Where a many fond fools are undone:
Gentle Will with the rest,
Who wait what the players liked best,
With a smile and a tear,
And both sincere,
And heaved a hard sigh from his breast.
Wild Heart! Be Still!
Were the last words of Will,
Poor Will.

NEW YORK CITY.

SHALL WE OBEY GOD'S COMMANDMENT?

OR

Shall we open the Columbian Exposition on Sunday?

OPINIONS OF SENATORS AND REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS.

IN answer to our request for their views as to whether the Columbian Exposition should be open on Sunday, Senators and Representatives have kindly sent us the following replies:

WHAT THE SENATORS SAY.

HOLDS THE OLD-FASHIONED IDEA.

THE HON. WM. P. FRYE,
United States Senator from Maine.

I still hold somewhat to the old-fashioned idea that Sunday is the Lord's Day, a day of rest and worship. I am not yet sufficiently liberalized to believe that exhibitions, theaters, or other places of amusement should be open to the people on Sunday.

MUST NOT OFFEND THE RELIGIOUS SENTIMENT OF THE COUNTRY.

THE HON. J. N. DOLPH,
United States Senator from Oregon.

I do not propose to base my opinion upon the institution of the Sabbath and the divine injunction to remember it and keep it holy.

The fathers of the Republic bequeathed to us the Christian Sabbath with our free institutions. Its value as a day of rest, the influence of its proper observance to promote good order and morality, cannot be overestimated. The great Exposition to commemorate the discovery of this continent, which led to the settlement of the New World by refugees from religious and political persecution in the Old, established the rule of religious toleration and laid broad and deep the foundations of free government, should, I think, be conducted with some degree of recognition of that Providence which watched over the infant colonies, made their great struggle for political independence successful, and followed them through their history as a nation.

As a Christian nation, I believe that we should not offend the religious sentiment of our own country and of the world and help to weaken the already waning respect for the observance of Sunday by making the Exposition a place of recreation and business on that day.

SHOULD NOT BE CONDUCTED IN DISREGARD OF THE SABBATH.

THE HON. E. K. WILSON,
United States Senator from Maryland.

The Columbian Exposition is, I presume, to be viewed as of a national character, and its conduct as expressive of national character, tendencies and feeling. In this point of view, I should very much regret to see it conducted in entire disregard of the Sabbath, which, I would fain hope, will continue to be cherished as an institution significant and promotive of religious sentiment among our people.

SHOULD NOT BE OPEN.

THE HON. R. BLODGETT,
United States Senator from New Jersey.

The Columbian Exposition should not be kept open on Sunday.

OPPOSED TO SUNDAY OPENING.

THE HON. O. H. PLATT,
United States Senator from Connecticut.

I do not think the Columbian Exposition should be open on Sunday.

SHOULD BE CLOSED.

THE HON. R. F. PETTIGREW,
United States Senator from South Dakota.

The Columbia Exposition should be closed on Sunday.

A SERIES OF RELIGIOUS EXERCISES.

THE HON. JOHN J. INGALLS,
United States Senator from Kansas.

In my opinion it would be an excellent plan to have a series of religious exercises at the Columbian Exposition on successive Sundays. The most eminent clergymen of all denominations, from all Christian countries, should be invited to participate, and the music should be under the direction of distinguished composers and performers.

NO BETTER TIME FOR IT TO BE OPEN THAN ON THE SABBATH.

THE HON. CHARLES F. MANDERSON,
United States Senator from Nebraska.

I am decidedly of the opinion that the Exposition should be open on Sunday. If it is to be the educator and the civilizer that it should be, I do not believe there is a better time than the Sabbath Day for it to exert its influence and do its work. I believe that all public parks, museums, art galleries and places of similar character should be open on Sunday to those who may desire to enter them.

SHOULD NOT BE OPEN FOR PROFIT.

THE HON. JAMES McMILLAN,
United States Senator from Michigan.

Taking into consideration the amount of labor necessary to keep the World's Fair open on Sunday, my opinion is that it should be closed on that day. Whether certain of the departments, like the Art Gallery, might not be opened on Sunday, provided no admission fee was charged, may be an open question. Certainly the Fair should not be open for profit that day.

SHOULD NOT BE OPEN.

THE HON. GEORGE GRAY,
United States Senator from Delaware.

I beg to say that, in my opinion, the Columbian Exposition should not be open on Sunday.

NO OPINION.

THE HON. ANTHONY HIGGINS,
United States Senator from Delaware.

I have no opinion on the question whether the Columbian Exposition should be open on Sunday.

SHOULD BE OPEN FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE LABORING MASSES.

THE HON. JOS. C. S. BLACKBURN,
United States Senator from Kentucky.

If the Columbian Exposition is intended for the benefit of the people I see no reason why it should not be kept open on Sundays, thus affording an opportunity to the laboring masses to enjoy it.

If it is to be run as a close corporation, for the benefit of a few, it would probably be best to close it during such days and hours as the masses might have opportunity to visit it.

NO OPINION TO EXPRESS.

THE HON. P. B. PLUMB,
United States Senator from Kansas.

I have not given to the subject which you mention any attention whatever, and prefer not to express an opinion which I might, on reflection, feel called upon to change.

GIVE LABORING MEN A CHANCE.

THE HON. M. C. BUTLER,
United States Senator from South Carolina.

In reply to your inquiry, I beg to say that I think the Columbian Exposition ought to be open on Sunday, to give the laboring people an opportunity to visit the grounds, otherwise thousands of people will not be able to see the Exposition. And, under proper regulations, I can see no objections to it.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE SHOULD HAVE THE BENEFIT OF ANY DOUBT.

THE HON. JOHN E. KENNA,
United States Senator from West Virginia.

Whether the Columbian Exposition shall be opened on Sunday is no easy question to answer satisfactorily.

them giving this rebuke, "he was much displeased" with them, and said: "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." (Mark x, 13, 14.) The Greek verb, here rendered in the Common English Version by the words "was much displeased," and in the Revised Version by the words "was moved with indignation," occurs seven times in the New Testament; and the passages in which it does occur, show that its New Testament use is to be *angry, vexed, or indignant*, which accords with its etymology. The state of mind assigned to Jesus by Mark was that of being vexed or indignant at the conduct of his disciples. Whatever may have been their motives, "he was much displeased" with their action, and promptly put an end to it.

These cases, and others that might be cited from the Gospel narrative, leave no doubt that Jesus could be, and that he sometimes was, displeased with his own disciples. He had no partiality toward them that converted their sins into virtues, or made him indifferent to their faults, or saved them from rebuke when needed. They were not his counselors, but his pupils in process of training for a great career; and sometimes they tried his patience, and called out his displeasure.

3. The ministry of Christ in Galilee, extending in the aggregate over about the period of two years, had its chief center in Capernaum and the adjacent cities. These localities were peculiarly privileged in this respect. What did Jesus think of the general conduct of the people resident in these cities, and thus highly favored by his personal ministry? Matthew says that in the second year of his ministry in Galilee "began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they repented not"; and speaking in particular of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, the evangelist informs us that Jesus pronounced woes against them for their failure to profit by his ministry. (Matt. xi, 20-24.) He said that, in the day of judgment, it would be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for Chorazin and Bethsaida, and that Capernaum which had been "exalted unto Heaven," would be brought "down to Hell," and be in a worse condition than "the land of Sodom." We learn from Luke that, at a later period, when Jesus was giving instruction to the seventy disciples, and was about to retire from Galilee altogether, he repeated his denunciation of these cities. (Luke x, 13-15.) His language, in both instances, was freighted with the element of righteous severity, and was true to the facts, and to the perceptions and emotions of his moral nature.

4. Christ, soon after his return from his second Passover in Jerusalem, entered into a synagogue in Galilee on the Sabbath Day; and in that synagogue was a man who had "a withered hand." The scribes and Pharisees present watched him to see whether he would heal the man on that day, "that they might find an accusation against him." Knowing their thoughts, he fixed his eyes on the man, and said to him: "Rise up, and stand forth in the midst." Then, with the man standing and seen by the whole audience, Jesus thus addressed the people, especially these scribes and Pharisees: "What man shall there be among you that shall have one sheep, and if it fall into a pit on the Sabbath Day, will he not lay hold on it, and lift it out? How much then is a man better than a sheep? Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days." Not a tongue was stirred in reply. Mark says that "when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts," Jesus said to the man: "Stretch forth thy hand," and that instantly "his hand was restored whole as the other." (Matt. xii, 9-14, Mark iii, 1-6, and Luke vi, 6-11.)

The state of mind assigned to Jesus in this case is that of anger and grief blended together. The Greek term *orge* is here properly translated by the word *anger*; and to the anger grief was added, so that Jesus was the subject of two distinct but connected emotions. He was righteously angry and indignant toward these scribes and Pharisees, and at the same time "grieved for the hardness of their hearts." There is no reason for any hesitation in accepting the entire statement of Mark as to the feelings of Jesus. The anger attributed to him implies no imperfection of moral character. It simply discloses the sternness of purity when the occasion calls for it.

5. It was not long after this scene that certain scribes and Pharisees who had come from Jerusalem to Galilee, explained the healing of a demoniac by saying that "this fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of devils." Jesus, in reply to this malicious and wanton slander of the miracle just wrought by him, first showed the absurdity of their theory of the cure, and then proceeded to one of the most awful utterances of his whole ministry. He characterized the sin of which these men were guilty as "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost," and declared that for this sin there is no forgiveness, even under the Gospel, either "in this world" or "in that which is to come." He described these scribes and Pharisees as a "generation of vipers," and said to them: "How can ye, being evil, speak good things?" (Matt. xii, 22-37, Mark iii, 19-30, and Luke xi, 14-23.) This utterance of Jesus is a revelation of intense moral displeasure. He consigned those to whom he applied it to the damnation of Hell, pro-

nouncing their doom in anticipation of the reality, and placing on the enormity of their act an appalling emphasis.

6. Jesus, when at a later period pursuing his ministry in Perea, healed a woman of her infirmity in a synagogue on the Sabbath Day. The ruler of the synagogue said: "There are six days in which men ought to work; in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the Sabbath Day." This remark of fault-finding criticism at once stirred the moral sensibilities of Jesus; and turning to this ruler he thus addressed him: "Thou hypocrite, doth not each one of you on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering? And ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan hath bound, lo, these eighteen years, to be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath Day?" (Luke xiii, 10-16.) This language on its face bears the stamp of excited and indignant sensibility. Jesus called the ruler a hypocrite. No one can suppose that the utterance was tame in its manner. There was doubtless something in the look of Jesus, in the flash of his eye, and in the tones of his voice, indicating his own feelings, and that he meant what he said. His words, in form addressed to a single person, yet intended for the hearing of others, told with immense effect. Luke says that "all his adversaries were ashamed," and that "all the people rejoiced for all the glorious things that were done by him." (Luke xiii, 17.)

7. The scribes and Pharisees of that age were the religious leaders of the people, and also the hostile critics and vilifiers of Jesus during his whole ministry. They were scrupulous ceremonialists and formalists in matters of religion, and, as a class, exceedingly corrupt and depraved in moral character under the disguise of a pretentious outward sanctity. They watched Jesus with malignant intensity and persistence, and sought to destroy his influence and to destroy him. They meant to kill him, and at last, when "his hour" was come, they accomplished their purpose.

What then was the attitude of Christ himself toward these hostile scribes and Pharisees? The general answer to this question is that he never yielded an inch to them, never sought to conciliate them by any scheme of policy, never modified his own course or teaching to adapt himself to their notions; but, on the contrary, boldly and fearlessly met them, exposed their iniquities and the utter worthlessness of their religious formalism, declared that by their traditions they made void the law of God, warned his disciples and warned the people against them, and openly denounced them in language of the utmost severity. His uniform doctrine was that no one could enter into the kingdom of Heaven, unless he had a better righteousness than that of the scribes and Pharisees. (Matt. v, 20.) He preached this doctrine everywhere, in Galilee and Judea, alike in their presence and in their absence, knowing that it was calculated to bring them into discredit, and that it would array them against him. The great conflict of thought and words between him and them was radical and irreconcilable; and on his part there was not the slightest concession to them.

This position of Christ was not due to an unlovely and sour temper of mind, or to a querulous and fault-finding disposition, or to defeated and disappointed ambition, or to the jealousy of rivalry, or to the spirit of retaliation in return for abuse received. Nothing of this kind existed in the mind and heart of Jesus; and yet there did exist in that mind and heart the capacity of being greatly offended and displeased with hypocrisy and wrong, however much they might be disguised, and in whatever forms manifested. Jesus was simply true to the demands and dictates of his own moral nature, when, in application to the facts as they confronted him, he spoke as he did in regard to the scribes and Pharisees. While not malignant, he condemned and disliked them, and thoroughly abhorred and despised their character. His own knowledge and purity made his position and preaching a moral necessity. He could not do otherwise, and yet realize the purpose for which he came into the world.

8. The above items, seven in number, gathered from the history of Christ's life, tho by no means exhausting the entire list of such items, are abundantly sufficient to show the general fact that he was capable of being displeased, even to the extent of righteous anger, with the conduct and character of men. This fact as distinctly appears as does that of his tenderness and love, or as the capability of displeasure ever appeared in the history of any being. We make a great mistake in our judgment of him, if we so exalt and intensify his merciful temper of mind as virtually to exclude the capability of displeasure, just as we do if we so magnify the mercy of God as absolutely to obliterate his justice, and make him morally indifferent to wickedness. Such a view misrepresents the real character of the historic Christ. The truth is that he *could* be, and that on frequent occasions he *was*, displeased with the conduct of men, and manifested this fact by his words.

9. The following suggestions naturally occur to the thoughtful mind in view of this fact:

(1.) The first of these suggestions is that the Christ, disclosed in the Gospel history, is the same God-Man in Heaven that he was on earth—"the same yesterday, and to-day, and forever," (Heb. xiii, 8.) He is there just

what he was when on the cross, when preaching in Galilee, or when denouncing the scribes and Pharisees in the temple. He does not in Heaven approve what on earth he condemned. His condition is changed, but not his essential personality and character; and hence we may and must take the earthly and historic Christ as the guide of thought to the heavenly Christ. Knowing the former, we have the means of knowing the latter. It was the latter who, through the pen of John, said to the church of Ephesus: "Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love," and who, through the same pen, said to the church of the Laodiceans: "So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth." (Rev. ii, 4, and iii, 16.) The heavenly Christ is simply the earthly Christ exalted and enthroned, but not essentially changed.

(2.) The second suggestion is that, in addition to his continued identity of nature and character, the historic Christ is, by the appointment of God the Father, the executive administrator of the divine moral government in Heaven and on earth. Of himself, just prior to his ascension, he said: "All power [authority] is given unto me in Heaven and in earth." (Matt. xxviii, 18.) His own teaching shows that penitence toward God and faith in him, as the Saviour of the world, will find in him a lenient and forgiving friend, who will revoke penalty incurred and save the ill-deserving. Impenitence and unbelief will not, by the terms of his own character and those of his regal office, and according to the plain teaching of Christ himself and that of his Apostles, find in him such a friend. His history on earth proves that there is in his character such a fact as "the wrath of the Lamb," and hence we need feel no surprise that inspiration points to a like fact in the after life, and also to "the great day of his wrath." (Rev. vi, 16, 17.)

(3.) A third suggestion is that Christ, in his regal function, when sitting on the throne, and administering the final judgment, will not forgive those who blasphemed against the Holy Ghost in Galilee, and whose sin he declared to be beyond forgiveness; that he will not reverse the doom which he pronounced against Judas; that he will not commend the scribes and Pharisees whom he condemned on earth; and, in general, that he will not recall, contradict, or make void his own teaching in the days of his flesh. He will there be of the same mind that he was here, and there have the same views and the same character that he had here.

(4.) A fourth suggestion is that whether we shall be on good terms with Christ when we meet him in the final day, and he on good terms with us, so that he will be our Saviour, and not simply our punitive judge, depends upon our own character when we thus meet him, since he will not change. The monitory advice in a Messianic psalm prophetically addressed to sinful humanity, is this: "Kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." (Ps. ii, 12.) Yes, we must be at peace with Christ, if we would find in him a friend. If we accept his salvation, we need not fear his judgment. If we set him at naught, we make ourselves the objects of his righteous displeasure. There is no clemency in him, or in his Gospel, that offers any hope to those who persistently and finally reject the plan of his grace.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE RECENT CHANGES IN OXFORD.

BY ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD,
PRESIDENT OF MIAMI UNIVERSITY.

I HAVE just returned from a stroll beneath the shapely towers of Magdalen, and along the river walk to which Addison has given his name, and now, as I sit in my own old College of Wadham, with its loveliest of all lovely gardens, the spell of Oxford is strong upon me. It is the old Oxford, the Oxford of stone and mortar, of storied windows and sculptured marbles, of wood and meadow, of retired gardens and secluded river nooks; the city that gives herself to you piecemeal, with never ceasing surprises, of infinite largesses and no less infinite reserve; ever coy, yet ever kind. And this part of Oxford changes not, and one feels assuredly can never change.

And yet when the spell is broken by a careful study of Oxford as it is to-day and as it was when I left it, at the end of my undergraduate life seven years ago, change is to be seen everywhere, in the Colleges and the University, in the buildings and in the lines of intellectual activity. The letter which brought me from Göttingen to the hospitable home of Prof. Max Müller warned me that there was change writ large in many things; but it seemed quite incredible. It may be a popular delusion, and I am assured it is by many who speak by the book, but it is generally believed that this is the stronghold of conservatism; not in a bad sense, of course, but in the sense, let us rather say, of "holding fast the form of sound words received by tradition from the fathers." In such a sense it can only be praise, and when the good yields to a better we may not lightly pass over the ends and the conditions of the new order of things.

The change in one direction began about ten years ago, and I witnessed its beginnings without fully realizing that what seemed individual activity on the part of a

few colleges was really the first sign of a general movement. This is the recent expansion of buildings and the growth of the separate theological houses.

As exemplified in the first efforts at building it was architecturally a profound failure, but times beget men, and certainly the architects of later years have done far better. It would be hard to surpass the beautiful additions to Trinity and Magdalen Colleges, and the new quadrangle at Brazenose, while in some points of questionable taste, is in many respects decidedly the most beautiful specimen of modern Gothic in Oxford. Almost every one of the colleges has made a recent addition to its *fabrique*, and the increase in the number of undergraduates in residence is quite a feature of the new order. In short, the colleges no longer determine the number of undergraduates in residence, but the number of undergraduates determines, or at least tends to determine, the extent of the colleges. This is nothing less than revolutionary—tho, like most revolutions in English history, it has been attained by a long evolution.

We look backward across the centuries and see the students being gathered into halls for their protection, support and better governance; then into colleges after the plan of Walter de Merton's wise foundation of Merton College; finally, the modern college comes upon the scene with less and less care for the protection, support and government, and more and more care for the education and temporal welfare of its members. There was a time when the college wanted as little as possible to do with those not on the foundation, and its aim was the mental welfare of its community. How the new changes mark the coming of the era when the college wants its members to shine that their light may attract others, and further wishes for increase of members that thus yet more may be drawn to its portals. It is the age when every standard is quantitative not qualitative which has begotten such a state of things, and we pause instinctively to wonder if it is for the best.

The heart turns back to the day when even a large college was content with a hundred inmates, when these were knit by the closest of ties, for there was no marrying or giving in marriage in those good old days, and the fellows lived on as the spiritual fathers of the scholars and undergraduates generally. Perhaps the heart rightly overrules the heart here; but the question is assertive: Would it not be better to keep the collegiate responsibility within comparative narrow bounds; would it not be better to keep the colleges to the number they can accommodate within their own walls and make them seek good men rather than many men?

Every teacher knows the two difficulties which lie in the path of schools. On the one hand, the poor students handicap the good students; and on the other the demand of education for the masses is the great demand of the day, and the colleges owe a debt to the world as well as their own foundation.

The claim of the college which stays within its true limits has its asserters. I sat next an old Wadham fellow, long a successful master of the now specially prominent school of St. Paul's, London, at dinner a few nights since, and he pointed out with conscious pride that Wadham was perhaps alone among Oxford colleges in having never marred the work of its founder. There are others who regret that she has not rather courted popular methods; but he is not to be lightly convicted of error who relies on the full halls of a small college as the ideal educational community.

The rise of the unattached students who, free from any collegiate affiliations, enjoy all the advantages of the university proper, no doubt led to the inauguration of this movement. It was in a sense the assertion of the right to learning without patronage. It presented at once a hostile front to the social conditions of Oxford life, and of course met with a stubborn hostility on the part of the under-graduates, which has by no means passed away. But the unattached soon proved their right to existence, and not a few colleges would now be glad to draw the better part of this class into their their own expanding halls.

This, by a natural sequence, leads us to the second very notable change in Oxford. The long vacation used to be dedicated to the unbroken rule of silence, in street and hall. To-day there are a thousand young men and women in the town intent on learning—on learning what the men do in term, especially on field and river, it is unkindly whispered. One exasperated don of the old school writes indignantly to the *St. James Gazette*:

"I see a correspondence has been going on in the pages of one of your contemporaries on the 'popularization of Oxford.' Vulgarization would be the more proper phrase. Time was when the Long Vacation was the period for quiet study. The disporting element was absent, and many a work of learning and research owed its origin to the opportunity offered thereby for uninterrupted study. But now no sooner are the schools over and the last undergraduate departed than Oxford is invaded by a horde of excursionists. The popular lecturer holds forth in the Schools, and for ten days or a fortnight the University is a scene of educational revel. I should be glad to see such a band of real students residing here during the vacations; but I venture to think that Margate or Rosherville would be far better places than Oxford for the performances of the Cheap Tripper."

The cause of all this indignation is the "University

Extension Summer Session." Not a few of the older Dons take this view. As I was sitting a few afternoons ago on the brow of Shatover, enjoying the beautiful view of Oxford and its surroundings which it affords, one of them came up and, on being asked what was his view of the movement, replied: "Well, one wonders what these people have been doing all the year to display so much superfluous activity in mid-summer."

It was a very striking thing to see eight or nine hundred women in the lecture halls; and it was a very amusing thing to see every University man who happened to be "up," wear his cap and gown religiously, lest he should be taken for an "extensioner."

The course was opened by Prof. Max Müller in an admirable lecture "In Defense of Lectures," which has already appeared in the *New Review*—and thereby hangs a tale. The Professor gave the lecture to the *Review* for publication upon condition it should not appear till the day after it was delivered. But as the *Review's* day of publication was the day before that fixed for its delivery, he was very anxious lest it should by some mishap come out too soon. I was amused at his anxiety, and he said:

"But I have had some experience. I was asked to speak at a dinner in London once on a particular topic. I prepared my speech. I went to town, and met the editor of the *Times*. We talked about the dinner and my speech. He secured a copy for publication, and asked to be allowed to write an editorial on it, to which I consented. Then I went to the dinner. The committee came to me, and said: 'Mr. — has failed us; you must speak for Oxford and Cambridge.' I told them I couldn't. They insisted. I could not explain, for my talk with the editor was confidential. I at last took my hat and said I would go home. Then they gave way. Then the *Times* had my speech and its editorial next morning, and I was understood. It is unpleasant, you see, to have your speech in print before you deliver it."

The weeks that followed afforded a long and delightful series of lectures in four courses. Three morning courses in Literature, History and Science, and a popular evening course. The lecturers included such able men as Samuel Rawson Gardiner, Dr. J. A. H. Murray, the editor of the Philological Society's Dictionary, Seymour Hayden, Arthur Sidgwick, Churton Collins, A. H. Green and J. A. R. Marriott; and the services on Sunday included striking sermons from the Rev. C. Gore, the head of the New Pusey House, and the Rev. E. S. Talbot, D.D., formerly Warden of Keble. The lecture rooms afforded a strange and a very suggestive sight. It was full of portent of change. Lady Margaret Hall had sent a few women to hear our lectures from Frank Bright, at University College, in my own day, but they were under a duenna. This flood of women, and of bright, active-minded men, who still bore the mark of non-university origin in a vain pursuit of their "his" when they spoke, was like an invasion of the Vandals.

And in one of the colleges I found a colony of fifty primary schoolmasters hard at work with real "term-time" exercises gathering up material for the winter's campaign. This was a significant commentary on the rest of the program. This was work. The other might be in a large measure play. This was a very plain effort to turn the University into a great workshop. These men were not recreating; they wanted to "improve their position"; therefore they wanted work. They were a little cynical and satirical at times, a little inclined to think that the University pretenses were a little above the truth. They laughed at the lecturer, whom the women most applauded. All of these, perhaps, signs that they wanted the real thing, not merely the appearance.

And even in the ranks of the "extensioner" was to be heard the talk about the theological halls. In the common halls of the colleges they were all the talk, especially Pusey House and its head. Wyckliffe Hall, the Low Church house came first, responsive to the crying need of additional theological training for Bachelors of Arts. The High Churchmen came next; and we have of late much of the Nonconformist Mansfield College.

These are very important indications of the spirit of the times. They are, perhaps, first recognitions of the need of post-graduate theological training. Then they consciously are rallying points for the different parties in the Church, and Mansfield is thought in Oxford to be intended to be a means for resisting the tendency of Oxford to draw all men into the Established Church. It has a hard contest before it; but it is well equipped. Its head, Dr. Fairbairn, is well suited to his task, and its buildings are very pretty and attractive. It has found an unfortunate site in the low grounds back of Wadham College, out of the way, and destined to be seen only by those who seek it. It is to be feared that it will be a long time before it will be incorporated into University life.

One who has never breathed Oxford air can form no idea how laden it is with theological controversy. It is quite impossible to pass an evening in college without some allusion to theology and the bearing of theological questions on society. It is a great surprise to the uninitiated at first, and then grows fascinating as one of the best demonstrators of character.

The Warden of Wadham objects to the chanting of the Creed and Lord's Prayer in chapel on account of its being a "Papist practice." There is no such objection

across the way at Keble, and the extreme Broad Church tendencies of Balliol under Professor Jowett are well known. The liberal and the most re-actionary lover of authority, the conservative and the disciple of agnosticism, the Nonconformist and the follower of Mrs. Humphrey Ward's vagaries, dispute in all places of congregation in a way that is singular for its vivacity and its vitality. When I was an undergraduate it centered around the grave of Pusey, then just dead. Now the death of Newman is the alleged reason for its existence. One needs must question this, while he meditates on the text: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge."

OXFORD, ENGLAND.

OUR WASHINGTON LETTER.

BY KATE FOOTE.

ONLY one portion of Congress has been dull during the holidays and that is the House wing; the Senate faithfully ground away at its grist; but as yet has not much result to show. The Elections Bill has four Republican Senators sufficiently opposed to it to vote against it when the time comes: Mr. Wolcott and Mr. Teller, of Colorado, Mr. Stewart, of Nevada, and Mr. Washburn, of Minnesota. Mr. Wolcott made his first speech against it. He was listened to with the interest that attaches itself always to the first efforts of a green hand of whom much is expected. It was a better opposition than the Democratic side has offered. He took up some of the points and showed defects; he said distinctly that it was better to have unlawfully conducted elections in New York and Philadelphia, than to have the Federal Government take charge of them, because it is too great an interference with States' rights. Of course I am not quoting his exact words and the last part is a logical deduction. He said: "It is better that the local and State elections in New York shall be attended by fraud and dishonesty, than that they should be kept pure by Federal interference." In another place he says: "The bill should not become a law because it involves Federal interference and espionage at other than national elections, and such interference is contrary to the spirit of our institutions and an obstacle to the right enjoyment of our liberties." Again he says: "The time will surely come, if we do not seek to foment trouble, when the white voters of the South will hardly be as unanimous as now. Already the signs of the times point unmistakably to serious differences among them. When these differences become solidified, the colored voter will be in demand."

This is the first allusion he makes to the desire of the Republican Party to awake an element in the South that shall offer an opposition to the Democratic Party there as great as Republicans offer it in the North. After saying that if every Southern member in the House of Representatives were a Republican we should still not have a majority there, he says, perhaps the best thing in the whole speech: "Two years from now, when the beneficent tariff measure, which is now the law, has had the opportunity which time alone can give it of demonstrating its wisdom inspired by new zeal, I trust we shall not need the assistance of the Southern Republican representation which this bill seeks to give us."

The whole speech is full of clearly offered points of objection, and to those who are in favor of the bill, while they cannot but continue to favor it, they also wonder why the Democrats have not made an equally good one in opposition, and why the very best one offered should be on the Republican side. The Democratic speeches have not been good; they have been wild outcries against the bill as a partisan measure, outcries varied in the pitch somewhat, but with a dreadful sameness in the air they played, and besides that, eulogies of the rebel army during the late war, to which it was tiresome to listen. Nobody believes that the rebel rank and file was composed of angelic, Heaven-led patriots, forced by overwhelming numbers to gracefully succumb at last, and what is the use of trying, at this late day, to make them appear so? Mr. Wolcott did not appeal to that, he had other and modern arguments, presented in terse sentences, that were not too short and made one feel that he meant what he said, and also that behind it he felt that he was going against the tide in his own party, and that he did not like to do so but he must.

Mr. Spooner's speech, made before, and an exceedingly clear presentation of the Republican side, gave the opposition some hard, clean hits for the very thing I have alluded to—namely, the fact that invective was not argument, and that to inveigh against a measure in general terms proved nothing. The speech of Mr. Spooner was the best that has been made in favor of the bill. It was pleasant to have it fall on the ears after the things that had been said on the Democratic side. As for the bill itself, it is not unconstitutional; it probably would help break up that "solid South" line which is a discredit to our free government, and it would help the black race along in its march toward civilization. It would not jar on the sensibilities of any State that is inclined to be honest in its political methods; it would only be rough with the roughs. It has been noticed before this that law did not annoy honest men; it was only the rascals that found it an obstruction. Some people object to the Ten Commandments. In studying our political probabilities just before a Federal election, few of the good people seem