were led to mistake the excrescences, the deranged machinery, or the makeshift arrangements which had taken the place of machinery which had ceased to work—all this chaos we mistook, and could scarcely avoid mistaking, for the true, proper, and normal organization of a university. From this cause arose two principal errors. Oxford and Cambridge were rich in old foundations, all, no doubt, originally well-mean’d, and some really useful. Among them were a great many prizes for the victors in university competitions, and there were also a great many fellowships, which, during the period of languor, had come to be regarded as mere prizes. The idea of encouraging the industry of youth by rewards, is very natural and pretty. When the rewards are moderate, and in a school, it may perhaps do good, or in any case no great harm. But practised on a gigantic scale, in a great university, it may lead to very unexpected results. It is one thing to give a medal for a clever copy of verses, and quite another thing to reward a young man for passing a good examination with an income of two hundred pounds a year, to be enjoyed for an indefinite time, and almost without conditions.

Under this system the fellowship rules everything, and all other motives fall into the background; while all authorities, the father and the college-tutor, conspire to tell the young man that he must study, not for self-improvement, not for science, not for the service of the world, but simply for a living. How degrading this system has been to Oxford and Cambridge, those know best who have watched them most carefully. It is the real reason why, with all their vast resources, they have contributed so much less to the advancement of knowledge than the comparatively poor German universities, where young men go to gain knowledge for its own sake. Under such a system Professor Seeley says: “The young man is treated as a boy; science is degraded to a trick; study is desecrated; education is degraded; at the same time the brain of the student is overwrought; his view of life is perverted, and sometimes his character is permanently enfeebled by those competitive examinations which, not many years ago, were so fashionable among us. I speak strongly, but I speak of what I know. . . . I fancy that of late years the pressure of competition at Cambridge and Oxford has been considerably relaxed, but I remember it when it was at its height; and now when I call to mind the maxims that were current under that system, the low and vulgar view of our studies which we were tempted to take—tempted do I say? Nay, which we were openly instructed and exhorted by our teachers to take—I confess that I am sometimes disposed to distrust my memory, and to think that what it presents to me must be a bad dream.”

This paper, giving as it does the view of so able and eminent a scholar of what a modern university should be, is very interesting. How far his own methods and teaching are from the system he has so heartily denounced, may be seen in the last number of the Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science.” It is number ten of the fifth series of this valuable serial, and is entitled “The Study of History in England and Scotland,” by Paul Fredericq, Professor in the University of Ghent, and is translated by Miss Henrietta Leonard, A.B., of Smith College. The chapter on the study of History in the Scotch Universities, is, strange to say, almost as short as the famous chapter in Horne-bow on the snakes in Ireland; but the account of the present methods of teaching the subject at Oxford and Cambridge is very interesting, and contains very instructive lists of books.

If any readers of THE TECH have already been led by their study of the details of physical science to take an interest in those metaphysical problems to which the study of science inevitably leads,—and this, to the present writer, seems by no means impossible,—such readers will certainly be interested in a paper on the philosophy of that remarkable German writer, Hermann Lotze, whose work, “Microcosmus,” has lately been translated into English. The paper is by Professor St. George Mivart, who is an ardent disciple of the doctrine of evolution, and at the same time a devout Roman Catholic. Trying to account for the materialistic views of science which are so common nowadays, he says: “Science, in the popular sense of the word, progresses by the discovery of uniformities in the co-existences and sequences of phenomena, and conceptions which relate not to phenomena, but to existences supposed to underlie phenomena, cannot be expected a priori to have much influence on such scientific discovery. Experience confirms this anticipation. The progress of physiological and medical science (of which he is particularly speaking) has been in part due to . . . investigations conducted in harmony with mechanical conceptions. No wonder,