

ford was superior to all others. Mr. Gladstone was most lucid in pointing out the cause of Oxford's greatness at this period—the decisive and exceptional influence of that order, whose founder, St. Francis, had done everything to hold himself and his followers aloof from academic life. Oxford became the centre of resistance to the Dominican attempt, disastrously triumphant elsewhere, to displace the Augustinised Plato of the fathers of the church by putting in his stead the Christianised Aristotle of Thomas Aquinas.

During the fifteenth century Oxford was still ahead of Cambridge, having Selling, Linacre, Colet and Sir Thomas Moore to boast of. But during the next century there was an entire change. The Reformation belonged to Cambridge “where it had its real commencement.” The Elizabethan bishops were for the most part Cambridge men. Many theologians were summoned from abroad, as if to give tangible proof of incompetency at home. In the seventeenth century Cambridge remained in the lead. Taking the seventeenth and eighteenth together, Cambridge confronts her rival with Bacon, Milton, and Newton, “names before which we can only bow.” Milton's name suggested that until the close of the last century, Oxford has made hardly any contribution “to the noble list of English poets.” The paramount influence of an Oxford philosopher, John Locke, from the speaker's own college, was next dwelt upon.

In the last third of the lecture he spoke of men of action and said that Becket, Langton, Wolsey and Laud were the greatest ecclesiastics since the Norman conquest, and to these names he added Wycliffe and Newman. All save Langton had been Oxford men. He described Laud as standing “upon the historic stage half way between culprit and martyr,” said of Wycliffe that it was his singular destiny to produce in Bohemia results far more potent than in his own country, and of Newman that it was he who had “set a mark upon the mind and inner spirit of the English church which it is likely to carry through many generations.” He made a wonderfully telling plea in behalf of Laud against Macaulay's hard words. His conclusion as to men of action was guardedly expressed, but to the

effect that Oxford men shone superior to Cambridge men in action.

In closing, he protested against that theory of education, happily without footing at Oxford and Cambridge “which would have it to construct machines of so many horse power, rather than to form characters to rear into time excellence that marvellous creature we call man—which gloats upon success in life instead of studying to secure that the man shall always be greater than his work and and never bounded by it.” At the end he dwelt solemnly upon the beauties of theology and the loveliness of the Oxford motto: *Dominus illuminatio mea.*

* * *

But as this is our last issue before the voting, or at least before the pledging of votes will be practically over, we feel that it is necessary to call attention to two other points in reference to the election. Last week the JOURNAL, both in editorials and in a communication, emphasized the necessity and suggested means of a closer union between the Arts and Medical students. Now it appears very plain that the first step towards unity in the Alma Mater Society must be taken in our election. If we are now really only separate faculties of the one university, why is it any longer necessary for us to perpetuate the old rivalry between Medicine and Arts in our election of a president? If Arts men are in earnest in their loudly professed desire to attach the interest of the Meds. to the Alma Mater, why is the supreme question with the Senior Year at present: “How can we get ahead of the Meds. in the election of the president?”

Our contention is not that there should be only one candidate brought out for presidential honors. We should have at least two or even three of our best graduates running for the office; and the more popular they are, and the more equal their qualifications, the better will be the election and the fuller the treasury. What we do contend against is that because a candidate is nominated by a section of Arts men, all Arts men should be considered in honor bound to vote for him, and that the Meds. should act on the same onesided policy. Surely the placing of the best man in the president's chair is of more importance than