stern upholders of patents in their broadest claims. One judge will reverse the opinions of another; and there is no ultimate scientific tribunal before which the statements of the experts can be brought to be examined and affirmed or denied.

The dignity of scientific men is imperiled by engaging in the business of expert testimony; and the dignity of the law is no less in danger, for the business man does not at present rely on the decisions of one judge. He feels that such decisions may be reversed by another judge on a new interpretation of obscure scientific points by pliant experts, and he therefore makes up his mind to fight; to weary out the opposing side, and to bring impecunious inventors to terms by manipulating the perplexities of the judges. The amount of money that is spent in patent litigation by the present method of procedure may be counted every year by millions.

It is incumbent upon a critic of existing evils to suggest a remedy. What other method of procedure is possible? Do not searching examinations bring out the fallacies of expert testimony? Possibly they do in criminal law. On the other hand, does the professor desire to be treated as a lying witness in a criminal case? Cross-examination of experts might be of more service if the experts could avoid becoming partisans; if the money element could be eliminated; if shallow self-possession could be persuaded to take the back seat, and modest knowledge, with its doubts born of long study, could be properly respected; if — and so one could continue with "ifs." The most practical remedy, it seems to me, for the existing evils of expert testimony, would consist in making it customary for a judge to call to his assistance any professor of science of high attainment who is not engaged by either of the parties in dispute. If the judge appealed to the State to provide him with scientific advice, and if men eminent in science were selected by the State to aid the judge in his endeavor to arrive at the truth on scientific points, both the bench and the professional chairs would gain in dignity, and the pursuit of truth would again be considered one of the chief characteristics of a scientific life.

John Trowbridge.

MYSTERY.

ELUDE me still, keep ever just before,
A cloudy thing, a shape with wingèd feet.
I shall pursue, but be you strict and fleet,
Unreachable as gusts that pass the door.
Better than doubting eye that eye of yore
Which set tall robbers stalking through the night;
Or of the wind, lane's hollow, briers white,
Made for the Apriltide one ghost the more.
For safe am I that have you still in sight;
See you down each new road, upon you come
In crocus days; under the stripped tree find;
In creed and song, in harvest as in blight;
My chiefest joy till I grow cold and dumb;
Till my years fail, and you are left behind!

Lizette Woodworth Reese.

"'TIS SIXTY YEARS SINCE" AT HARVARD.

It is three years since I promised The Atlantic Monthly that, by way of closing a series of reminiscences, I would attempt a comparison of Harvard College sixty years ago with the college of to-day.

The subject is an interesting one, and is very apt to come up at class dinners, as old gentlemen, in a figure, pick over their walnuts. If Mr. Hill will pardon a parenthesis, let me say that a hundred years ago and more George Washington would frequently "sit over his walnuts" two hours, really picking out the meats and nibbling at them, with the accompaniment of one only glass of Madeira. The subject is an interesting one, but it has proved so interesting that I have never put pen to paper until now. For *le mieux est l'ennemi du bon*, alas, and one does not very willingly handle a theme which so many other men can work out much better than he.

I am set on it, at last, by the accident that I have been reading this week Mark Pattison's extraordinary and therefore amusing memorials of his own life in Oxford, to which place he went four years before I went to our Cambridge. The book, quite worthless in itself, is amusing, and indeed edifying, when matched in with Stanley's, Ward's, Newman's, and a dozen other memorials of Oxford life at the same time. To an American graduate it is simply amazing as well as amusing, because it exhibits a habit of life — one hardly says of thought — among undergraduates as different from our undergraduate life as the life of Mr. Kipling's four-footed friends is different from the life of Thyrsis and Amyntas in Arcadia. Let me try my hand and memory in giving to the undergraduate of to-day some notion of what undergraduates at our Cambridge did, and what they thought about, fifty or sixty years ago. Possibly this may show how it happened that a few of them turned out to be of some use in the world.

As matter of familiar speech or language, let me begin with saying that, in the thirties, it was not the habit of Harvard College men or boys to say that they were of Harvard or from Harvard. We knew what such words meant, and Amherst or Williams men used them to us, not we to them. We spoke of ourselves as Cambridge men, — as a Balliol man now might say he was from Oxford. This means, I think, that we all wanted to hold to the phrase in the Constitution of Massachusetts which speaks of the "University at Cambridge." Mr. Everett afterward introduced this on the college programmes and catalogues. It showed that a man was somewhat fresh if he said he was from Harvard. The present fashion came in a little after.

Professor Beers has just now written a pleasant book which he calls Initial Studies in American Letters. He says good-naturedly that "the professors of literature in our colleges are usually persons who have made no additions to literature; and the professors of rhetoric seem ordinarily to have been selected to teach students how to write, for the reason that they themselves have never written anything that any one has read." And after this friendly joke on his own craft, he adds that "the Harvard College of some fifty years ago offers some striking exceptions to these remarks." I will own that, as a Cambridge man, I read with some pride and much pleasure his list of the seventeen years after 1821, in which there graduated Emerson, Holmes, Sumner, Phillips, Motley, Thoreau, and Lowell. He had only to go a little farther to have added Higginson and Parkman. Let me say, in passing, that the inaugural address delivered by Edward Channing in 1819, when he as-