

## Critique.

Perhaps you have heard of the  
reverend doctor who, in delivering an  
address before the graduating class of  
a theological seminary, remarked,  
"Young gentlemen, you will preach  
all your sermons on family discipline  
in the first few years of your ministry."  
Your critic feels that she stands in  
nearly much the same relation to this  
assembly that the young minister does  
to his first charge. Therefore she will  
criticise just as tho' she hadn't always  
failed in extempore speeches, always  
been out of order in Parliamentary  
Drill, leaned on the table in debate

and become so frightened that her knees  
shook and her voice trembled when read-  
ing an essay, and violated all the  
rules of Society etiquette generally.

---

The one thing that most of all  
differentiates the oration from the  
essay is the appeal, and this element  
Miss Ansden made very apparent  
all thro' her oration from beginning to  
end, in this way making the subject  
alive and of real interest to the present  
audience. Her plea for compulsory  
education was well founded and  
borne out by statistics. The speaker's  
enunciation was very clear, a thing  
which all will admit adds immensely  
to the audience's enjoyment of any  
production. Perhaps she might have



show a little more enthusiasm  
 and perhaps too if the physical outlay  
 that was expended in the constant  
 swinging motion had been used in-  
 stead in making a few gestures, the  
 effect would have been just as good.  
 In looking over the manuscript, the  
 critic was surprised that the writing  
 should begin so near the top of the  
 page. The title looks as tho' it were  
 standing ready to give one leap and  
 be off, and the first line after it.

There was one particular in which  
 the authors of the oration and the story  
 were alike. Miss Mungler also swung  
 from side to side, a gesture motion  
 whose effect was heightened by the pathos  
 soothing tone of voice which accompan-  
 ied it. Miss Mungler did not read enough  
 to her audience, for her eyes were

hardly lifted from her paper. However these are comparatively small points. The story, "Trade Unions" was one of the best that society has hitherto to this year. It was very interesting, a good plot ~~and~~ well worked out, a story that kept the hearers close attention, altho' there was not as much conversation introduced as one likes to hear in a story. The style was easy and graceful.

Miss Fairchild's critique was refreshing and original as we might have expected. Despite the gratefulness of her writing, ~~she~~ notices that Miss Fairchild repeats words and phrases several times in an essay and occasionally quite near to each other. This is apt



to ~~find~~<sup>mar</sup> the harmonious sound, but still, it may be one of the very characteristics that makes Miss Tanfield's work so natural. One thing was especially striking in this critique, that is, the perfect unity and the fact that thro' the entire paper the connecting thought between two successive paragraphs was absolutely clear with out an exception.

How well Miss Bates stands upon the platform! We were all enjoyed listening to her essay on ~~the subject~~ of our great English epic poem "Beowulf", a charming subject for a literary society. The numerous quotations from the poem itself gave added beauty. Miss Bates seemed to have caught the poet's spirit and carried it into her own style.

The debate between Miss Peterson and Miss Willard was on the question - "Resolved that some play either classical or Shakespearian shall be given each year by the students of Oberlin College". Both disputants were composed and neither was closely confined to her rubric. Miss Willard's position, <sup>in standing</sup> was not good, but her arguments were, and that is more to the point. ~~There was her~~ statement that ~~she made which was rather narrow. She said~~ "The demands on the time of Oberlin students are greater than the demands on the time of students in other colleges", could hardly be called a strong point however. We doubt whether other colleges would admit it. As the affirmative handed in no



brief it is hard to judge of that part of the debate, altho' we can say in general that her arguments were good and well sustained as well as those of the negative who handed in a very carefully prepared brief, which gave in condensed form a clear accurate account of the whole argument.

The extemporaneous part of last week's programme was also of a high order. The first speech by Miss Banta, on the "Nicaragua Canal Bill" was a perfect success. Miss Banta was well informed on the topic and did not begin by saying that she had her information from the boy who sat next her at the table, nor did she conclude with the remark that "she guessed

8

That was all she knew."

From Miss Savage we gained some real information as to Gen. Otis in the Philippines. Miss Savage is to be congratulated upon her first appearance in society and gives <sup>us promise</sup> of being another strong member from the Junior class.

The fact that Miss Bartholomew was unprepared in regard to the subject upon which she was asked to speak seemed to frighten her somewhat, but she regained her composure and gave us an interesting account of ~~some~~ <sup>an article</sup> ~~thing~~ she had read.

Miss Forbes, who would probably have been the choice of any one in the audience, handled the trying subject



of extemporaneous speaking in her  
usual happy way.

The unusual vivacity manifest-  
ed in Parliamentary Drill brought  
with it a pang, for what will Society  
be another year without the members  
from 1900?

Mary M. Baldwin.

May 1900.