FREEDOM OF WORSHIP.

Prize Essays on *Free Worship and Finance*, by Rev. T. P. Browning; Rev. S. H. Saxby; Rev. J. Hamilton; and Rev. W. P. S. Bingham. RIVINGTONS: London, Cambridge, and Oxford, 1865.

NO one, who can spare a few moments from the engrossing competition of the Senate-House, Fenner's, and the boats, can be unaware of the strange excitement with which the whole of England is labouring at the present time. Public meetings to discuss questions of parliamentary reform; meetings for and against ritualistic practices; meetings to consider how trades unions may extend their influence to the continent; meetings, again, of working-men to counteract the activity of the trades unionists; church congresses, social science congresses; the revival of diocesan synods; the progress of co-operative societies; and last, not least, the wonderful activity of the Anglican church in every kind of work—all combine to shew that a new phase of social life in England is about to commence, and that the old order must ere long give place to the new. In the political world the more wealthy and educated classes have set their faces in the most determined manner against democracy; the working classes are equally determined to procure for themselves what they consider a fair representation in the House of Commons. How to balance these apparently conflicting, but really not irreconcilable, interests, is the problem on which statesmen are engaged. A not dissimilar difficulty requires the consideration of ecclesiastics. The inevitable working-man, who seems to absorb all the attention at present in matters political, is at the bottom of the tribulation of the divines as well. On the one hand the working-man, having much the same moral affections as other men, stands in equal need of religious training, and requires similar facilities for public worship. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the great majority of the persons generally known by the name of the working classes, do not attend

any place of worship at all. Neither the Church, nor the dissenters either Protestant or Romanist, can, or at least *do*, attract that numerous and influential body of men. Of the dreadful results of an entire absence of religious instruction, undergraduates will be less able to form an adequate idea than clergymen and those who have seen with their own eyes something of working life.

Many of the subscribers to *The Eagle* are destined to take Holy Orders, and it is to those chiefly that the following remarks may prove interesting, although the subject is one which comes home to every one in a greater or less degree.

The present coldness of the working classes in religious matters cannot but lead to disastrous results. If any one imagine that great masses of men can live on from day to day without public worship and its concomitant blessings, and yet not be in danger of succumbing to all kinds of vices, and becoming gradually but surely *brutalised*, he must be at a loss to account for the existence of a Church at all, and more especially for its divine foundation; for the repeated injunctions not to forget the assembling of ourselves together, and for the command to preach the gospel to the poor. The Church is absolutely necessary for the *temporal* as well as for the spiritual welfare of the nation. The Church exists and is flourishing: but, sad to say, to a large portion of the nation it is as if it were not. Dissenting chapels abound; but these same classes are not to be seen there. The Romanist offers his gorgeous ritual; the working-man turns his back on it. Large meetings have been held in Cambridge and many other towns by the working classes themselves to investigate the reasons for this general indifference, and numerous simultaneous sermons have been preached with the object of stirring up greater endeavours to put an end to so melancholy a state of things. The reasons for non-attendance at Church given by the working-men themselves in their congresses are generally vague, and can hardly be satisfactory even to those who advance them. But, whatever the cause may be, there is one practice in vogue which certainly tends to foster the evil and to make its cure almost impossible—the practice of appropriating sittings in parish churches to certain persons or families or houses, whether for fixed sums of money or for other considerations.*

* Appropriation, or the pew system, has been defined as the division of a Church into private tenements, and the tenancy or ownership of such tenements by private individuals in the same sense in which lawyers and others speak of the tenancy or ownership of a house. Or, again, in the *Church Dictionary* of Dr. Hook, pews are described as "enclosed seats in churches, which enable people to attend church and hear sermons comfortably and luxuriously." We would say that appropriation is religion made easy to the minority, and impossible to the majority of the community. Under this system, the occupants regard their pews or appropriated seats, no less than their houses, as their castles. Equally—to say the least—in both cases they resent intrusion. They claim, not merely a right of exclusive occupancy for themselves, but the power also to repel all others at their will.—Rev. T. P. Browning, *Essay* I. p. 1, *On the Evils of the Appropriation of Parish and District Churches.*

It is thought by some that, until the pew system is swept away entirely, all attempts to influence the working classes to any great degree by means of clerical agency will be pretty nearly hopeless. These declare that the pew system must go; churches must be free and open to all alike, without any distinction of rich and poor;
nothing can be done; for, under the present arrangement, the lower classes are absolutely debarred from taking part in the national worship; it is simply out of the question; there is not sufficient accommodation for them in the churches; richer men have outbid them, and bought up the holy place; the working-man must go elsewhere.

Others affirm that the poor keep aloof from a different cause altogether; they are confident that no good would be got by preventing the appropriation of pews; much harm might follow: for
would be annoyed at losing their accustomed seats and at being mixed up with strangers, and might gradually be driven themselves from the churches.

These conflicting opinions cannot both be right. It is for churchmen to decide whether appropriated or free sittings are more suitable to the dignity
Catholic, and better calculated to enable the national religion to be brought home to the greatest number of people, so as to confer the greatest advantage on the nation at large. Let us therefore examine the arguments of those who advocate the retention of the practice of buying and selling sittings in churches.

In the first place, say they, the English are pre-eminently a domestic people. Families love to worship together, which

they can always do if they have pews of their own; whereas if all the seats were free, the chances are that a whole family would never be able to sit together. Besides, they continue, it is very disagreeable not to know where one is going to sit. It is a great addition to the pleasures of a service to be able to go straight to a definite place, and there sit or stand or kneel free from molestation. But in free churches, if the service is more attractive, or if the preacher is more earnest and eloquent than elsewhere, many people from the neighbouring parishes will flock to hear him, and the parishioners to whom the church really belongs will be ousted from their rights, or at least inconveniently crowded and disturbed. At all events, they argue, it will be allowed that at watering places such as Brighton, to which many thousands of strangers flock every Sunday, and especially during the season when great numbers of permanent visitors take up a residence of two or three months at the sea side and inundate the churches, each of the parishioners must have a seat secured to him, or he runs a good chance of seeing his place filled Sunday after Sunday by some wretched excursionist. Besides, in almost all churches free seats are set apart for the poor, and it is useless to tell us that they require more room when we can see with our own eyes that the seats already assigned to them are seldom entirely filled. You cannot expect, they say, refined gentlemen and delicate ladies to tolerate being mixed up with common folk: whether it is absurd or unchristian, or whatever else you please to call it, a well dressed person cannot attend to the service if he has to sit between a couple of chimney sweeps. Then invalids ought to have seats of their own: a comfortable seat, or a footstool of a peculiar shape, may make all the difference in the world to a person enfeebled by illness. Besides all this, they urge that, of course, one could not leave books in the church; but would have to drag them to and from home every time one went to service. Such objections, they are prepared to hear, sound trivial, but still everyone is alive to them, and does not feel them the less powerfully because he cannot entirely justify them. In free churches there would be such an amount of crowding and scrambling for places that many decent people would refuse to go to church at all. And suppose the whole of the sittings were made entirely free, they think that the result would be, that the crinolines would fill up the whole place, and the poor would be as badly off as before. What they dread most is, that the parishioners would gradually cease to look upon any one

church as their own, since any of the neighbouring churches are equally open to them, and thus that the parochial system would be subverted, which is one of the finest institutions in England. In fact, they are sure that we should find that the advantages gained by the change would be entirely at the expense of those who, by their regular attendance, shew that they appreciate the services, and for the imaginary benefit of a class of people who are chiefly conspicuous by their absence.

Such are the objections which are generally urged against the abolition of the old pew system—plausible enough, but not very formidable when examined more closely.

It may, perhaps, be not inexpedient to give some instances of the practical working of the system as well as to discuss it theoretically; for as the Rev. Stephen Saxby observes in his admirable essay on the subject, "the experience of every day shews us the difficulty of redressing an abuse merely on the grounds of its discrepancy with first principles. The fact is, there are many things which work fairly well, in spite of their demonstrable inconsistency with sound theory. This paradox is forced upon us in civil jurisprudence, in diplomacy, and even, though somewhat against our will, in some few matters of church polity; nor will any observant man be surprised at meeting an instance of it, in affairs small or great. The obvious explanation of it is, that the theory is constructed for men as they ought to be, while the practice deals with them as they are. It is, therefore, instinctively felt by the community at large that it is not enough to prove unsoundness in principle: if we are to bring about any material change in public feeling, we need also to shew that the thing of which we complain is working badly." Thus, until it has been undeniably shewn, not only that the principle of the pew system is faulty, but also that its actual results are bad, that nothing good can be effected by it which would not attend the opposite system in a greater degree; and that, on the other hand, infinite harm is being produced by it, which the free system obviates, words will only have been thrown away. To those who are under the impression that the pew system works well, it is useless to assert that it is contrary to the spirit and letter of the English laws, and a direct violation of the teaching of the New Testament.* To the first objection they answer that the law may be altered; to the second, that the Epistle of St. James was

* See Epistle of St. James, chap. ii. St. Matthew, xxiii. 6.

addressed to a particular church, and that we in the present day are only compelled to obey it in things general, not in matters which each society of Christians is at liberty to arrange in any way which it finds suits it best.*

Objection 1. *Families like to worship together.*

In the first place it may be observed that the pew holders do not constitute the English nation, nor even a majority of it. They are, in truth, a very small minority indeed. The general argument, then, derived from the domesticity of the English nation, can by no means be admitted to be hostile to the system of free churches. Our opponents assert that a system which prevents families from worshipping together, is to be condemned. We say that the free system has no greater tendency to produce that inconvenience than the system of appropriation. Nay, we even declare war upon the pew system on this very ground, that it is a *great barrier* to the very desirable blending together of national and family worship on the part of the great majority of the community. For even allowing that in some cases it may enable the pew holders, who, be it remembered, are only a very small minority, to sit together by families, yet no provision is made for a similar luxury on the part of the majority, who are, forsooth, to content themselves with the free seats, if there are any. Now, as the advocates of appropriation object to all the seats being made free, on the ground that families would find it difficult to sit together under that arrangement, with what consistency can they condemn the greater part of the nation to use free seats only? Their own objection tells against themselves: they cut their own fingers with the sword destined for their enemies. But, even in appropriated churches, it is doubtful whether this advantage is secured even for the minority. The Rev. W. R. Wroth deposed as follows at the Anti-Pew meeting held in Bath in March, 1864:

"That families sat together much better in his church than in pewed churches, because it was often difficult to seat all in a pent-up pew. They could not make the pew expand with the family. It was difficult, as families enlarged, to find a pew just large enough for a certain number of people to go to. The pew system was, he firmly believed, a great separator of families in churches."† In general it is found

* *Essay on the English Pew System*, by Rev. Stephen Saxby, M.A.

† *Essay on Evils of the Appropriation of Parish and District Churches*, by Rev. T. P. Browning, p. 46.

that families which are anxious to sit together can secure that object in free churches by simply going early. Nor let it be imagined that the necessity of going in good time is a hardship or inconvenience. In our own college chapel, any undergraduate who wishes to occupy a particular seat on Sunday evenings is compelled to be there some five or ten minutes before the hour strikes. I have never heard any one complain about it, nor do I believe that any of us look upon it as a nuisance.

Objection 2. *The pleasure of having a fixed seat.*

We must again insist on the *universality* of the argument. If it is a pleasure to know where one is going to sit, the pew-holders, that is to say, a very small minority of the parishioners, are not the only persons who would like to enjoy that pleasure. The excluded majority would much like to know where they are going to sit. And indeed it is strange that the wealthy few should wish deliberately to inflict an acknowledged inconvenience upon the many by monopolizing a right which the law declares to be common to all; and that too, when, by so doing, they bring the welfare of thousands upon thousands of souls into jeopardy.

In the second place, any person desirous of securing the same place Sunday after Sunday, can do so as certainly in free as in appropriated churches, by simply going in good time. Thus nothing would be lost on this point by making all the sittings free, and at least punctuality might be gained. Under the present system, though half the appropriated pews are unoccupied, strangers or parishioners, who have no purchased seat and cannot find room in the free sittings, must be left standing until it is quite certain that the owners of the pews do not intend to come in late.* Hence much

* In many bepewed churches these private boxes are not thrown open to the public until the end of the psalms, or even of the second lesson. The wrongs of the stranger are less obvious: but it would be a parallel case to that of the parishioners if a few of the more wealthy members of the Union were to club together and calmly to sell to the highest bidders among themselves all the best seats in the debating room. On the night of a debate, the other members coming in find the remaining seats occupied; the best seats indeed are empty, but no one must occupy them until it is ascertained, or presumed from the prolonged absence of their owners that they will not want their seats that night. The expectant members are then as a charity allowed the use of their own property, but only as a charity.

confusion is introduced into the service, which might be to a great degree obviated by the free system.

Objection 3. *The churches at watering places, &c.*

Appropriation in a modified degree seems to be justifiable in this case, and where there is a rush to any given church in consequence of some unusual attraction, such as an extraordinarily eloquent preacher, a splendid service, or on special occasions, such as confirmations, club sermons, &c. Exceptional measures may legitimately be taken to meet an exceptional state of things. It is just that in these cases the parishioners should have a prior claim to the use of the best seats in the church. If either party must be inconvenienced, it should be the visitors: it is hardly fair to expect the parishioners to content themselves with out-of-the-way corners and back seats. But on the other hand, it is illegal to exclude any orderly person from a church: visitors therefore, be they never so numerous, must be admitted; and consequently the parishioners must be protected. The author of the second essay on the English Pew System, p. 39, suggests a simple plan by which this difficulty may be successfully met without adopting permanent appropriation.

Objection 4. *Free seats are already assigned in most churches to the poor.*

This is true: but no one will assert that they are any but the worst seats, behind pillars, well to one side of the building, or to the rear; the farthest from the preacher. So that the rich, whose ears are better accustomed to catch and interpret sounds, have the nearer places: while those who are naturally harder of hearing and slower of comprehension, are the furthest removed, when according to common sense, if it really were desired that justice should be done under the appropriation system, their positions should be exactly reversed. As the poor grew more blind or deaf they should be moved up nearer to the preacher; and at no time should they be slighted if the church is to retain an affectionate hold over them. In appropriated churches, if any provision at all is made for those who have become deaf by age, it generally consists in allowing them to sit in the front seat of all immediately under the pulpit, where they can hear indeed, but not conveniently see, the preacher. It is generally found that no one else cares to sit on this bench.

Objection 5. *The poor do not occupy what room they have, and therefore it is not true that they require more.*

This statement will in many cases be found to be only too true: but the inference from it we deny in toto. It is

very probable that the invidious distinction made in many churches between rich and poor may have much to do with the reluctance of the working classes to attend the services. Be that how it may, it cannot be denied that under the pew system the great majority of the poor, if the exhortations of the clergy prevailed and induced them to wish greatly to attend the services, would be entirely excluded. There is only room for a very limited number of poorer worshippers at once, the greater part of the building is *sold*, and has become private property. Thus it is perfectly senseless for clergymen to urge their parishioners to be regular in their attendance, because it is well known that, if they were, there would be no place for them, even though half the pews were empty. The truth is that things have come to such a pass that the working-man has almost ceased to look upon the parish church as his own: and it is difficult to understand how this can be avoided, seeing that he is aware that the greater part of it is partitioned among the rich, and that he is only allowed there on sufferance and by charity. There is abundant testimony to prove that when the church has been made entirely free, the poor are much more willing to attend.

Objection 6. *The unpleasant mixture of classes.*

This objection is practically found to be groundless. The English poor have a great deal of pride and delicacy of feeling. A chimney sweep would no more think of obtruding himself upon a finely dressed lady, than she would think of seating herself among the royal party in Windsor chapel. Moreover sweeps are not in the habit of going to church in their work-a-day clothes. The reader may see for himself how the system works in St. Clement's church in Cambridge: I have never heard of any complaints on these grounds from those who habitually attend the services there. In fact the objection is purely imaginary; the congregation naturally sorts itself, and no inconvenience results.

Objection 7. *The necessity of providing seats for invalids.*

It certainly does not seem advisable to abolish appropriation to the extent of neglecting the comfort of those to whom appropriation is really a blessing, without being at the same time a curse to others. Special arrangements may be, and surely always would be under any circumstances, made for invalids.*

---

* Permanent appropriation would be justifiable to suit the convenience of schools, town corporations, &c. &c. We would beg

Objection 8. *Books and cushions could not be left in free churches.*

If I had not frequently heard this objection gravely urged by many clever and I believe, unselfish persons, it would have been incredible to me that any sane Christian should deliberately choose to countenance a system which practically excludes numbers from those means of grace, to the advantages of which he declares himself to be fully alive, rather than endure the trouble of carrying two or three books to and from his church; especially in these days when church services can be procured of such small sizes. It might have been different in the times when a bible weighed about 50 lbs.; but at the present day the objection appears to me to be in the highest degree captious and unworthy. If any effete dandy is quite unable to support the weight of a few additional ounces in his weekly walk between church and home, he might perhaps, if assisted by his friends, be equal to the effort of making an arrangement with the churchwarden, by which his books and cushion might be kept for him at the church. But even allowing some importance to this difficulty, the question still remains to be answered, on what grounds the rich minority are to be so pampered, while the majority, the poor, those who stand in much greater need of instruction and comfort, to whom religion is more of a stern reality, and less a luxury than to the wealthy—why they are to be placed on such an invidious footing, or to be excluded altogether. The rich can afford to build private chapels, if necessary, and to have their own spiritual instructors; they have readier access to books of all kinds, more time to study and meditate, and many advantages which are denied to the poor. And yet they are the men who deliberately and sacrilegiously portion out and sell among themselves that to which their poorer brethren have an equal right, ignoring the bible, the laws, justice, and expediency, as it seems to me.* They adopt a course, which

---

the reader to bear in mind that total, instant, and uniform abolition of appropriation is not what we advocate. In some cases such a course would be manifestly unjust: but these are the exceptions, and no argument for buying and selling any portion of any church can be based on them. Nor can such exceptional cases ever justify the minority from selfishly excluding the majority, nor indeed the many from excluding the few.

* I am forcibly reminded of the story Nathan told David. "There were two men in one city; the one rich, and the other poor. The rich man had exceeding many flocks and herbs: but the poor man had nothing, save one little ewe lamb. And there came a traveller unto the rich man, and he spared to take of his own flock and of his own herb, to dress for the wayfaring man that was come unto him; but took the poor man's lamb, and dressed it for the man that was come unto him." The case is even worse; for the poor parishioners have as much right legally and morally to the appropriated seat as the rich themselves, whereas the poor man in the story could not claim an equal share of the other's possessions.

if it has not been the primary cause of the present prevalence of irreligion among the lower classes, at all events has a tendency to perpetuate that unhappy state of things, and must be an insuperable barrier against all improvement.

Objection 9. *The seats being all made free, there would be crowding and scrambling for places.*

Those who advance this objection are to be thanked for the important concession that an abolition of the pew system would bring crowds to church. Surely it would be worth while to risk the scrambling, if we could ensure the crowding. But it is not so; it is exceedingly improbable that there would be any scrambling at all. It is not generally the custom to keep the church doors shut until a few minutes before the commencement of service, and then suddenly throw them open. The doors are open from an early hour, the people drop in one by one, and take the places they choose: and those who take the trouble to come in good time have the choice of the whole building. There is no reason to suppose that there would be more scrambling over the whole of the free church than there is at present among the free seats; and there any one may see that there is none.

Objection 10. *If all seats were made free, the poor would be as badly off as before, because ladies and gentlemen would still take up the same amount of room as they do now.*

This is an assumption which must not be allowed to pass unchallenged. Experience has proved it to be untrue. It always happens that when a church is thrown open to all without distinction, the congregation, supposing it to be already smaller than the whole number which could be accommodated in the church, instead of diminishing or standing still, increases steadily. What is complained of in the pew system is, that it renders attendance at church distasteful to the pride of the poor, so that the free seats are often not filled, while many of the pews remain empty in the absence of their owners. Thus the room that there actually

is, is greatly wasted. And it restricts the availableness of the building in another way which will be explained below. Moreover at present the responsibility rests on those who exclude their brethren by usurping the sole use of a great portion of the building. If churches were made free, the responsibility would at least be shifted on the shoulders of others: and the enemies of the church would be unable to throw in her teeth the reproach of pandering to wealth. It is right and just that the rich should occupy as much room as they require and can get: it is utterly unjust that they should buy or sell, or appropriate in any way whatever to the exclusion of others, that to which the rest have as much right as themselves.

Objection 11. *By making churches free, there is danger of subverting the parochial system.*

Here I cannot do better than give the words of the learned author of the first essay in answer to this objection:* "It is said again, that free churches are subversive of the parochial system, and that their success is purchased at the expense of the rights of parishioners. Are we then to understand that under other methods of arranging congregations, the rights of parishioners are respected, and carefully maintained? What becomes of the rights of parishioners, when the church is parcelled out amongst one-fifth or one-tenth of well-to-do persons, whilst the remainder of the parishioners are left destitute of accommodation? Or, what again, in pew-rented churches notoriously occupied to a great extent by non-parishioners?† Whence this new-born zeal for parochial rights in the realms of pewdom? We might here fairly retort with the proverb, 'Physician, heal thyself.' The real truth is, that the parochial system can scarcely be said to exist in our populous towns and cities. It was subverted long before our modern free churches sprung up. Wherever a popular preacher, or an attractive service, or a costly and beautiful church exists in a town possessed of more than one parish, or parochial district, there we may confidently affirm, the parochial system is more or less disturbed, if not absolutely subverted. There will certainly be a rush from the neighbouring parish or districts towards

* *Essay on the Evils of the Appropriation of Parish and District Churches*, by Thomas Peak Browning, curate of Newton-upon-Ouse, p. 43.

† It is by no means uncommon to let out pews to *non-parishioners*—an abuse of an abuse!

the earnest, eloquent preacher, the impressive ritual, and the beautiful edifice. What is the remedy? To make all churches equally attractive? Or equally unattractive (not to say, repulsive)? Shall we extinguish the powerful preacher, put down the musical service, and reduce everything to a dead level of ugliness, rigid uniformity, and dull mediocrity, in order that the parochial system may be restored and maintained in its integrity? Or shall we make every service highly attractive, and every preacher eloquent, and every church gorgeous and 'exceeding magnifical'? This may scarcely be on this side of the Millennium. Or, once more, shall we call upon the churchwardens to drive away non-parishioners and 'remit such home to their own parish churches and ministers'?*

"We may indeed very well be allowed to lament the partial loss of that good old-fashioned religion, which bound men to their parish church, and taught them that the parish clergyman was the person immediately set over them in spiritual things; and that to him ought all the parishioners to adhere. But it is unfair to lay to the charge of free churches difficulties and anomalies which attach more or less to every existing method of seating and arranging congregations. These anomalies are deeply rooted in our social system, and cannot be eradicated in a day or a year. In the meantime, *all churchmen alike* are concerned in maintaining and extending the parochial system. Nothing which disturbs or tends to subvert it can be lightly regarded. Let no efforts be spared by churchmen—pewed and unpewed—to secure to the *parishioners primarily* those churches which belong specially unto *them*. Let no clergyman regard his work in any district as a successful work, until he shall have drawn together—*not simply a congregation from various quarters*, but—a goodly gathering of all classes and degrees from the particular district attached to his church."

Theoretically, then, it has been shown that the advantages, which are supposed to be conferred by the pew system only, are all attainable in a higher degree and by more people at once by adopting the non-appropriation system. It may be added that the pew system is a great hindrance to the Church of England in discharging her duty of preaching the gospel to the poor, by rendering it impossible for more than a few of the poor to attend the services, and by placing those who do attend in a position from which their pride

* See 28th Canon of the Church of England.

justly revolts. It is also repugnant to the principles and customs of antiquity. It is also uncatholic. The Church of England, being both national and catholic, ought to be open without restriction to the nation at large, but more especially to the poor. The system of appropriation "knows nothing of catholicity, and *for the communion of saintliness it substitutes the communion of respectability.*"

It also begets and perpetuates schism. "Many a man goes over to the dissenters, because in the meeting-house he can enjoy the luxury of being a first class worshipper, whereas in the church he was only reckoned as a second or third class."* The pew system also entails a loss and waste of church accommodation, and restricts the usefulness and availableness of churches.† It also supplies selfish persons with a specious reason for not allowing our churches to be thrown open daily to offer to our people, especially the poor, quiet places for meditation. This has been done in some free churches, but in no others. The dainty appropriators, forsooth, are afraid of having their cushions soiled, or books thumbed. Cushions soiled! books thumbed! O horror! horror! rather than *that*, debar the poor man from *all* his privileges. The pew system also enables opponents of our church to attack her through the church-rates. Whether or no it be desirable that church-rates should be continued, it is manifestly unjust to compel all, under legal penalties, to contribute to the expenses of a church from the use of the greater part of which they are altogether excluded, and that too in direct defiance of the law. I am confident that parishioners would more cheerfully pay a tax for the maintenance of a building, "whose accommodation, whether large or scanty, was freely and impartially distributed, as far as it might serve, amongst all sorts and conditions of people," than to one which has been illegally seized and sold either in whole, or in part, by the wealthy.

* *Essay on the English Pew System, its evils and their remedies.* Rev. S. H. Saxby, M.A., Incumbent of East Clevedon, Somerset, and Chaplain to the Earl of Carnwath.

† The whole of each of the hundred families to which the hundred pews are assigned probably do not attend at once, and the places of the absentees are vacant; and from this and other causes, the waste from portioning the ground out in separate pews, instead of open sittings, has been estimated at 30 per cent. A free church capable of holding 500 persons may be made equal to one holding 1000 by simply doubling the number of services: in churches wholly or partially appropriated the eternal difficulty of appropriation renders this either impossible, or limits the advantago to be obtained from it to that portion of the church which is free; but even this part, from causes mentioned above, is often not occupied by anything like the full number which it can accommodate of those for whose sole benefit the additional services are held.

The amount of unrighteous quarrelling and meanness, the feuds, hatred, and discontent among the appropriators to which the pew system gives rise is almost incredible; and for this, if for no other reason, many and many a parish priest would rejoice to see the system abolished.

It may be as well now to show by some practical examples the abuses of appropriation. In the first essay Mr. Browning gives some statistics, some of which I shall take the liberty of transcribing. He says: There is a large church connected with a parish of nearly 16,000 people, which has not a single free seat. A zealous rector was appointed, who was going to associate with himself curates, to divide his parish into districts, and make a house to house visitation. And what was the result? He had not a single place to ask his poor people to come to!

In Liverpool we find a parish containing 16,000 souls, with no church accommodation whatever for the poor, and an average attendance at public worship of only 200 persons. Another with a population of 20,000 with accommodation in church for only 133 of the poor. We are told that in the midst of a dense population there are in that city churches originally built exclusively for the rich, of which the proprietors have migrated to other parts, and carried away the keys of their pews with them! In another of the hives of teeming life and commerce, we hear of one parish, containing 34,000 persons, with church accommodation for from two to four hundred of the poor; and another containing nearly 13,000 souls, with no free seats whatever.

It is worth while to stop and analyze these last two statements. In the last case the poor do not go to church at all, and are given to understand, more plainly than words could tell them, that they are not wanted: so there is an end of them. In the parish mentioned last but one, supposing that 4000 out of the 34,000 are rich people, which is probably over the mark (by rich I mean who can afford, and do actually pay, from £5 to £10 per annum for a seat in church): these 4000 then are enabled to attended the services whenever they please (we are supposing the church to be of large dimensions with 4000 sittings sold permanently, over and above the accommodation for the poor, or the free seats).

The remaining 30,000 parishioners, then, receive the liberal share of 400 seats at the very most. Supposing that, owing to the high religious tone prevailing in the parish, the 30,000 were anxious to attend the services as regularly as the circumstances of the case permitted; still many would be compelled to stay at home by illness, domestic duties, and other causes. Supposing, then, that notwithstanding the general zeal, one in every five was compelled to remain at home: 24,000 church goers still remain. Supposing, again, that, in order to accommodate as many as possible, three services a day were held (one more than our prayerbook presupposes), and that the poor divided themselves into batches of 400, which took their turns regularly to attend the sundry services, that being the greatest possible number that can attend at once. The magnificent result of this elaborate organization, if steadily persisted in, would be that each of the poorer parishioners would be able to attend one service in twenty Sundays; that is to say, he or she would be able to go to church not quite three times a year. This hardly requires a comment. No allowance has been made for the number of dissenters, which in so large a parish with such meagre church accommodation would doubtless be great, because it is my object to show that, although the parish church was built for, and belongs to, the whole parish, yet, if the parishioners obeyed the priest's summons, left their indifference or schism, and tried to return to the church's arms, they would find themselves so effectually snubbed, that they would be unlikely to persevere in the attempt.* If the same church were unappropriated, then deducting as before, one in every five for illness or domestic duties, and supposing that there were no dissenters, each poor parishioner would be able to attend a service once every other Sunday:† but deducting

* The existence of dissent does not justify the exclusion of dissenters from the parish church, either directly, or by any arrangement which produces that effect indirectly. It is well known that dissenters frequently make use of our churches: it is to be hoped that they will be always welcomed there. Nor, if a certain number of men habitually absent themselves from church, does that justify any arrangement which compels them, directly or indirectly, to continue to do so. A life member of the Union would fancy himself wronged, I think, if, after prolonged absence from the house, he were finally excluded from it for the better convenience of a few.

† *i.e.* twenty-six times a year instead of scarcely thrice, as under the present arrangement.

the probable number of dissenters, and persons who did not care to attend, probably every parishioner would be able to attend service once, or even twice, on every Sunday. The clergyman would then at least have an opportunity of doing his duty of preaching the gospel to the poor, and would be released from the unpleasant sensation of inconsistency which (I trust I am not uncharitable) he surely feels now whenever he has to read publicly the second chapter of the General Epistle of St. James.

In the rectory district of Marylebone, in London, containing 33,000 persons, there are free sittings for about 500 in a church built to accommodate 2500 persons: the rest are let for pew rents. Again, in St. George's, Hanover Square, with a population in the season of 25,000, there are open free seats for 300 persons, in the passages or against the walls. The other sittings are let for rents amounting to nearly £1000 a year.

In another church in London, it was elicited by the Bishop of Exeter that the free sittings, which are in the roof, must be reached by an ascent of nearly one hundred steps! "Are the lame and halt," inquired the Bishop, "expected to climb those hundred steps to get to their free sittings?" The Rector acknowledged that he had never seen more than one person in those places, though there may have been others out of sight.

At a meeting held at Bath on March 1st, 1864, Mr. Ilerford described the condition of Manchester as regards church accommodation. There are, it appears, in the central part of that city 300,000 inhabitants, or about 60,000 families. For these there are thirty churches, besides the cathedral. The sittings in those churches are appropriated to about 3000 families, leaving 57,000 families, or nineteen-twentieths of the population excluded from the public worship of Almighty God.

At the same meeting, the Rev. J. S. Jones spoke of the condition in which he found his church at Liverpool. It was built for more than 2000 persons, and the seats were hired out at so much per quarter. There were two back rows of benches in a dark gallery, free!

Here is a case at Exeter: The population of the parish is 6000 or 7000. There is church room for 900 persons only, and a very small number of unappropriated seats. The appropriation is said to be of the worst kind, for many of the pew holders never come to the church, but give permission to friends (often non-parishioners) to occupy their

seats. Hence a difficulty of finding a place in a church which is only partially filled.

The population of Hockton, near Wakefield, consists of about 2000 persons, chiefly colliers. The church is appropriated to twenty houses, leaving 400 houses without the right of a sitting, save on a few benches in the children's gallery.*

This state of things cannot—must not be allowed to remain, if we would see the Church of England doing her work as the national, and more particularly as a branch of the catholic church. Her intrinsic merits are so great and acknowledged that she will remain unshaken by the attacks of her unholy adversaries without, rage they never so furiously: and, if those within, her bishops, priests, deacons, and churchwardens, act up to her principles and precepts, she will endure and increase to the end of the world; but just so far as they forget their duty, just so much will she be weakened.

It will be observed that we have been all along considering cases where the population is in excess of the church accommodation. Where the reverse is the case, arguments no less weighty can be adduced against the sacrilegious and illegal practice of appropriation. Why, it may be asked, when there is room for all comers, should not a fixed seat be assigned to each parishioner, so that the exclusiveness of the Englishman may be humoured? Who can suffer by it?

These questions are briefly answered thus by the Rev. S. Saxby:†

"There is indisputably a sense in which certain seats in a church are less desirable than others. They may be exposed to draughts, or be behind some obstacle, or too far distant for convenient hearing of the words spoken. Who is to have these? It is not reasonable that the squire be put into the worst place, nor in truth is it seemly. It is very certain that the middle class folk, of undefined social position, will not consent to what they would consider a slight on the part of the churchwardens. And thus it must happen always that, in proportion as a seat is objectionable, it is sure to be assigned to the poor. In such a case there can be but one answer to the question of the Apostle, 'Are ye not then partial in yourselves?' There is then always this objection to

* All these instances are given in Mr. Browning's *Essay*. They might be multiplied to any extent.

† Essay II., p. 9.

all appropriations, even under the most favourable circumstances, that the worst places are invariably given to the poor. The objection is sufficient of itself, were there none other, to condemn the whole system as in flat contradiction to the word of God." For other objections I must be content to refer the reader to Mr. Saxby's admirable essay.

There is one more argument which is frequently brought against the free church system, which still remains to be answered. The pew rents, it is urged, form a useful fund out of which the parish expenses and the priest's stipend, in the absence of an endowment, can be paid with certainty. If you abolish pew rents, you deprive the church of a regular income, and leave the priest to the tender mercies of voluntary subscribers. He is thus kept in a state of uncertainty as to the payment of his stipend, and is placed in a dependant position, which must be exceedingly irksome to a man of refinement. This argument, specious though it appears at the first blush, may be easily and triumphantly refuted. The difficulty is entirely obviated by the adoption of the primitive and apostolic practice of the offertory. Universal experience has proved that the offertory both produces a larger sum of money per annum than pew rents, and is less liable to fluctuations. If a clergyman can induce his congregation to accept the offertory, he may fearlessly abandon pew rents, as far as pecuniary considerations are concerned: he will find that the parish expenses will be now more generously provided for than under the former system. In an appendix to the third essay on *Principles of Church Finance*,* some statistics are given which establish beyond doubt the important proposition that the system of the offertory is the preferable of the two, however poor the congregation may be. That the priest will be more dependant on his parishioners than formerly, if pew rents are supplanted by the offertory, is a statement which is not borne out by facts. Under the system of pew rents the paying parishioners, if any doctrine the clergyman has advanced, or any action he has performed, is not quite to their taste, have the power of absenting themselves from the church altogether, and thus depriving the parish of the annual rent of their sittings, thereby embarrassing the clergyman greatly. The latter, therefore, must make up his mind only to preach just so

* *An Inquiry into the Principles of Church Finance in Ancient and Modern Times*, by James Hamilton, M.A., Senior Curate of Chipping Campden, p. 57.

much truth as is acceptable to his perhaps ignorant and bigoted congregation, and no more: and, being under the thumb of the wealthier portion of his parishioners, he finds himself checked and restricted in a manner which is not likely to conduce much to his dignity or peace of mind. In fact under the pew system the parish priest is degraded to the position of mere private chaplain to the pew holders. The whole question of finance is fully and ably discussed in the third and fourth essays, which it is well worth the while of those who take an interest in the question to peruse carefully.

The writers of these four essays are careful to impress upon their readers that the free church movement has nothing whatever to do with party. It is neither a hobby of low church, nor of high church, nor of broad church. It is a question of justice. The establishment is allowed to hold an immense amount of national property upon certain conditions. Can any honourable man wish to see any one of those conditions unfulfilled? Expediency bids us to condemn a system which permanently excludes myriads from any means of instruction, secular or religious, practical or moral—I care not which it be. Consistency requires that we should not turn church sittings into private boxes, and then pray the lessees of theatres for the love of God to throw open their boxes to the poor for public worship on Sundays. It is as scandalous that a few influential parishioners should club together to share among themselves the best parts of the parish church, as it would be, did the same men combine to enclose the most fertile portions of the village common.

F. A. S.

TRIA TEMPORA.

Youth is like a summer morn,
Golden fring'd is every cloud;
Deeply waves the golden corn,
Trill the birds their music loud;
And the sun with dazzling ray,
Mounteth up to fuller day.

Age is like sweet even time;
Hushed is every noon-day blast;
Spangled every leaf with rime,
Song and mirth and light are past;
Quench'd is Phœbus' glowing beam,
In the steep Hesperian stream.

Death is like to silent night,
When the silver-crescent queen
Rides in heaven's pathless height,
Scattering darkness with her sheen:—
Thus doth Faith with stedfast eye,
Pierce through death's dark mystery.

EDUCATION OF THE LOWER CLASSES.

"Is it possible, and is it advisable to establish a system of National Education, such as to open a way into the learned professions for all boys of high talent, whatever be their original rank in life?"

AS the question of advisability seems to me to depend chiefly on certain details, which, in their turn, depend on some scheme to be proposed for shewing the movement to be possible, I have ventured to consider first, whether the scheme be possible; and then, whether it be advisable: although we are naturally more concerned at first with the advisability of a scheme, than its possibility. A subject such as the possibility of a measure of this sort must necessarily be treated somewhat as questions in experimental science; which depends for its advancement on the suggesting of a number of various experiments to be tried in support of some theory, whether true or false. But here the analogy ceases; for while the chemist, for instance, trusts in great measure to his luck, and hopes that some unforeseen result, caused by the unexpected combination of certain gases or substances never mixed before in his retort, will establish his theory, or at any rate set at rest his doubts on the vexed point, by disproving it, the educationalist will not venture on any experiment of which he does not flatter himself that he pretty clearly sees the consequences.

The most, then, that can be looked for in debating such a measure is, that theories shall be freely advanced, in order that they may be as freely canvassed.

That members of the lower classes would not be so effectually raised by a sudden translation to the company of those far above them in the social scale, as by a system of gradual changes, will probably be allowed to hold good as a general rule, though admitting of exceptions. For by this means John Mogg—which name is selected not only on account of its euphonious properties, but also because it is

typical of many an honest name among the British lower orders—may be checked in his upward career on the social ladder, when it is perfectly clear that he is not likely to profit himself by mounting higher, and when he may be safely helped down without the danger of falling from a great height. But put John Mogg on the topmost round of the ladder at once, and it may be found necessary either to precipitate him summarily to the ground, or to leave him standing in his exalted position—either alternative probably the reverse of pleasant to him, and neither beneficial to society.

If then, (to quit metaphors and Moggs for the present) we come to schools, it seems to me possible that national schools should send up their really promising scholars to large Middle Class Public Schools, with Exhibitions or Scholarships to support them while there.

The Middle Class Schools, on their part, might send up their best scholars in like manner—not later, perhaps, than the age of fifteen—to our Classical Public Schools, providing for them by larger Exhibitions to meet the greater expenses of the Classical School.

Next for matters of detail. None but a mind accustomed to such speculations could suggest an entire scheme that was reasonable, much less valuable on such a topic. But without entering too closely into all the particulars, it seems to me not impossible to hold a joint yearly examination of all the village National Schools within a certain district—for instance, a county—taking care that the examination be as searching as at the early age of the examinees would be possible; and that the same body of examiners examine all the schools in the district. By this means an uniform standard would be established in the several districts, and the examiners would be able to choose a small number of promising boys to be drafted off into the Middle Class Schools every year.

It is certain that, from all we know of the British lower classes, such signs of high talent would be decidedly limited in number.

Two obvious objections occur here which may be discussed at once, before passing on to the higher school. The first is, that though the examiners of the several districts would have an uniform standard to guide them in making their selections, the bodies of examiners for the different districts might often disagree in their standards, and thus unintentional injustice be done to deserving candidates

Still, such an objection, though doubtless a very real one, would not be sufficient of itself to deter an earnest man from taking any part in the movement. And, after all, no great wrong could be done if all the districts were pretty much of the same size, and each allowed a certain number of Exhibitions every year to the Middle Class School. The other objection would be, that an examination at such an early age would be useless, inasmuch as it would fail to discover who were the really talented boys amongst those examined. The answer to this is, that it is the only choice open to us: the majority of parents remove their sons at about the age of ten or eleven from the day schools, and make use of them to work in the fields: and thus we have to take them while we can.

Let us suppose then, that John Mogg has passed through his course of spelling, reading, writing, arithmetic, and geography at the village school, that his iron constitution has withstood the temporary indispositions occasioned by four or five school feasts; and that, therefore, he has attained the age of ten or even eleven, and finally, that the examiners of his district have given him an Exhibition to the Middle Class School. He will find himself now in the company of some who, like himself, are being supported by Exhibitions gained on entrance, but the majority of his associates will probably be the sons of small tradesmen in the rank of life next above his own.

Behold him clad in fustian jacket and trousers, out at elbows, out at knees. The first metamorphosis that should take place in his outward man should be a (very) hot bath; he should next be dressed in rough but decent clothes in the form of a jacket and trousers, with a clean outside collar: and it will not be too much to say that the chances are in favour of his looking as much a gentleman as many diminutive sons of gentlemen, in their present fashion of coats and inside collars.

Nor will he, if the training of his village school has been what it might, be far behind the sons of gentlemen of that age in his intellectual attainments.

He will be at once initiated into the mysteries of Latin Grammar; will wonder at the absence of *w* in the Latin alphabet, and think how difficult, without the help of *w*, it would be to pronounce the digamma in *o, a, t, s*, which he has always been accustomed to call "*wuts*"—not that he would think of digammas as such—that is reserved for a Paley; he would look scornfully on an alphabet that omitted

the initial letter of such important monosyllables as "wo"; or "woy" in the expression of "woy farmer."

In short, for the future he will be educated much in the same manner as boys at a classical school, with, however, one important difference: that, whereas they are pressed on continually so long as they remain at a classical school, and no pains are spared to hammer the merest elements of classics into the thickest of their heads, John Mogg's masters will not feel themselves bound to deal with him in the same manner till he leaves the school. He will, indeed, be forced to work hard; but if he discover no aptitude for classics, he may be made to give up more of his time to mathematics, so long as these two studies continue to be the chief avenues to the Learned Professions.

The exhibitions gained on entrance to the Middle Class Schools might be tenable for four years, at the end of which time it would be sufficiently evident whether a boy had really talents which would not only serve him in a learned profession, but would profit his profession also by his admission to it.

Or, again, it would be possible to make the Exhibitions tenable for one year, and then, in deserving cases, renewable; and perhaps such a system as this would better ensure industry.

If at the end of four years he failed to gain any of the Exhibitions to the upper Classical School, it would be very hard to say that his education had been utterly thrown away: for at least he would be fitted by that time for clerkships of various kinds, for good appointments in printers' and booksellers' establishments or other situations, where his higher knowledge would be useful to him; and would, doubtless, help him forward more rapidly than many in such positions now are able to advance—men whose education has not been of nearly so high a stamp. On the other hand it is not contended that, by raising his rank in life one degree, any great service has been done him, but no harm has necessarily been done him; and in the case of those who show themselves capable of advancing still higher in the scale, a positive advantage will have been conferred.

Let us suppose then that one of this class is pronounced fit to take his place in a Classical School with the sons of gentlemen, some of whom are destined to attain to the higher branches of literature and science. He will enter the Classical School with a provision sufficient to support him entirely, and he will, when he has dropped certain prejudices

incident to his condition, be much the same as those around him; such prejudices, for instance, as that "I be" is the first person singular, present indicative of the verb "to be"; that the negative form of "it is" is "beant," and so forth. The Exhibitions in the Classical School should, perhaps, be tenable for a term of at least two years and then renewable, in order that the new comer may be allowed some law to make up what time he has lost by beginning his classical studies later in life than the sons of gentlemen, with whom he will come into competition.

If he has passed into the upper school at the age of fifteen, he will still have nearly four years before he enters at one of the Universities: which is as long as many boys now remain at a Public School. It is now that we are met by one of the most formidable difficulties in the way of the proposed scheme. Some few of the boys who have thus raised themselves by their own exertions, may, it is true, be able to obtain exhibitions such as are attached to all large schools, and the standard of which affords a presumption that the gainer of one of them will also be able to gain a college exhibition or scholarship, thus securing a competency for his support at the University: but it must be acknowledged that the greater number of such lads will not be able to keep themselves at College: and the question arises, what is to become of them? Are they to be allowed after all the pains taken with their education, to degenerate into booksellers and superior printers' assistants, as those who were rejected as unfit for the Classical School? Or are they to look to the state to extend still further its maternal interest in their welfare?

This does seem at first a true difficulty, but let us consider, as in the former case, whether it would be any disadvantage to society, that their booksellers and tradespeople of that standing should be men of minds cultivated with a higher education than at present: in the present case cultivated by the refinement of a Public School education. Whether it would not be a step in the direction which should be the aim of all politics, without party bias of any kind, viz: to raise the lower classes towards the higher, without allowing the higher to degenerate to the level of the lower. This then is one alternative to allow the would-be-lawyer or doctor, nay the would-be-clergyman to become a tradesman. Nor does it seem so very objectionable that our middle classes should have a sprinkling of higher refinement of feeling, such as is consequent on a higher education, disseminated among their ranks. The only question, of course, is whether such a result would not be purchased at too high a cost, and that question must be decided by the success of those who *do* pass through all the stages of life intended to be laid open before them by this measure: and who therefore derive all the benefit intended to be derived from the system.

But there is a second alternative far preferable to the first, namely, that men so educated should be further provided for by the state.

It is surely not too much to say that every artizan has a right to assistance in his need from the state, provided that that need be not attributable to his own fault. It is true that such a right is but imperfectly recognized at present, but that does not disprove its existence or repudiate the charge of disgraceful selfishness against nine-tenths or more of the rich in the kingdom—men whose houses are literally overflowing with every sort of luxury, while neighbours are reduced to the extremities of poverty: whose life is passed in a pleasing succession of stays at their sea side, their shooting and their town residences, of which three establishments two are at any given moment not only unproductive to their owners and their country, but a positive source of expense. And thus they wander on through all the pleasant paths of life, in happy unconsciousness of everything but present pleasure or gain, many of them perhaps not spending their money on themselves from greediness for enjoyment, but from ignorance of any better way in which it might be spent. Luxury in such an aggravated form makes one pause to consider whether after all our modern politicians are so far advanced, and whether old Cato was not right with his Sumptuary Laws to check the growing spirit of luxury, by forbidding jewels, expensive clothes and all articles not highly profitable to the state. This is surely the crying sin of England and every other state, that we have no keen feelings of humanity and brotherhood. To take one instance of heartless extravagance, from a multitude that might be adduced, how many millions worth of jewels are simply wasted in the trinket boxes of rich ladies.

It is this selfishness of society which retards not only the progress of education, but a thousand other improvements, and this is the key to the beneficial admission of the lower classes to an association with the higher. In short if we can but be unselfish enough, and be educated enough.

Something yet remains to be said of the advisability of

the proposed plan: but the remarks on this head shall be as brief as possible.

It would be easy at the first sight of such a question, for a reformer to ask, on what principles of economy we should be justified in neglecting any measure that may increase our resources? to ask, what would be thought of a landowner who refused to work new mines of hidden treasures on his property, of a millowner who neglected to employ a large part of the power at his command, which might be applied to the working of fresh engines, but which is allowed to be simply wasted? and it would be hard to defend such a system. The argument, in fact, is in theory incontrovertible, but when applied to practice would be probably found less hard to meet.

Let us then take the facts, or such of them as are manifest and undeniable when regarded as future. And we shall obtain the following results:—

There are more than fifty counties in England and Wales, if we omit Ireland and Scotland from consideration, as capable of looking to their own interests in this matter—an hypothesis sufficiently doubtful. Each of these countries, if the proposed scheme is to have as wide an influence as it ought, should contain one at least of the middle class Government Schools. Each of these could hardly have less than six on an average, and it is hard to see how they should not have a larger number to send up yearly to the classical school. The number of Public classical schools, at present, where such boys could be received so as to derive any of the great benefits of the English Public School principally, cannot be computed at much more than twenty, but for the purposes of calculation, let us state it at twenty-six, viz: half the number of counties in England and Wales together.

If the above calculations are correct, and I fully believe that they greatly understate the facts of the case, each of the public schools would have to provide accommodation for twelve boys every year from middle class schools, that is, allowing that such boys would stay at the classical school three or four years, for between forty and fifty boys.

This would be a great burden to inflict on a school of not more than three or four hundred: and it is impossible to imagine that the school would escape in many instances considerable deterioration from the admixture of so large a lump of the new leaven. Moreover, injustice would seem to be done to the present frequenters of our public schools, by giving a preference to those who gained exhibitions from the middle

class schools; for of course *their* procedure to the upper classical school would be a necessity, and each school would be obliged to reserve twelve vacancies for such comers every year. With our present number of public classical schools, then, any scheme which would require the absorption of so large a number of those who are not what is called 'gentlemen' into their body, would appear to be unadvisable.

And wholly, as far as I can see, on these grounds, namely that they would injure our existing great schools, or at any rate, most of them. Wholly on these grounds, for on the more general ground of injury to society at large, whether that rank of it to which the national scholars would be raised, or that from which they rose, no fears need surely be entertained of admitting men who would have undergone such a thorough course of training as those brought up on the graduated school principle. But for this too the remedy is easy—let fresh large classical schools be established throughout England: not schools intended exclusively for such as have raised themselves from the middle class schools, for that would deprive them of the advantages to be gained from the company of gentlemen in the upper classical schools, but such establishments as Haileybury, Wellington, Clifton, and their contemporaries in the scholastic world, where sons of gentlemen will congregate from the small private schools, and form a society which will be able to hold its own against new comers; but will by their association with them confer on them incalculable advantages.

If this were done, and if a severe education-tax were levied, and, above all, if by a ready submission to that tax were to show that we had the interests of our countrymen at heart, I believe a system of national education, such as that under our consideration, would be both possible and advisable.

H. G. H.

THE WAVE.

I WATCHED a wave on the restless sea
  At morn, and said "where art thou going?"
But it halted not as it answered me,
  "Where fate may lead and the winds are blowing.
I must wander on for a little while
  'Mid the storm and the wind and the roar,
But at last I shall reach the peaceful isle
Where the palm leaves glance in the sunbeam's smile,
  And rest on its golden shore."

So all day long was the wavelet tost,
  And the foam from its crest in white flakes flew,
But never a whit of courage it lost,
  Though shrieked the storm and the fierce wind blew.
And at eve it sighted the welcome strand;
  It smiled as it neared the shore,
Then gently it broke on the golden sand,
And gained in its death the promised land,
  And rested for evermore.

E.

TENNYSON'S AYLMER'S FIELD AND OTHER POEMS.

(Continued from p. 183.)

THE poem which stands next in order to Enoch Arden seems intended by the poet to be a direct contrast to it. Not only is the development of its plot quite different, but the language in which it is clothed seems much less artistic, and less worked up than that of the preceding poem. But perhaps the most striking difference of all is to be found in the course of life which the two heroes pursue. In Enoch Arden the actions of the hero were strictly in obedience to the voice of conscience. However dark and awful was the ruin into which he was hurried, however cruel the destiny that awaited him, still we always find him true to his God and his faith. He always feels that he and his absent wife are under the divine protection, and he commits himself to the care of an all-seeing God. So in the Ancient Epic we hear of the trials and dangers which beset an Æneas or an Achilles, but still they are always assisted by some friendly god in their struggles with destiny "which ruleth all, even gods though they be." In Aylmer's Field however, as in most of the Greek Tragedies, we find this picture quite reversed. The central figure of the poem is no longer obeying the will of heaven or the voice of his conscience: he is swayed by pride, by self-conceit, and selfishness. He is not the victim of circumstances forced upon him in despite of his loyalty and devotion to duty—He is the just victim of his own selfwill. To this may be ascribed all the sad calamities which visit him and his house, even to the last and greatest tragedy; and then the poet leaves him without one word of pity. This cardinal vice of overweening pride is most often found in that class to which the hero of this piece belongs. For just as in Enoch Arden the poet had described the trials which beset a man in low life and reduced circumstances, even though he may be a most deserving and heroic man; so in Aylmer's Field has

he painted for us by way of contrast the "fine linen," the sumptuous living and the comfort which attend the rich even though they may be incapable and unworthy of enjoying them. The "grund-gedanke" of the two pieces seems to be this very contrast between the right of the hereditarily-incapable to enjoy their riches, and the right of the naturally-heroic to take from them their ill-deserved prosperity. This leading idea is kept up throughout the two poems, and nothing is more remarkable than the way in which Mr. Tennyson has finished each piece. After describing the sad and toilsome life of Enoch, and his long-delayed return to his native land, the poet ends by dwelling upon the disappointment and unlooked-for change that awaited him on his arrival. Thus the last idea which remains in our minds on reading the end is one of intense pity and sorrow for the Hero. What a contrast then is presented to us in the issue of the plot in Aylmer's Field! Here we have no room for sympathy or sorrow. The poet has described the various stages of pride in the life of Sir Aylmer; and the very last act of his life, his leaving church when the Rector's words were cutting him to the heart, shows how impenitent and hard he remained to the last. Thus the poet contrives to leave on our mind the very opposite impression to that which he had produced in the case of Enoch Arden. We leave the poem with a feeling of utter disgust for Sir Aylmer and are unable to pity his tragic end.

The most remarkable point in the development of this plot is the fearful and tragic way in which Mr. Tennyson has described the working of Sir Aylmer's pride. He has looked at it in every possible light, he has turned it inside and outside, and made it more and more detestable at each stage. For it is not difficult to trace three distinct stages in the course and progress of this cardinal vice. In the first stage we see how it affects its victim in time of prosperity, and how it gradually eats away from under him that foundation of popularity and sympathy which should support him in his hour of need and desolation. The Baronet is described as a man who prided himself upon him his ancestral name and upon his wealth, using the former not as a vantage ground for benefiting his fellow creatures but rather for trampling upon their due rights:

> dull and self-involved,
> Tall and erect, but bending from his height
> With half-allowing smiles for all the world.

This overweening pride is made to appear far more hateful from the contrast between it and the loving kindly disposition of Leolin and Edith. For while Sir Aylmer patronizes all beneath him, affecting an interest in their welfare entirely out of keeping with his proper nature, she on the other hand takes the liveliest and sincerest interest in all around her, visiting the cottages of the poor "with a voice of comfort and an open hand of help," while Leolin is loved by them only less than her because of his warm heart and

> A childly way with children, and a laugh
> Ringing like proven golden coinage true.

Passing on to the second stage we find Sir Aylmer standing upon a projecting cliff with the rocks undermined beneath him. But the tempest is not yet raging at its highest, and his self-confidence is still sufficient for him. It is true that rumour has done her work and by telling of his pride in other fields has made him

> A mockery to the yeomen over ale
> And laughter to their lords.

But then his own immediate dependents are still subservient to him: they have not yet been driven into open mutiny by the story of all the wrongs inflicted upon Edith and the absent lover. In this part of the poem, no less than in the preceding one, is our hatred of his pride increased by the contrast which the poet has presented to us. For just as in the first stage we were able to observe the contrast between Sir Aylmer's haughtiness in dealing with those beneath him, and the kindly and open manner of his daughter and Leolin; so now can we observe the same contrast in his own domestic life and his relations with his own family. Thus on the one hand we have the baronet's pride developing into the grossest tyranny and cruelty. He has determined to prevent the proposed marriage, and to effect this object he even condemns his daughter to the closest possible confinement; and though he sees her health gradually breaking down under his harsh treatment, he restrains his natural affection for her, and only once, seized with a sudden and strange emotion,

> She look'd so sweet, he kiss'd her tenderly.

While on the other hand, in contrast with this unnatural

treatment, we have the kindly disposition of the daughter heightened by the cruel circumstances in which she is placed. She utters not an angry word, not a sigh of complaint; but buoys herself up with a hope for better days to come, and the love of her banished Leolin. And at last when all intercourse, even by letter, is stopped between them, and not even a fitful ray of light visits the darkness of her prison, she sinks gradually without a murmur or complaint.

But it is upon the third part that Mr. Tennyson has lavished most pains. Though he has made this vice detestable in the two first stages, he has made it ten times more so in the third and last stage. Hitherto the contrast has been between the bad qualities of the baronet and the gentle loving dispositions of those around him, but now the contrast is to be seen between Sir Aylmer's deeds and his own real feelings. Hitherto the circumstances have been favourable to the growth of the leading passion, but now it meets with the strongest opposition. Hence arises a terrible internal conflict which ends naturally in his loss of reason. Here then is another difference to be observed between this poem and its predecessor. Here the conclusion of the plot is perfectly natural, and just what we should expect. There, as I endeavoured to show before, the poet seemed to have experienced the greatest difficulty in bringing the life of his hero to its close, and his solution was not so satisfactory.

In this third stage the crisis comes. The "sons of the glebe" no longer content themselves with mocking at their master, they scowl fiercely and break into open mutiny: they regard him as the robber of all their social joys, and the two-fold murderer of his own daughter, and their rector's brother. He himself feels the blow intensely, but he refuses to yield to his better impulses. At last however he is unable to bear up against the words of the rector, and he sheds tears as witnesses of his internal agony. But then his pride returns, and seems to smooth the troubled waters. He walks firmly from his pew till he reaches the middle aisle, when his strength almost leaves him. How tragic is the picture which the poet has here painted for us! How harsh and unnatural does it make pride to appear! Perhaps in his hatred of this vice the poet has been carried to an excess of spitefulness. He seems to have taken Euripides rather than Æschylus as his model of dramatic excellence; and the Euripidean thought of the certainty of retributive justice appears to predominate. We find not a word of pity or

compassion; nor even that consolation which the chorus offers in the Agamemnon of the balmy influence of suffering, or that it is heaven

τὸν πάθη μάθη θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν.

Sir Aylmer is an extreme case, and he is left to endure the bitter pangs which he has inflicted upon himself, while the poet almost exults in his pain. Mr. Tennyson has certainly shewn great dramatic talent in the masterly way in which he has delineated the influence of this one vice: but after all it is rather the hand of Ben Jonson than that of Shakspeare which we can trace. He has not got the many-sided view of our greatest dramatist, and he excels rather in the second-rate, but by no means contemptible, power of delineating "humours."

The last difference which I have to mention between the plots of Enoch Arden and Aylmer's Field is the rarity of descriptions in the latter, and the predominance of incident. This follows naturally from what has been said about the diversity of plots in the two poems. Only twice in the whole poem do we get any attempt at description of scenery; and neither of them is sustained for any length. The first and longest is his description of Edith's favourite haunt: while the second and most beautiful one is at the end where he describes the desolation that afterwards befel the house of Sir Aylmer,—

> And where the two contrived their daughter's good
> Lies the hawk's cast, the mole has made his run,
> The hedgehog underneath the plantain bores,
> The rabbit fondles his own harmless face,
> The glow-worm creeps, and the thin weasel there
> Follows the mouse, and all is open field.

But we never get throughout the piece anything like the grand description of the tropical island, or the hazel woods, which Mr. Tennyson gave us in Enoch Arden.

Thus far I have spoken about the plot of Aylmer's Field and its development, but I must now pass on to the details and the language of the poem. Considered as a whole, the language is much less artistic than that of Enoch Arden; and other broad distinctions are to be traced; yet we can detect in parts the fine touches of the same master-hand. We can observe in the first place the same power over language, and the same exuberance of fancy which was so remarkable before. For example, when speaking of the childhood of

Edith and Leolin, the poet tells us that Leolin used to play with her, and roll his hoop to please her, and with her dipt

> Against the rush of the air in the prone swing—

a line which is singularly well adapted to the sense. For up to the words "the air," which must be taken as one syllable, the line runs very quickly, thereby describing the quick dash of the swing till gradually it catches the heavy air, and is unable to go any higher. The latter part of the verse being composed of monosyllables reads very heavily, and suggests the opposition of the air, especially after the pause which we are forced to make in the middle of the line. This line must recall to our memory the similar line in Enoch Arden, of which I have spoken before, namely:

> The league long roller thundering on the reef.

And if I may quote one example of his rich fancy, I would refer to his description of the land of hops—

> There when first
> The tented winter-field was broken up
> Into that phalanx of the summer spears
> That soon should wear the garland.

Again Mr. Tennyson shows the same marvellous power of condensing the richest imagery into one or two words. Thus he compares a passion yet unborn to the "music of the moon," which sleeps in the eggs of the sweet bird of night. Or, again, he invents the word "parcel-ivy-clad"; and, lower down in the same description of Edith's favourite haunt, he talks of

> A summer burial-deep in hollyhocks.

But, after all, this "curiosa felicitas" of expression is not peculiar to the poet before us. For there is hardly a single poet enjoying any popularity whatsoever who does not possess this power in some degree. But, besides this, we can trace another point of resemblance in the style of the two pieces which would prove that the same hand had worked out both.

In Enoch Arden, Mr. Tennyson sometimes showed himself as a critic, and made sarcastic allusions to certain practices of the times. Thus when he speaks of Annie's failure in business, he attributes it to her fairness and justness, since she had not been taught to barter,

> Neither capable of lies
> Nor asking overmuch and taking less.

But in this poem his allusions are not only very frequent, but also very severe. Thus he satirizes the sleepy land in which Sir Aylmer lived, and its conservative lethargy; or, again, the idea so prevalent among the higher classes of society that the whole object of life is to preserve game and fall back upon the glories of a name. The fault of the whole piece is perhaps the irritable and spiteful tone which pervades it. This may be accounted for by the hatred which the laureate shows here no less than in the rest of his works of the cardinal vice of overweening pride. And to this spiteful feeling we may in turn attribute the gloomy view of life which he takes. Thus speaking of the legal profession, which he calls the "lawless science of our law," he alludes to the unfairness of fortune in her favours and the uncertainty of success

> Thro' which a few, by wit or fortune led,
> May beat a pathway out to wealth and fame.

But the one vice so common to the present day on which Mr. Tennyson has spoken with the saddest enthusiasm, and which is the groundwork of some of his greatest and most celebrated poems, is the attempt to stifle real love. Pure and loyal devotion to a woman can only be the product of a high state of civilization; and when a parent sells his daughter to the highest bidder he is travelling back into the darkness of the early centuries. This sin, accordingly, is lashed by the poet with the strongest invective. He describes how Edith's parents tried to lure all the wealthiest and noblest of their neighbours into their net, and to force their daughter to give up her real love for Leolin to another whom she could not ever sincerely love; and he remarks how they two contrived every thing for "her good" as they tried to make themselves believe—

> Her worldly wise begetters plagued themselves
> To sell her, those *good* parents for *her good*.

These two traits, and a few other illusions like that wondrous sympathy between absent friends mentioned in

> Star to star vibrates light: may soul to soul
> Strike through a finer element of her own?

which recalls to our minds a similar passage in the Princess, are the chief points of resemblance between Sir Aylmer's Field and the rest of Mr. Tennyson's works: but the differences are not less marked or distinct. It remains for me, therefore, to mention some of the most important.

The first thing that strikes any one reading Sir Aylmer's Field for the first time is the number of expressions or passages which appear awkward or difficult to understand. And this difficulty of meaning is quite different from that which we meet with in Mr. Browning. For Mr. Tennyson's mind is cast in a mould altogether distinct from that of his great contemporary. When the former conceives an idea he clothes it at once in the most telling and enticing language, and if he pauses for an instant, it is only because he cannot choose between the number of rich words that crowd in upon his mind. If, therefore, he becomes anywhere obscure, it is generally because he has not taken sufficient pains to arrange his words. But when the latter has conceived any idea, his mind travels so quick, that he feels that in its present form it would be unintelligible to the majority of his readers. His first impulse, therefore, is not to clothe it in the richest garb, but rather in the plainest. The thought is with him the soul of poetry, and not the mode of expression. Hence, when we find him hard to understand, it is because the numerous ideas which have presented themselves to his imagination are not sufficiently discriminated, the mist of thought not properly cleared up. He is stunned by the exuberance of thought, not of language. In Aylmer's Field, therefore, the dark expressions, and in particular the haze which hangs over the rector's sermon seem to point out a want of care and pains on the part of the poet. In Enoch Arden, not a word seems out of its due place; but here the execution is much less artistic.

I will merely quote one passage, by way of example, which is taken from the *Rector's Sermon.*

> Thou wilt not gash thy flesh for Him: for thine
> Fares richly, in fine linen, not a hair
> Ruffled upon the scarfskin, even while
> The deathless ruler of thy dying house
> Is wounded to the death that cannot die.

If we were to compare this passage with an obscure expression from Robert Browning's works, we should see the truth of the remark which I have made above. The meaning of this piece is not obscure from the depth or exuberance of its thought, but simply from the language and the play upon words. Mr. Tennyson cannot resist the temptation of using an Oxymoron wherever he has an opportunity. When compared with a somewhat similar expression at the end of Guinevere, the allusion seems to be

to the soul, and the meaning of the piece as follows: Though with your daughter has passed away and died the whole house of Aylmer, and though your conscience tells you that in your immortal soul you have bowed down to another god, a god of acreage rather than the God of Heaven, yet do you show yourself still impenitent and are unwilling to humble yourself before Him. In addition to the longer passages there are many expressions like "neither loved nor liked," a repetition which is hardly forcible; or again "ran a Malayan muck," or lastly

> "Seconded, for my lady followed suit,"

an allusion that is almost humorous, and on that account not quite in accordance with the spirit of the passages which seem to warrant us in assuming that the poet took less pains in working at Aylmer's Field than Enoch Arden.

In considering the next three poems which follow Aylmer's Field there is not much to delay us. The first of them is entitled "Sea Dreams," and is one of those moral pieces which by the neatness of the plot and the delicacy of its language tend so much to preserve Mr. Tennyson's popularity among his admirers. A celebrated French critic, who in a comparison between Tennyson and Alfred de Musset awards the palm of genius to the latter, considers that our poet's popularity depends on the sympathy which his audience feel with him in the subjects which he chooses. "Sa poésie," he remarks "semble faite exprès pour ces bourgeois opulents, cultivés, libres, heritiers de l'ancienne noblesse, chefs modernes d'une Angleterre nouvelle. Car elle fait partie de leur luxe comme de leur morale: elle est une confirmation éloquente de leurs principes et un meuble précieux de leur salon." This little piece is merely meant to convey the lesson of forgiveness to us, and it owes its name to the dreams which a city clerk and his wife are represented as having dreamed. It is very tasteful and pretty, but when we have said this we have said all that can be said for it.

The next two pieces are quite distinct from any other pieces in the volume before us, and they present many points of similarity between themselves. They belong to that class of literature which we should call dramatic, and so far they resemble Enoch Arden and Aylmer's Field. But in other respects they are quite distinct. For they contain as it were no plot. They are merely little touches and small portraits of one phase of character. They are certainly very pretty and even perfect in themselves, but they are of such a kind

that we can attach no importance to them. Had they appeared by themselves in the lists under a mask and without a name, critics would have pronounced them happy and promising, but they would not have entitled their author to the praises of genius or originality. As it is, the prowess of their artificer being known, they have been loudly praised, and in fact the second of them has been received with more enthusiasm than any other poem in the book. In one point certainly they present Mr. Tennyson to our view in almost, I may say, a new light. Hitherto with the exception perhaps of "Amphion" in his book of poems, and one or two touches here and there he has shown no signs of humour. But these two poems are full to overflowing of this thoroughly Saxon element. People could not understand how it was that a great English poet like Mr. Tennyson should be deficient in that quality which has been so prominent in the works of so many of our greatest poets including the names of Chaucer, Shakspeare, and Dryden. But now the Poet Laureate has shown that in common with other qualities he possesses this indispensable requisite for dramatic poetry. The Northern Farmer is certainly the greatest success of the two poems: and the subject is one which we should expect to be more congenial to the tastes of our poet, both from his early acquaintance with the eastern counties and the natural constitution of his mind. The way in which the mind of the Farmer is always reverting to his farm, is very cleverly kept up by the poet; and even in his most serious moments we find him mixing up his duty to his farm and his duty to God as if they were synonymous terms.

I weänt saäy men be loiars, thof summun said it in 'aäste:
But a reäds wonn sarmin a weeäk, an' I 'a stubb'd Thornaby waäste.

He cannot bear the thought of dying before he has stubbed up and ploughed the whole common, and while his cows are calving. It is an enigma which he cannot solve. Again the comparison between the parson's sermons and the buzzing of a buzzard-clock is very humorous. But though it is perfect in itself, it can only be regarded as a very successful experiment. Our poet Laureate has tried his strength on several of the separate parts which make a perfect drama, and every one must hope that he will attempt the harder and more tedious work of writing a complete drama upon which posterity may decide whether Tennyson shall be

"a name to resound for ages."

CHARADE.

THE summer sun was setting,
The hills were in a glow,
Augustus wooed fair Emmeline
In accents soft and low.

In accents low he sued her,
A fav'ring ear she lent:
But in a broken voice replied,
'Mamma will not consent.'

Just then the garden gate unclosed,
Her mother came in view;
And Emma from her lover's side
To hide her blushes flew.

Despair oft gives us courage,
'Gus nerved him for the worst.
Cried he, 'Say only you'll be mine
This hour you'll ne'er MY FIRST.'

The pale moon sank before the sun;
A youth, with hasty stride,
Paced down the church's lofty aisle
And through the chancel wide.

That morn would see him dubbed a knight,
To join the valiant band
Of those who for their country's right
Fought in a stranger land.

In festal robes with stately pace
The long procession came:
Churchmen and lords of high degree,
With dames of noble name.

The rite was o'er, the abbot's words
  Echoed with solemn sound.
The sword of knighthood to his side
  By ladies fair was bound.

He left the church with hurried step;
  To a retainer beckoned:
'Ho! vassal o'er the drawbridge hie,
  And bring me forth MY SECOND!

Christmas tide had come and gone,
  The holly boughs were down;
Roast beef and plum-pudding were fled,
  Blancmange was out of town.

One mark of fun and of frolic
  Alone remained behind:
For Master Bob in the easy chair
  Uneasily reclined.

Then they sent for Doctor Bolus,
  Who came and shook his head,
And said, 'I'm not at all surprised:
  He must be put to bed.'

'You may let him have for breakfast
  Of bread and milk a bowl:
But don't forget he takes to night
  A good dose of MY WHOLE.'

T. R.

OUR PICTURE GALLERY,

III.—The Enterprising Man.

THE epithet "enterprising" is, I take it, one of neutral signification: it does not, of itself, necessarily imply either commendation or censure. In the ordinary type of the enterprising man we see personified a combination of originality in the conception and audacity in the execution of a project. To produce the perfect type we must temper the above ingredients with that wholesome corrective, the rare faculty of discretion. It is to this perfect development that the word enterprise owes the laudatory force which, I admit, it frequently obtains.

But I have not here to deal with any model of perfection, but with the ordinary enterprising man as he appears upon the stage of College life. Let us begin with his pedigree. His great-grandfather's maternal uncle was an enthusiastic supporter of that ideal enthusiast William Paterson, and died at the ill-fated settlement of Darien. His great-grandfather sunk his fortune in the South Sea scheme: and as deep-sea sounding was then in its infancy, it is not surprising that he did not recover it from its watery sepulchre. Our hero's grandfather was more fortunate, or shall we say, that he possessed more of that discretion which we have commended above? However that may be, it is an ascertained fact that on the 18th of June, 1815, he invested a large sum of money in the public funds, and two days afterwards—the news of the battle of Waterloo having arrived in the interval—sold out and realized a profit which made him a wealthy man for the remainder of his days. His son, our hero's father, was a shareholder in the Great Britain, the first steamship which crossed the Atlantic, and in the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, and to this day wherever the project is of the calibre of the Atlantic Telegraph, the Suez Canal or the Mont Ceuis Tunnel, there may his name be seen conspicuous upon the list of directors.

Our hero's debut upon the stage of Cambridge life is recommended rather by its novelty than by its dignity. He arrived in a horse-box attached to a luggage train, a mode of conveyance by which he had ascertained that he would save exactly thirteen minutes and a-half. By some inadvertence of the porters the (supposed) empty horse-box was shunted into a secluded siding and the door locked. The unconscious occupant, who had been asleep during this operation awoke two hours afterwards to find himself enveloped in total darkness and immured in a hopeless captivity. What was he to do? In vain were all his cries for help; it was not until ten o'clock the next morning that he was heard and released from his dungeon. Our hero was naturally a little depressed by this occurrence: and it is on record that he passed a whole day without originating a single brilliant idea. The next morning, however, his naturally sanguine spirits revived: and as he was ascending the staircase to his rooms, which were situated in the third story, he was heard to exclaim, "A lift: the inspiration of genius has not deserted me!" And the same evening he addressed a letter to the Master and Seniors suggesting that lifts should be established on every staircase. He proved that by this arrangement each Undergraduate would on the average gain 17·121 minutes per diem, and that by a judicious employment of the time so saved not less than 12·16 per cent. of the whole number plucked for Little-go would escape that undesirable consummation.

I do not know whether Cambridge life offers peculiar facilities to the enterprising man: but from this time forward it is ascertained that the improvements suggested by our hero averaged eighteen a week. That his suggestions were not accepted cannot be with justice imputed as a crime to him: and if failure in the previous examination is still a not unfrequent occurrence, let those who rejected the project of the lifts bear the undivided odium of their short-sighted policy: if the ditch that separates two great Colleges is still an insurmountable obstacle to those who would pass from one to the other, can we justly direct our indignation against the man whose fertile brain conceived the idea of a drawbridge, which might secure the communication during the day and be raised at night? I imagine we cannot.

There are some circumstances recorded of our hero, which would be incredible if they were not attested by the best authority. It appears that in his time, the lecturers' tables were not always provided with the choicest assortment of

pens: at all events, he is said to have offered to supply each lecturer with two good pens a term for the very moderate remuneration of a half-penny. He is also said to have undertaken to furnish the college with *drinkable* Burton ale, at the same price as the college brew of that period: from which we unwillingly draw the irresistible inference, that the latter was not at that time the Elysian beverage with which we are acquainted. I also find an inexplicable notice that he originated a petition entitled, "For the employment of additional waiters at the *undergraduates*' tables on feast days." The word "undergraduates'" is in italics. Now why should additional waiters be required on feast days in particular, and why is such stress laid on the word "undergraduates'"? His greatest exploit, however, seems to have been the Bread and Butter Petition; which, at his instance, was signed by the whole college, and, strangely enough, is said to have been rejected: a malicious libel (for I have no hesitation in stigmatising it as such) alleges the reason to have been that, of four statements contained in the petition, two were absolutely unfounded and two more than doubtful.

His ingenuity in private life was not less conspicuous. His eminent services to the College at length procured him the graceful recognition of a double set of rooms. He was accustomed to pass the greater part of his time in the inner room: there it was that he gave free rein to his fancy, and allowed it to soar aloft like a winged courser, far beyond the range of human vision. This practice of his was liable to the slight disadvantage, that his friends constantly came into his outer room and went away under the impression that he was out. How was this to be obviated? A brilliant idea occurred to him. He succeeded, after several days' patient labour, in establishing a communication between the outer door and the door of his inner sanctum, by a system of cords and pulleys, so constructed that the one door could not be opened without the other, as by a magnetic sympathy, following its example. This precaution, one would have thought, would be sufficient: but to make assurance doubly sure, he contrived that a heavy weight should descend on the head of the person entering: this naturally elicited a shriek proportionate in its intensity to the momentum of the weight, and our hero was at once certified of the arrival of the new-comer. Whether his friends continued to visit him with the same affectionate frequency as before, is a question that need not here be entered into: although I cannot but think that our hero's contrivance might be adopted with

advantage by certain of my acquaintance, who are anxious to read hard for their approaching degree.

I believe it was in our hero's second Long, that he obtained leave from the proper authorities to erect a hammock-bed upon the College lawn, and there recline under the shade of a wide-spreading elm. I suppose it must be attributed to his extensive experience of camp life—he was an enthusiastic volunteer—that he found such a peculiar charm in devoting a blazing hot afternoon to the following operation. It is two o'clock; a well-known form is seen to emerge from the gate of the court, and proceed, hammock on shoulder and hammer in hand, to the blissful spot where the interwoven shadows of a branching tree flicker over the verdant greensward. The hammer begins its work: one stake is laboriously driven into the ground: the happy labourer swelters in the hot sun: he pauses to rest and recover his breath. Again the work begins; a second stake is driven in: the third and the fourth follow in due course. The hammock is adjusted, and our hero deposits his wearied frame therein. It is just half-past three: he will still have an hour, in which to recover from his self-imposed fatigue. But hark! A sudden crack is followed by a crash of falling greatness; the frail edifice collapses, and the genius that conceived the plan, is buried in the ruins, of the treacherous structure. The next half-hour is spent in repairing damages, and after fully twenty minutes' undisturbed enjoyment of his well-earned repose, our hero proceeds to hall under the impression that he has passed a very pleasant afternoon.

I have said that our hero was a volunteer. Now it so happened that the College company had fallen to a very low ebb in point of strength and efficiency, and he undertook to regenerate it. This he saw at once could only be accomplished by bold and startling measures. He was soon proved to be equal to the emergency. Buying up a large number of second-hand uniforms, he offered a uniform and a bounty of a sovereign to each recruit. The inducements thus held out were in some degree successful: but further instigation was still needed. Our hero instituted a system of room-to-room visits, and where he could not persuade by bribes, he offered to fight the recusants. This settled the question: crowds of recruits thronged with patriotic ardour to the standard of their country: and even reading men who had grudged the very hour which they devoted to exercise, rushed emulously to arms: for upon a careful calculation they decided that they would lose more time by the continual visits of our proselytising hero than by the drills and parades which would result, if they acceded to his wish. The cause of loyalty triumphed: and in the marvellously short space of three weeks, no less than thirty recruits were enrolled in that list of effectives which annually forms the subject of a jubilant leader in the Times. It may however be doubted whether the "effective," who owes his efficiency to a high-pressure system of three weeks' training, constitutes that impregnable bulwark of his country which flattering inspectors and exultant scribblers represent him to be.

At this crisis in our hero's history, a paragraph appeared in the papers announcing that a plan was in contemplation for uniting the islands of New Zealand and Nova Zembla, by means of an underground railway. The announcement was followed the next day by the mysterious disappearance of our hero. His fate is still shrouded in melancholy uncertainty: there are those who connect his disappearance with the paragraph above mentioned: there are others who assert that he has gone in quest of Nana Sahib or the North Pole: but in any case I think we may predict with certainty that the world will awake some morning to find that some problem, which it has for centuries believed impossible, has been suddenly solved, and that the solution is due to the superhuman exertions of the Enterprising Man!

SS.

OUR CHRONICLE.

WITH the issue of the present number, our College Magazine completes its fifth volume, and the tenth year of its existence. Those amateur periodicals are few indeed to which so long a life is allotted, and the Editorial Committee feel that their hearty thanks are due to the contributors to whom the *Eagle* owes its present vigorous condition. They can point with pride to the fact that while the Magazine has not deserted its original object, of furnishing an outlet for the literary talent of Undergraduates, in almost every number there have been articles by men whose names would serve as passports that would give them an admission to the pages of periodicals of far more wide spread reputation. From one point of view alone, the state of the *Eagle* is far from satisfactory; but that is a very important one. The expenses of publication are met by subscriptions; but while the resident Graduates and Undergraduates have promptly met the calls for sums already due, the dilatoriness or forgetfulness of non-resident subscribers has produced a certain amount of temporary embarrassment, and the Editorial Committee feel that unless this can be removed before the end of the Long Vacation they would not be justified in entering upon the publication of another Volume. At the same time the sums due to the *Eagle*, even allowing a considerable margin for subscriptions which there seems little hope of receiving, more than cover the total of its debts. Under these circumstances the Editors are sure that the Members of our College would much regret the extinction of a periodical which does much to cement the strong College feeling, of which we are justly proud; and they therefore appeal to them to let no careless neglect cut short the life of our noble bird, but by their liberal contributions of food, both literary and pecuniary, to send it forth to wider and higher flights. They may also remind subscribers that it

was in reliance upon their promises of support that the expenses of publication were undertaken, a reliance which they are very reluctant to believe misplaced. The Editors contemplate several considerable improvements in the external appearance of the Sixth Volume, should they be enabled to enter upon its publication.

The Rev. S. S. Walton, fellow of this College, has been appointed to the rectory of Fulbourn. Mr. J. E. Sandys, Senior Classic, 1867, has been appointed a Lecturer in Classics. The Naden Divinity Studentship has been adjudged to Mr. W. E. Pryke, B.A., 14th Wrangler (bracketed) 1866, second class Theological Tripos, 1867; and the Fry Hebrew Scholarship to Mr. W. Covingt B.A., 18th Wrangler in the same year, and first class (wi Hebrew Prize) in the Theological Tripos, 1867.

Our College shows no signs of falling off in the career of classical success, which has of late been so brilliantly pursued by some of her members. Of the University Prizes adjudged, six have been brought to this college; having been won as follows:

Sir W. Browne's Medal for Latin Ode— G. H. Hallam.
" " *Greek* " G. H. Hallam.
Porson Prize—T. Moss.
Chancellor's Medal for English Verse—T. Moss.
Members' Prize (*Bachelors*)—J. E. Sandys.
" " (*Undergraduates*)—A. S. Wilkins.

The following donations and subscriptions have been promised to the Stained Glass Window Fund.

DONATIONS.

	£.	s.	d.		£.	s.	d.
J. Alexander	3	3	0	J. R. W. Bros, B.A.	5	0	0
W. G. Alford		10	0	F. P. Burnett, B.A.	5	0	0
W. H. Allhusen	1	1	0	A. G. Cane	5	5	0
H. H. Allott	5	5	0	E. V. Casson		10	0
W. S. Barnes	1	1	0	A. D. Clarke, B.A.	5	5	0
A. Bateman, M.A.	3	3	0	H. Chabot	1	1	0
G. L. Bennett	1	1	0	J. E. Congreve			
H. T. Bonsfield		10	0	G. F. L. Dashwood, B.A.	5	5	0
W. O. Boyes	3	3	0				

	£.	s.	d.
W. O. Dawson	3	0	0
W. M. Durieu	5	5	0
Lieut. Gardiner, B.A.	5	5	0
J. George, B.A.	3	3	0
F. G. Gretton	0	10	0
E. J. Guest	2	2	0
R. Hey	1	1	0
H. Hibbert	10	10	0
C. Hockin, B.A.	20	0	0
A. Hogg	5	5	0
H. Howlett	1	1	0
C. T. Hudson	1	1	0
E. K. Kendall, M.A.	2	2	0
Rev. S. H. Lee Warner, M.A.	5	0	0
H. Lee Warner, M.A.	25	0	0
J. E. Lewis	1	1	0
H. M. Loxdale, B.A.	10	0	0
E. T. Luck, B.A.	10	0	0
R. G. Marsden	3	3	0
C. Morice	1	0	0
W. L. Parrott	1	10	0
G. J. Peachell, B.A.	1	1	0
H. Robinson, B.A.	3	3	0
J. P. Seabrook	3	0	0
W. Selwyn, B.A.	1	0	0
A. Smallpeice, M.A.	5	5	0
W. F. Smith, B.A.	10	0	0
R. H. A. Squires	6	6	0
R. S. Stephen, B.A.	3	0	0
J. J. Thornley, B.A.		10	0
C. E. Thorpe, B.A.	1	1	0
R. Trousdale	2	0	0
A. S. Webb, B.A.	3	3	0
W. A. Whitworth, M.A.	5	0	0
T. Whitby, B.A.	1	1	0
	209	13	0

SUBSCRIPTIONS.

(to be paid in three years from the time of promise.)

	£.	s.	d.
G. H. Adams	3	3	0
C. F. E. Allen	3	3	0
W. Almack	6	6	0
F. Andrews, B.A.	6	6	0
R. C. Atkinson	1	1	0
H. H. Bagnall	9	9	0
T. Bainbridge	6	6	0
J. W. Bakewell	3	3	0
H. Baker	2	0	0
S. B. Barlow, B.A.	9	9	0
W. F. Barrett	6	6	0
E. K. Bayley	10	10	0
F. Baynes	3	3	0
E. Beaumont, B.A.	6	6	0
M. H. L. Beebee, B.A.	15	15	0
J. R. S. Bennett	6	6	0
T. Benson	6	6	0
H. R. Beor	6	6	0
J. Blanch, B A.	6	6	0
G. W. Bloxam, B.A.	3	3	0
J. H. Blunn, B.A.	2	2	0
A. Bonney	3	3	0
W. Bonsey	6	6	0
J. A. Bostock	3	3	0
S. J. Boultbee	6	6	0
C. W. Bourne	6	6	0
W. N. Boutflower	3	3	0
R. Bower	3	3	0
W. H. Bradshaw	6	6	0
E. Bray, B.A.	6	6	0
T. L. C. Bridges	6	6	0
T. W. Brogden, B.A.	6	6	0
A. F. Q. Bros	6	6	0
R. Browne	6	6	0
J. F. Buckler	3	3	0
G. F. Bulmer	6	6	0
F. Burnside	3	3	0
J. P. Cann	3	3	0
E. Cargill, B.A.	1	11	6
E. Carpmael, B.A.	6	6	0
C. Carpmael	6	6	0
J. W. Cassels	2	2	0
J. S. ff. Chamberlain	6	6	0
W. H. Chaplin, B.A.	3	3	0
Rev. W. A. Chapman	5	0	0
W. Charnley, B.A.	3	3	0

	£.	s.	d.
E. C. Chaytor	3	3	0
W. H. Child	3	3	0
O. L. Clare, B.A.	15	15	0
W. T. Clark, B.A.	3	3	0
H. H. Cochrane	6	6	0
J. M. Collard	6	6	0
J. S. Constable	1	10	0
S. W. Cope, B.A.	9	9	0
W. W. Cooper	6	6	0
C. C. Cotterill, B.A.	6	6	0
W. Covington, B.A.	9	9	0
D. L. Cowie	6	6	0
W. A. Cox, B.A.	6	6	0
G. E. Cruickshank	3	3	0
A. Cust, B.A.	6	6	0
J. W. Dale	3	3	0
W. Davies	6	6	0
R. P. Davies	3	3	0
E. S. Dewick	3	3	0
R. H. Dockray, B.A.	6	6	0
C. E. Drew	6	6	0
R. J. Ellis	3	3	0
L. H. Evans	3	3	0
C. C. G. Fagan	3	3	0
A. Farbrother, B.A.	3	3	0
A. J. Finch	6	6	0
R. R. Fisher, B.A.	6	6	0
E. M. Fitzgerald	1	10	0
F. Fitzherbert	6	6	0
A. Forbes, B.A.	6	6	0
A. Foster	3	3	0
G. W. D. S. Forrest	6	6	0
E. Fynes-Clinton	3	3	0
L. B. Gaches	6	6	0
E. H. Genge, B.A.	3	3	0
B. W. Gardom	5	0	0
F. G. Gilderdale	3	3	0
R. Giles	3	3	0
R. A. Gillespie	6	6	0
T. W. W. Gordon, LL.B.	6	6	0
Govind-Withul	3	3	0
W. H. Green, B.A.	3	3	0
A. G. Greenhill	3	3	0
W. Griffith	6	6	0
C. H. Griffith	6	6	0
G. H. Hallam	6	6	0
P. F. Hammond, B.A.	10	10	0
H. G. Hart, B.A.	9	9	0
W. E. Hart, sen.	6	6	0
W. E. Hart, jun.	6	6	0
C. E. Haslam	3	3	0
J. B. Haslam, B.A.	6	6	0
S. Haslam	6	6	0
W. A. Haslam	5	0	0
J. T. Hathornthwaite	3	3	0
J. E. Hewison	3	3	0
H. M. Hewitt, B.A.	10	10	0
H. Hilary	3	3	0
E. Hill	6	6	0
C. Hoare, B.A.	15	15	0
H. Hoare, M.A.	31	10	0
W. Hoare	10	10	0
T. Hodges, B.A.	1	11	6
A. E. Hodgson	3	3	0
J. W. Hodgson	6	6	0
C. Hogg	3	3	0
D. Hooke	3	3	0
C. A. Hope, B.A.	6	6	0
J. W. Horne	3	3	0
J. W. Horne	3	3	0
H. Humphreys, B.A.	3	3	0
E. B. l'Anson, B.A.	6	6	0
J. D. Inglis	3	3	0
J. N. Isherwood, B.A.	3	3	0
T. Johns, B A.	3	3	0
C. N. Keeling, B.A.	3	3	0
P. H. Kempthorne, B.A.	6	6	0
F. G. Kiddle	6	6	0
T. Knowles, B.A.	6	6	0
T. S. Ladds	3	3	0
A. W. Lambert	6	6	0
E. L. Levett	3	3	0
Rev. W. H. A. Lewis	3	3	0
E. W. M. Lloyd	6	6	0
A. Low	6	6	0
F. Macdona	3	3	0
F. A. Mackinnon	6	6	0
H. M. Mansfield	2	2	0
F. G. Maples, B.A.	6	6	0
H. W. Markham	3	3	0
M. W. Marklove	3	3	0
R. G. Marrack, B.A.	6	6	0
M. H. Marsden, B.A.	6	6	0
A. Marshall, B.A.	9	9	0

	£.	s.	d.
F. Marshall	3	3	0
R. J. Martyn	3	3	0
R. B. Masefield, B.A.	6	6	0
J. Massie, B.A.	6	6	0
F. C. Maxwell	1	1	0
E. Miller, B.A.	3	3	0
W. Mills, B.A.	9	9	0
R. H. Morgan, B.A.	10	10	0
H. W. Moss, M.A.	31	10	0
T. Moss	6	6	0
J. B. Mullinger, B.A.	3	3	0
J. Musgrave	6	6	0
H. Newton, B.A.	15	15	0
H. Nicholson	6	6	0
H. T. Norton	3	3	0
J. Noon	6	6	0
A. N. Obbard	3	3	0
T. de C. O'Grady	6	6	0
G. Oldacres, B.A.	6	6	0
W. Oxland	3	3	0
H. W. Pate	3	3	0
J. Payton, B.A.	3	3	0
J. Peake	6	6	0
E. L. Pearson	6	6	0
J. B. Pearson, M.A.	21	0	0
J. A. Percival	3	3	0
T. N. Perkins, B.A.	3	3	0
E. A. B. Pitman	6	6	0
T. G. B. Poole, B.A.	3	3	0
D. Preston	3	3	0
J. Pridden	3	3	0
R. K. Pritchard	6	6	0
W. E. Pryke, B.A.	6	6	0
J. Pulliblank, B.A.	6	6	0
M. H. Quayle, B.A.	6	6	0
H. Radcliffe, B.A.	6	6	0
G. E. Redhead	6	6	0
R. M. Reece, B.A.	6	6	0
J. R. Reece	3	3	0
W. Reed	3	3	0
C. W. Reynolds	3	3	0
C. L. Reynolds	3	3	0
T. Roach, B.A.	3	3	0
G. Robinson	3	3	0
F. Robson, B.A.	3	3	0
C. F. Roe, B.A.	6	6	0
R. C. Rogers	6	6	0
W. Routh	6	6	0
R. H. Rowband, B.A.	6	6	0
H. Rowsell, B.A.	6	6	0
E. J. S. Rudd	9	9	0
C. D. Russell, M.A.	6	6	0
A. C. D. Ryder	3	3	0
A. Salts	1	1	0
J. E. Sandys, B.A.	10	10	0
E. S. Saxton	3	3	0
T. Scaife	3	3	0
B. P. Selby, B.A.	6	6	0
W. H. Simpson	3	3	0
A. C. Skrimshire, B.A.	3	3	0
E. Brook Smith	1	10	0
G. Smith	3	3	0
R. K. Smith	1	10	0
F. A. Souper, B.A.	6	6	0
A. J. Stevens, B.A.	6	6	0
F. S. Stooke	3	3	0
H. W. Street, B.A.	6	6	0
C. J. Stoddart	3	3	0
W. C. Stoney	3	3	0
C. Taylor, B.A.	31	10	0
J. Taylor	6	6	0
J. Thomas	3	3	0
E. S. Thorpe, B.A.	9	9	0
J. Toone, B.A.	6	6	0
C. S. Towel, B.A.	6	6	0
E. W. Turner	3	3	0
W. R. Twyne	6	6	0
W. W. Unett	9	9	0
W. Lee Warner	6	6	0
C. Warren	9	9	0
J. Watkins	3	3	0
H. Watney, B.A.	9	9	0
A. W. Watson, B.A.	6	6	0
F. Watson	3	0	0
J. T. Welldon	6	6	0
C. Welsby	6	6	0
G. H. Whitaker	6	6	0
G. C. Whiteley	6	6	0
R. Y. Whytehead	6	6	0
G. A. Willan, B.A.	3	3	0
H. A. Williams	3	0	0
A. J. Williamson	3	3	0
A. S. Wilkins	6	6	0
A. F. L. Wilkinson	6	6	0

	£.	s.	d.
W. B. Wilson	4	4	0
H. J. Wiseman, B.A.	6	6	0
A. Wood, B.A.	9	9	0
G. F. S. Wood	3	3	0
C. Wotherspoon	3	3	0

	£.	s.	d.
	1342	10	0
Donations	209	13	0
	£1552	3	0

Of the above sum £846. 0*s.* 9*d.* has been invested in the India stock. The Committee wish to draw attention to the fact, that prompt payment of subscriptions will considerably augment the amount of interest received. Non-resident Members will oblige, by paying their subscriptions to the Treasurer, C. Hoare, Esq., Fleet Street, London, E.C.

The officers of the Lady Margaret Boat Club for the present term have been:

President, E. W. Bowling, M.A.
Treasurer, A. Low.
Secretary, J. M. Collard.
1*st Captain*, W. Bonsey.
2*nd Captain*, A. J. Finch.
3*rd Captain*, J. Watkins.
4*th Captain*, C. W. Bourne.

The following were the crews of the College boats in the late races:

1st Boat.

1 C. W. Bourne
2 A. J. Finch
3 J. W. Dale
4 W. H. Simpson
5 J. M. Collard
6 W. Bonsey
7 E. Carpmael
C. C. Scholfield (*stroke*)
J. T. Welldon (*cox.*)

2nd Boat.

1 R. Hey
2 F. Baynes
3 W. A. Jones
4 J. Watkins
5 W. B. Wilson
6 J. Noon
7 A. C. D. Ryder
F. A. Macdona (*stroke*)
R. Bower (*cox.*)

3rd Boat.

1 E. C. Chaytor
2 H. R. Beor
3 W. Hoare
4 A. Low
5 J. W. Horne
6 E. L. Pearson
7 C. F. Roe
S. Haslam (*stroke*)
A. F. Q. Bros (*cox.*)

4th Boat.

1 W. H. Chaplin
2 J. E. Congreve
3 W. E. Hart
4 H. H. Cochrane
5 W. Almack
6 E. W. M. Lloyd
7 E. W. Bowling
R. J. Ellis (*stroke*)
C. Carpmael (*cox.*)

Monday, May 20.

FIRST DIVISION.

1 1st Trinity	8 Caius	15 1st Trinity 3
2 3rd Trinity	9 Christ	16 Jesus
3 Trinity Hall	10 1st Trinity 2	17 St. Peter's
4 L. Margaret	11 Sidney	18 Clare
5 Emmanuel	12 2nd Trinity	19 King's
6 Pembroke	13 Trinity Hall 2	20 L. Margaret 2
7 Corpus	14 Magdalene	

SECOND DIVISION.

1 L. Margaret 2	9 L. Margaret 3	17 Clare 2
2 3rd Trinity 2	10 Catharine	18 1st Trinity 6
3 Christ's 2	11 Trinity Hall 2	19 Pembroke 2
4 1st Trinity 4	12 Jesus 2	20 L. Margaret 4
5 Emmanuel 2	13 Sidney 2	21 Downing
6 Corpus 2	14 Caius 2	
7 2nd Trinity 2	15 1st Trinity 5	
8 Queens'	16 Emmanuel 3	

Tuesday, May 21.

FIRST DIVISION.

1 1st Trinity	9 Caius	15 Jesus
2 3rd Trinity	10 Sidney	16 1st Trinity 3
3 Trinity Hall	11 1st Trinity 2	17 Clare
4 L. Margaret	12 2nd Trinity	18 St. Peter's
5 Emmanuel	13 Trinity Hall 2	19 L. Margaret 2
6 Pembroke	14 Magdalene	20 King's
7 Corpus		
8 Christ's		

SECOND DIVISION.

1 King's	8 2nd Trinity 2	15 Emmanuel 3
2 3rd Trinity 2	9 L. Margaret 3	16 1st Trinity 5
3 Christ's 2	10 Trinity Hall 3	17 Clare 2
4 1st Trinity 4	11 Catharine	18 Pembroke 2
5 Corpus 2	12 Sidney 2	19 1st Trinity 6
6 Emmanuel 2	13 Jesus 2	20 Downing
7 Queens'	14 Caius 2	21 L. Margaret 4

Wednesday, May 22.

FIRST DIVISION.

1 1st Trinity	8 Corpus	15 Jesus
2 3rd Trinity	9 Caius	16 Clare
3 Trinity Hall	10 1st Trinity 2	17 1st Trinity 3
4 L. Margaret	11 Sidney	18 L. Margaret 2
5 Emmanuel	12 2nd Trinity	19 St. Peter's
6 Pembroke	13 Trinity Hall 2	20 3rd Trinity 2
7 Christ's	14 Magdalene	

SECOND DIVISION.

1 King's	8 2nd Trinity 2	15 Emmanuel 3
2 3rd Trinity 2	9 Trinity Hall 2	16 Clare 2
3 Christ's 2	10 L. Margaret 3	17 1st Trinity 5
4 Corpus 2	11 Sidney 2	18 Pembroke 2
5 1st Trinity 4	12 Catharine	19 Downing
6 Queens'	13 Caius 2	20 1st Trinity 6
7 Emmanuel 2	14 Jesus 2	21 L Margaret 4

Thursday, May 23.

FIRST DIVISION.

1 1st Trinity	8 Sidney	14 Magdalene
2 3rd Trinity	9 1st Trinity 2	15 Clare
3 Trinity Hall	10 Caius	16 Jesus
4 Emmanuel	11 Corpus	17 L. Margaret 2
5 L. Margaret	12 2nd Trinity	18 1st Trinity 3
6 Christ's	13 Trinity Hall 2	19 St. Peter's
7 Pembroke		20 3rd Trinity 2

SECOND DIVISION.

1 3rd Trinity 2	9 2nd Trinity 2	16 Emmanuel 3
2 King's	10 L. Margaret 3	17 Pembroke 2
3 Corpus 2	11 Sidney 2	18 1st Trinity 5
4 Christ's 2	12 Catharine	19 Downing
5 1st Trinity 4	13 Caius 2	20 1st Trinity 6
6 Queens'	14 Jesus 2	21 L. Margaret 4
7 Emmanuel 2	15 Clare 2	
8 Trinity Hall 3		

Friday, May 24.

FIRST DIVISION.

1 1st Trinity	9 Sidney	15 Magdalene
2 3rd Trinity	10 Caius	16 L. Margaret 2
3 Trinity Hall	11 2nd Trinity	17 Jesus
4 L. Margaret	12 Corpus	18 St. Peter's
5 Emmanuel	13 Trinity Hall 2	19 1st Trinity 3
6 Christ's	14 Clare	20 3rd Trinity 2
7 Pembroke		
8 1st Trinity 2		

SECOND DIVISION.

1 3rd Trinity 2	8 Emmanuel 2	15 Jesus 2
2 Corpus 2	9 L. Margaret 3	16 Pembroke 2
3 King's	10 2nd Trinity 2	17 Emmanuel 3
4 Christ's 2	11 Sidney 2	18 Downing
5 Queen's	12 Catharine	19 1st Trinity 5
6 1st Trinity 4	13 Caius 2	20 1st Trinity 6
7 Trinity Hall 3	14 Clare 2	21 L. Margaret 4

Saturday, May 25.

FIRST DIVISION.

1 1st Trinity	8 Pembroke	15 L. Margaret 2
2 3rd Trinity	9 Sidney	16 Magdalene
3 L. Margaret	10 2nd Trinity	17 Jesus
4 Trinity Hall	11 Caius }	18 St. Peter's
5 Emmanuel	12 Trinity Hall 2 }	19 1st Trinity 3
6 Christ's }	13 Corpus }	20 3rd Trinity 2
7 1st Trinity 2 }	14 Clare }	

The friends and pupils of the Rev. A. V. Hadley, late Tutor of the College, whose untimely death was recorded in our last number, are anxious to place some memorial of him in the New Chapel. It has also long been felt by the numerous friends of the late Archdeacon France, once Tutor and President of the College, that some record of his name should also appear in the same building. Both of them saw the first stone laid; both have been carried away by almost sudden deaths before its completion. Singularly successful as Tutors—the one for few, the other for many years—and remarkable for their unselfish love of their College, their names deserve a monument more lasting than the sorrowing affection of their surviving friends. It is therefore purposed to place at least one memorial window to them in the New Chapel; and a Committee is now being formed of their friends and pupils among the senior and junior members of the College to collect subscriptions for this purpose.

END OF VOL V.

W. Metcalfe, Printer, Cambridge.