IN RELIGION'S REALM.

Expressions from the Various Religious Newspapers.

The Religious Thought of the Day as Expressed in the Sectarian Press—Some Matters of Interest to Both Ministers and Laymen.

The *Central Christian Advocate* says: "The Methodist movement has not exhausted itself. The only question is, can we carry it on into the next century on the high plane of spiritual life and personal righteous living that has made it what it is? Can we continue to make as successful a fight against worldliness and selfishness as the first Methodists did? This we believe to be the problem for the years to come, and there must be a quite definite answer to it before the closing year of this century."

The Nashville *Christian Advocate* (Meth.) says: "Bishop McTyeire used to say: 'A decent ritual is the best defence against ritualism.' The remark is profoundly true. In a church that has no forms of any sort, the ministers are at liberty to do as they please; and nothing is surer than that some of them will please to do very fantastic things. By the law of reaction, others will protest against this individualism, and will insist on going to the opposite extreme of a fixed, mechanical routine."

Of the late Dr. Howard Crosby, the *Christian Inquirer* says: "Dr. Crosby was, by nature and long experience, a reformer. His boldness in this respect often startled more timid brethren. He was a terror to evil-doers. Saloon-keepers dreaded and at the same time admired him. He was a 'mailed knight;' he dreaded no foe, and he championed every good cause. He never was known to fight unfairly. Even his vanquished foes admired the chivalry of his methods and the sincerity of his purpose. He hated with a perfect hatred every form of can't or sham or hypocrisy. He was himself absolutely sincere in every relation of life. His earnestness was a fire in his bones; he never adopted any form of sinuosity or crookedness in reaching an end. He thought for himself, and he dared to utter his thoughts in direct and unadorned speech."

The *Western Christian Advocate* (Methodist) says: "The Protestant Episcopalians of New York City are protesting against their clergy inviting other ministers to participate in their services. Dr. Rainsford, Rector of St. George's, invited on Good Friday a Congregational minister to officiate, and Dr. Heber Newton had a Universalist, a Presbyterian, a Unitarian, and a Campbellite minister, each for a short sermon at All Souls. We have no admiration for the exclusiveness of this denomination, but are bound to say that there is no justification for the contemptuous disregard of its laws by any of its clergy. If they are bigger than their church, they should at least be magnanimous, and refuse to embarrass it by claiming membership while defying its authority. The kicking Jeshuruns are numerous and should be strapped down or barred out."

The Rev. Dr. A. F. Schauffler has sent the following letter to the *Tribune:* "I was the first of the non-Episcopal clergymen who made addresses in St. George's Church this Lenten season. This morning I read Dr. Rainsford's letter to your paper, and am somewhat surprised at its contents. Certainly when I consented to preach in St. George's it was with the understanding that I appeared there as an ordained clergyman, and not as a layman. The letter of invitation was addressed to me as 'Reverend and Dear Sir,' and therefore gave me to understand that it was as a clergyman that I was invited to officiate. When I reached the vestry one of the clergy of the church (I forget who it was) asked me if I would wear a gown, to which I replied, 'Certainly.' I do not know whether it is customary for laymen to be offered gowns in the Episcopal Church, but my impression was to the contrary. I accepted the gown, because I regarded myself as ordained as well as the clergy of the church, who had invited me under the title of 'Reverend and Dear Sir.' Otherwise I would not have accepted the invitation to speak, where, by accepting it, I should have put any implied stigma on the Council that ordained me. If Dr. Rainsford meant that I should officiate as a layman, he should have said so in his letter of invitation, and then I could have governed myself accordingly, and should not have addressed me as he did, and then when his brethren begin to find fault with him, explain matters as he does in the letter to you. I honor and love the doctor, but feel that his present course is hardly consistent, for either he was not frank with those whom he invited or he is afraid to meet the consequences of his action."

"Farmton" says in the *Advance:* "Churches are now asking ministers to occupy their pulpits during the pastor's vacation. Ministers are also beginning their search for pulpits to supply during their vacation. It is expedient on both sides to make such plans long in advance. The question of right compensation for Sabbath preaching is an important one to the church, and especially important to the clergyman who officiates. As a rule such compensation is 1 per cent. of the entire salary paid the pastor. If the salary is $1,500, the compensation of a single Sabbath is $15. If the salary is $5,000, the compensation is $50. But as the salary increases, the tendency is rather to cut down the compensation for a single Sabbath. I know of only one church which pays $100 for a Sabbath's preaching; but either $40 or $50 is a sum more usual among strong churches. Churches are inclined to be more generous in payment than are ministers in compensating their brethren. I know one minister whose salary is $7,500, who called a brother clergyman to preach in his place, and he sent that brother clergyman $10 in payment! For a similar service the church sent the same minister $50. If my brother minister is sick, or is absent because of sickness, and I am able to supply his place, I am happy to do it, and do it for nothing; but if he is absent on a fishing excursion I expect him to pay me just as liberally as his church would."

Of the English hymns and prayers in use at the Paulist Fathers' Church at the 9 o'clock mass, the *Freeman's Journal* (R. C.) says: "There has always been a large congregation at this mass; but since the recitation of prayers and singing of hymns in common have been introduced the number of persons attending has greatly increased. With the several hundred extra movable seats supplied there are still two or three hundred persons standing in the aisles. Evidently this manner of hearing mass has proved very popular with the people of St. Paul's, as we have no doubt it will in every church where it is tried. The congregation is led in the prayers and hymns by one of the priests from the pulpit.

"We advise our friends who wish to learn if this congregational manner of assisting at low mass works to edification to go up to St. Paul's some Sunday morning and listen to the vast congregation there, of more than 2,000 people, pray and sing together. There are two other masses going on at the same hour in the old building on Sixtieth street, formerly used as a temporary church. These masses are for the children, who also have their own suitable order of prayers and hymns in common."

The *Examiner* (Bapt.) says: "Granted that the place of such men as Drs. Briggs, and Toy, and Thayer is with the Unitarians, the question is: Does Dr. Briggs carry with him any considerable portion of the Presbyterian Church, does Dr. Toy have the sympathy of the Baptists, is Dr. Thayer a representative Congregational-[illegible] The answer cannot be doubted for a [illegible]ent. It is a question yet to be de-[illegible] [w]hether Dr. Briggs can much [illegible] toleration for his views in [illegible]terian Church; approval is [illegible] of the question. Dr. Toy ceased long ago to have more than a nominal connection with the Baptists, and not a voice was lifted to urge his retention. Dr. Thayer was so conscious of his disagreement with the Congregationalists that, like an honest man, he resigned his Andover chair and practically withdrew from the denomination. That here and there a man adopts views which a majority of his church regard as heretical, so far from proving a drift toward heresy, proves rather that a vast majority stand by the doctrines which they profess. So long as men investigate and think, so long will there be men who disagree with the convictions of the majority. But such exceptional cases indicate no drift. It is easy to exaggerate the significance of such divergencies from received opinions; for the most part their meaning is hidden from contemporaries."

The *Christian Intelligencer* (Ref.) says: "The President of the 'American Secular Union' says of the Bible, that 'it contains many excellent moral precepts, but these are so mixed up with what is immoral as to make contamination by contact imminent.' This being so, it is strange that somehow good people study the Bible, but bad people do not. Nor is there any record anywhere of a man getting contamination by reading the Bible, while every day there occurs instances of men being thoroughly reformed by the influence of this one book. Here is a very curious case of contradiction. An immoral book which yet does not make its readers immoral, but on the contrary turns felons and profligates into models of upright living. Suppose that the American Secular Union tries its hand at producing an ethical scheme which will work the transformations wrought by the Gospel. For surely they ought not to take away a tried remedial agency until they can furnish a better to put in its place."

Writing on "The Function of Public Prayer," the Rev. John McGaw Foster says in the *Andover Review:* "There are, no doubt, those souls in the ministry—it is to be feared they are rare—who are able in extempore prayer to sink their own personality, and place themselves merely as spokesmen to express the common spirit of devotion. And yet the prayers of these, helpful and uplifting though they may be, must always fail in one important feature—familiarity. The words of the Common Prayer, touching only the common needs of mankind, used again and again in the holy place, become to the worshiper the very alphabet of devotion. He associates them always with the purpose for which they are uttered, and when they are spoken in public worship there is no distracting effort of the mind to follow unfamiliar or unexpected phrases. They become to him simply the channel for the spirit of prayer to utter itself. This familiarity, also, is the safeguard of liturgical prayer; for if the manner of expression is faulty, it is corrected by the mind, which forgets the words in the association, breathing only the spirit of the hour.

"It is often urged in favor of extempore prayer in public worship that the minister is free to adapt his utterances to occasions which may arise to call for special intercession. A moment's recalling of the meaning of prayer as we have studied it will convince us of the danger of such liberty. It is apt to be sentiment rather than prayer which craves expression at such times, and the novelty of the utterance can easily become a means of distraction from the true purpose for which prayer is made. The occasion is rare indeed on which familiar forms, with such adaptations as may be provided, do not serve the purposes of common worship better than impromptu words can do.

"Like the bread and wine of the Eucharist, the outward sign of common prayer fulfills best its office when it is familiar and simple, and when it savors not of the individual personality of priest or people. Of such nature is liturgical prayer, and because it thus seems better than other manner of spoken prayer to express the spirit of prayer in the congregation of Christ's flock, we may believe that the reunited church will offer its worship to God in the liturgies of the ages."

The London *Church Review* says: "Many of the young Oxford men who became Roman Catholics and priests have returned to the church of their fathers, embittered more or less against the Roman enchantress that had lured them only to deceive them. Among these may be mentioned Lord Robert Montague, brother of the Duke of Manchester, who since his return to Protestantism, has written most scathing denunciations of the Church of Rome as a religious and political power. His latest and most important work, 'The Sower and the Virgin,' is a refutation of the doctrines of Mariolatry and Papal infallibility that has had a marked effect upon the higher classes in England, by deterring many from the consideration of Rome's pretensions and leading others to renounce the false teachings of that church.

"Among the clergymen who have returned to pure Catholicism within the last few years may be mentioned Canon Ffoulkes, Father Roberts (Cardinal Manning's nephew), Hutton, Galton, Law (Chaplain to the Duke of Norfolk), Whitehead, Addis, etc. Father Addis was one of the leading scholars in Oxford, and when he became a Roman Catholic was accounted a great prize for Rome. As a priest he labored for ten years at Sydenham, and in conjunction with Thomas Arnold, brother of Matthew Arnold, compiled the "Catholic Dictionary," a standard authority on orthodox Romanism, and the only work of the kind in the English language. It is a significant sign of the times that the editor of such an important publication should abandon the Church of Rome a few years after it was issued.

"Father Addis withdrew only last September; Father Whitehead, who had been a member of the Dominican Order, renounced the Roman Church in November, and every week some priest is following their example. Some of the former priests have returned to the ministry of the Anglican branch of the Church Catholic. Father Addis is now ministering in Melbourne, Australia, and others have entered upon secular pursuits. This is also the case with more than twenty priests who in our day have withdrawn from the Roman Catholic Church in Scotland. Thomas Arnold, it is said, has also abandoned the Church of Rome."

The Rev. Dr. R. Heber Newton makes a statement in the following letter to the *Churchman:*

"Your irenicon in this week's *Churchman* seems to me to require and deserve a frank and cordial response; and although you have had the courteous discretion to make no personal references, I trust you will find space to admit a brief personal answer.

"You have very fairly stated the broad ground on which, for years past, I have felt free to have special services in my church, at which Christian divines not in the orders of our church have been invited to deliver addresses. Something I might indeed add to your statement, if my present purpose were argumentative. Since, however, I am responding to an irenicon, I will only add, in this connection, that no one who has spoken in my church on such an occasion has ever uttered one word that might not have been spoken by yourself on any occasion or in any presence. I may say further that, if it had occurred to me that serious disquiet would be caused by any special use which I have made of the large liberty which I hold that the church allows, and wisely allows, in matters of this kind, I would gladly have subordinated any personal preferences as to means and methods of expressing and promoting Christian unity to the calm consideration of those larger measures of reunion in which our church is now happily leading the way, and to which other churches are inclining so graciously.

"Serious misapprehensions do certainly seem to have arisen, and I regret to learn that others have been supposed to be in part responsible for arrangements which were mine alone, and of which no one but myself had any knowledge. I regret this sincerely. It involves a sort of injustice to which I have been not infrequently subjected, and to which I would not willingly subject another. No man ought to be held responsible for any word or act which he himself has not spoken, or done, or freely consented to; and perhaps the greatest wrong of an injustice of this kind is this, that the injured party may be restrained by a sense of personal dignity, or by a feeling of loyal friendship, or by a generous indisposition to seem to strike another, from vindicating himself and even from defining his own position. Thus, the wrong done to the man may result in a more important wrong to the truth.

"I should do more than it is in my mind to do if I were to enter into a discussion of your irenicon in all its parts; and yet you will pardon me, surely, for saying that, in all its parts, I do not entirely agree with you. But to its spirit, as an irenicon, let me say that I respond sincerely and heartily, and not least heartily to that part of it in which you urge that the present is a good time for earnest men to be prudent and self-denying, even in the use of what they hold to be their lawful liberty, rather than to jeopardize that large measure of Christian unity which our Bishops have formulated."

DIVISION OF TIME.

Why Our Hour is Divided Into Sixty Minutes.

Why is our hour divided into sixty minutes, each minute into sixty seconds, etc.? Simply and solely because in Babylonia there existed, by the side of the decimal system of nations, another system, the sexagesimal, which counted by sixties. Why that number should have been chosen is clear enough, and it speaks well for the practical sense of those ancient Babylonian merchants. There is no number which has so many divisors as sixty. The Babylonians divided the sun's daily journey into twenty-four parasangs or 720 stadia. Each parasang or hour was subdivided into sixty minutes. A parasang is about a German mile, and the Babylonian astronomers compared the progress made by the sun during one hour at the time of the equinox to the progress made by a good walker during the same time, both accomplishing one parasang. The whole course of the sun during the twenty-four equinoctial hours was fixed at twenty-four parasangs, or 720 stadia, or 360°. This system was handed on to the Greeks, and Hipparchus, the Greek philosopher, who lived about 150 B. C., introduced the Babylonian hour in Europe. Ptolemy, who wrote about 150 A. D., and whose name still lives in that of the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, gave still wider currency to the Babylonian way of reckoning time. It was carried along on the quiet stream of traditional knowledge through the Middle Ages, and, strange to say, it sailed down safely over the Niagara of the French revolution. For the French, when revolutionizing weights, measures, coins and dates, and subjecting all to the decimal system of reckoning, were induced by some unexplained motive to respect our clocks and watches, and allow our dials to remain sexagesimal, that is Babylonian, each hour consisting of sixty minutes. Here you see again the wonderful coherence of the world, and now what we call knowledge is the result of an unbroken tradition of a teaching descending from father to son. Not more than about 100 arms would reach from us to the builders of the palaces of Babylon, and enable us to shake hands with the founders of the oldest pyramids and to thank them for what they have done for us.—*National Builder.*

UNCLE SETH'S SPRING POEM.

Early every spring I must
Either poetize or bust.
Poetry biles in all my natur',
As hot water biles a tater;
I go off alone awhile
By myself and let her bile.

'Tain't spring bitters that I need
Or more sulphur with my feed,
Or some ol' quack's stomach filler,
Sassafras or sasparilla;
But it's just a chance to sling
Poetry out a-ting-a-ling.

All the hills and mountains high
Are a flirtin' with the sky,
An' it pelts the hills 'ith showers,
An' they giggle back 'ith flowers;
Natur' giggles an' I must
Either poetize or bust.

'Neath the lather of the snow
Natur' shows her face aglow,
Waiting for the grass permiscus
To come sproutin' up like whiskers.
Poetry's bilin'; for awhile
I'll go off and let her bile.

Now all nature's in a rush,
'Tain't no sin for me to gush;
Natur' wiggles on in meter,
An' I catch the general teeter,
An' a child of natur' must
Either poetize or bust.

—*New York Blade.*

CURRENT NEWSPAPER WIT.

Never kick an electric light wire when it is down.

"Talk isn't so cheap after all," remarked the orator when he came to settle the stenographer's bill.

Teacher—"Freddy, how is the earth divided?" Freddy—"Between them that's got it and them that wants it."

Clara—"And that's your new hat? Well, it's simply stunning." Laura—"That's exactly what papa said when he saw the bill."

"I can't change my mind," said Chappie. "I might have known that," retorted his exasperated partner. "There is no lower denomination in minds than yours."

Mrs. Oldfidget is much worried about her daughter. The other night she kissed her, and the young lady murmured in her sleep: "Oh, Charlie, you've shaved off your mustache!"

Drummer—"Have you a fire-escape in this hotel?" Boniface—"We have ten of them." Drummer—"Thought so. The fire all escaped from my room last night and I almost froze."

"But, doctor, you said, you know, that I must avoid all excitement." "Certainly, it hurts you. I have always told you so." "Why, then, did you send me your bill yesterday?"

Old gentleman (at head of stairs)—"Sally, ain't it time to go to bed?" Sally—"Yes, father, dear, don't put it off another minute. Your health, you know, is not robust."—*Life.*

"That was a fine coat you made Buster, Mr. Snip. What did he pay for that?" "Nothing," returned Snip, sadly. "So?" said Binks. "I'll take two at the same price."—*Harper's Bazar.*

She—"If I were not a girl I should like to be a Lieutenant of Hussars." "It is quite unnecessary for you to be as much as that my dear young lady, for you are irresistible even as you are."

"My father gave me fits this morning," said Jimpsey. "I wish mine would give me some," said Georgie, who wears trousers made from the paternal sleeves. "All I get is misfits."—*Harper's Bazar.*

Sam Johnsing—"I'se all right now. I'se gwinter to git up." Mrs. Johnsing—"Fool, niggah. Jess you stay in bed until you has tuck de rest ob de medicine in dat bottle what I paid a dollar for."

Irate customer—"You said this cloth was a fast color, yet it faded out in two weeks after it was made up. Dealer—"Well, I don't think you ought to expect it to fade any faster than that."—*Chicago Inter-Ocean.*

Tommy—"My sister thinks purty well of you." Mr. Bingum (sweet on Tommy's sister)—"Indeed! Now, what does she say about me, Tommy?" Tommy—"Well, I heard her tell ma yesterday that you knocked the spots off nothing."

Fay—"I feel like a new man to-day." Bright—"Do you? Glad to hear it. Perhaps you can see your way clear to pay that little bill." Gay—"I'm a new man, I told you. You can't expect me to assume the liabilities of the old concern."

Prof. Bohn—"Do you know I like to study young women?" Miss Sharpe—"And have you studied me out?" Professor—"Not quite; but I shall find you out very soon." Miss Sharpe—"Yes, I think you will the next time you call."—*Harper's Bazar.*

One of the best double puns we have ever heard was perpetrated by a minister who had just united in marriage a couple, whose Christian names were respectively Benjamin and Ann. "How did they appear during the ceremony?" he was asked. "They appeared both Anni-mated and Bennie-fited," was the clever reply.

Zoological Discussion.

Watts—"Since Biggars made that little wheat deal he is beginning to think himself a financier. I should not be surprised to see him try to ape Jay Gould."

Potts—"Well, if he confines himself to aping Gould and does not undertake to monkey with him he may be all right."

HARVARD COMMONS.

Facts About Early Student Life at Cambridge.

Gastronomic Reminiscences of the Last Century—Quaint Leaves from an Old Harvard History—Each with a Bowl and Spoon.

In the current number of the *Nation* Justin Winsor has a very readable letter on the English universities. His description of the eating halls is particularly attractive. Speaking of the after-dinner symposia of the "Dons," he says:

"The propulsion of sherry, claret and port—these seem to be the orthodox wines of the after feast—gives a man something to do in the gaps of conversation. With the fireplace forming the link which connects the end of the horseshoe curve of sitters, there is a difficulty in the course of the viney propulsion. At some colleges I found they got over it by reversing the direction; but at New College and Queen's in Oxford, they had devices of their own. At the one a little track ran along the hearth and sustained a little carriage, in which the restless and viney vessel sped across the hot side of the circle; and at Queen's the track was placed upon the mantelpiece."

As I read this over I thought of Edward Everett's account of a similar scene. "Few things," said he, "that fell within my observation at the English universities charmed me as much as the liberal but simple cheer on great occasions, the munificent academic hospitality, and at all times the excellent company at the fellows' table in the hall of Trinity College, Cambridge. The lofty rafted roof; the central brazier, with its generous charcoal fire; the original full lengths of Lord Chief Justice Coke, of Bacon and of Dryden, and other illustrious graduates of the college looking down from the walls; the reflection that this had been the social gathering place of the institution for ages; the academic grace—the ancient Latin grace—all united to produce a very pleasing effect on my mind on many occasions that I had the pleasure of being a guest at the master's lodge."

MEMORIAL HALL TO-DAY.

These pleasing pictures naturally turned my mind to our own Memorial Hall with its collection of curious and unexampled portraits and array of busts. The students that gather within it three times a day do not realize that they are features in an institution very interesting to outsiders. They only know that on vesper's night the gallery is invariably filled with blooming girls and their escorts, who come with great expectations to see the "animals feed," as one pert miss expressed it. The students, not to be outdone, are quite ready to welcome these visitors and return gaze for gaze in a privileged kind of way that frequently abashes the fair intruders. But few of them all realize that Memorial Hall has not been built a great many years, and that it is the successor to an institution, venerable and revered, that lasted 210 years before it came to an end. I refer to the college commons, which, after existing from the founding of the college, was abolished by order of the faculty in 1849.

I was interested to learn somewhat of this relic of other days, and, cribbing from the "Harvard Book," have come upon some very curious particulars.

Complaints as to the fare provided for the students have furnished a running accompaniment to the life of the college. Just as a dissenting Judge is a sign of a vigorous court, so the complaints of the food on the part of the students, beginning with the founding of the college and lasting unceasingly down to the present writing, have furnished unmistakable evidence of the vigor of the university, and to-day we hail it as a sign of undiminished prosperity that those complaints are still rife. They are of the very essence of reason, too, in that they have invariably consisted in demands for luxuries at prices that would scarcely furnish necessaries. I am, however, unable to find that the complaints have ever accused the protective tariff as being the cause of their grievances.

The trouble began as early as 1637, when Nathaniel Eaton was appointed Principal (Harvard being then only a school).

"Being also questioned about the ill and scant diet of his boarders (for though their friends gave large allowance, yet their diet was ordinarily nothing but porridge and pudding, and that very homely) put it off to his wife." [Winthrop, History of New England.]

SHE MAKES A CONFESSION.

Whereupon they questioned his wife, who made a confession, of which the following is an extract: "And that they sent down for more when they had not enough, and the maid should answer, if they had not, they should not. I must confess that I have denied them cheese when they have sent for it, and it has been in the house; for which I shall humbly beg pardon of them and own the shame, and confess my sin. And for such provoking words, which my servants have uttered, I cannot own them, but am sorry any such should be given in my house. And for bad fish, that they had it brought to table, I am sorry there was that cause of offense given them. I acknowledge my sin in it. And for their mackerel, brought to them with their guts in them, and goats' dung in their hasty pudding, it's utterly unknown to me; but I am much ashamed it should be in the family, and not prevented by myself and servants, and I humbly acknowledge my negligence in it," etc. [Savage—Notes to Winthrop's History of New England.]

It will be seen from this that either the students were of a very imaginative cast of mind, or else that they did, indeed, have great cause of complaint. It is pleasing to learn that Mr. Eaton and his lady were dismissed from their duties.

The next step was to establish regular college commons, and, to set the thing in motion, all the dignitaries took their meals there at the first commencement, in 1642, for the encouragement of the students, it was said. It would seem that in those days the commons were of such a nature as to require the inspiring example of the officials to prevent the students from their being utterly disheartened and cast down. The commencement dinner of the present day can hardly be said to serve a similar purpose, though, possibly, Daniel Webster had it in mind, when he roused thunders of applause at a commencement dinner by observing, "This is a glorious occasion."

In the seventeenth century there was very little money in New England, so that payments of college dues were made in kind, so to speak. People were encouraged to turn in edibles to the college steward, to the end that they might be turned to account in the commons. The following are some of the things the steward acknowledged having received: "Meatte, calfe, sheepe, beaffe, malt, lambs, 30 pounds of butter, '6 lb. of butter towards his commencement chardge,' 4 quarters of a weather, 3 quarters of a lamb, three pecks of pease, porke, pullettes, 'one old cow, 4 quarters, his hide, his suett and inwards,' a fat cow, turkey hens, two hoges, geott mutten, two wether goots, foulles, checkenes, rasines, a bush of parsnapes, a firkinge of butter."

STUDENTS' FOOD DONATED.

In this way, if the college happened to be paid in provisions of good quality and to a considerable extent, the boys in commons lived high. But if the provisions were of poor quality, or were not provisions at all, but perversely insisted on being chairs, or tomahawks, the natural inference is that starvation must have been imminent. The students of those days must have blessed President Dunster (1650), who succeeded in levying a sort of tax in kind on all New England whereby a great variety of different kinds of food was bestowed upon the college. Connecticut was particularly forward. We must attribute this peculiar generosity to the fact that Yale had not then been conceived of. President Dunster, too, overhauled the whole system and drew up a set of rules, some of which are very interesting as showing the state of affairs in 1650. I quote one or two: "No scholar shall, under any pretence of recreation, or other cause whatever (unless allowed by the President or his tutor) be absent from his studies or appointed exercises, above an hour at morning bever, half an hour at afternoon dinner, and so long at supper."

As the meaning of the word bever was "refreshment between meals," we must believe that the young Puritans of those days, in spite of their big ruffs, sober garments and long faces, were carnal minded enough to be fond of eating to a somewhat anomalous extent. Another rule forbade any student to eat out of the commons. This rule was the source of dire troubles, which did not cease till the prohibition was removed. Still another rule ran as follows: "Neither may any scholar rise from his place or go out of the hall at mealtimes before thanksgiving be ended, unless liberty be given by the President, if present, or the senior fellow, or such as for that time possess that place."

"PRECISE" PILGRIMS.

It is an amusing picture that rises to one's mind of all those small "Pilgrims" sitting in their places so prim and precise, with their long black stockings and bagging trousers, their white ruffs and solemn visages, vainly trying altogether to repress the human fun that would gleam in their eyes, and prompt them to throw the potatoes, while some dignitary with a nasal tone muttered an interminable grace. Compare that scene with the present college eating-hall, where, amid the din of scores of waiters, hundreds of students, the rattling of plates, the buzz of voices and the crash of breakage at intervals, one could not even think a grace.

Between 1655 and 1660 complaints of the commons were frequent, and President Chauncey applied to the General Court to have it remedied, but to no purpose. A large part of our information in regard to the commons is derived from the account books of six college stewards, found in the possession of a family of the name of Boardman, descendants of persons of the same name, who filled the position of college stewards from 1682 to 1750. The steward was, of course, the chief functionary. Then came the butler, which was not altogether a misnomer, for considerable beer was drunk in those days, and our little Puritan students were good men at the tankard. Food furnished in the common's hall was called commons. This was dinner only. For a long time breakfast and supper were distributed to students out of the buttery window. Food furnished in this way was called seizings. The waiting was done by students. From 1650 to 1734 were many complaints. The food, no doubt, was often badly served and poorly cooked, but, on the whole, it seems to have been fairly palatable and digestible.

SWORE A LITTLE.

Judge Sewall tells of one student who "spoke blasphemous words about the fare," and, in consequence, was obliged to sit uncovered at meals in the presence of President and fellows. It would seem, therefore, it was the custom for the students, etc., to eat with their hats on.

Imagine President Eliot and all his two thousand charges sitting in the same hall consuming soup with their hats on. The hard fare of the "students in commons" in 1681 touched the heart of one Samuel Ward, who gave the college an island in the harbor, the rents of which were to be devoted to the welfare of the "students in commons."

In 1724 the Board of Overseers ordered all students to board in commons, as they had began to evade the old regulations. The new rule, however, was not well kept, and in 1731 an investigating committee of the board made a very harsh report as to the condition of the college at large. They recommended, among other things, laws to prevent students and graduates "from using punch flip and like intoxicating drinks;" to compel the fellows and graduates who had chambers in the college to board in commons, to require that the commons be of better character and more varied, that clean tablecloths of convenient length and breadth should be furnished twice a week, and that plates be allowed.

It naturally occurs to one to wonder what the students had been in the habit of eating from—if they were not allowed plates. It is evident from the persistent attempts to make every one take their meals in commons that there was a growing tendency to luxury among the rising generation of students, which greatly alarmed the venerable overseers of a generation past, who then, as now, were apt to be several decades in the wake of the college.

Pecuniary fines had now been instituted in the college, and misbehavior in the hall was punished in this way. When we learn that the steward was allowed to sell his bread and beer, etc., to the students at an advance of fifty per cent., and that the beer was made at the college brewery, and was therefore very thin, we do not wonder that from 1737 to 1769 the commons were a source of great disorder.

THE QUANTITY REGULATED.

The quantity in the commons was regulated by the Board of Overseers, who voted in 1750 "that the quantity of commons be as hath been usual, i. e., two sizes of bread in the morning, one pound of meat at dinner, with sufficient sauce, and a half pint of beer, and at night that a part pie be of the same quantity as usual, and also half a pint of beer, and that the supper messes be but of four parts, though the dinner messes be of six." And as the students were again drifting away from the hall, the overseers promised them pudding three times a week to induce them to come back. This not being effectual, a stringent rule was passed, which led to open rebellion.

The students had for grievances the persistent refusal of the authorities to listen to excuses from prayers, and the badness of the commons. The Board of Overseers met on the 7th of October, 1766, and condemned the action of the students, but at the same time resolved: "That there has been great neglect in the steward in the quality of the butter provided by him for many years past, and" etc. The rebellion was quelled with great difficulty. It is not stated whether the quality of the butter was improved or not.

Speaking of the commons of the last century, Dr. E. A. Holyoke, 1746, says: "Breakfast was two sizings of bread and a cue of beer." Evening commons were a pye. Judge Paine Wingate, 1759, says: "As to commons, there were in the morning none while I was in college. At dinner we had, of rather ordinary quality, a sufficiency of meat of some kind, either baked or boiled; and at supper we had either a pint of milk and half a biscuit, or a meat pye, or some other kind. Such were the commons in the hall in my day."

EACH WITH A BOWL AND SPOON.

As we have seen, breakfast and supper were obtained by application at the buttery window. When the hours came and the bell rang, the students would issue forth from their rooms like bees from a hive, each with his bowl and spoon. Then would ensue a great rush and riot and the buttery windows would be besieged in form. There was a great pushing and sprawling, and generally the system was well calculated to awaken the latent hoggishness of the human disposition. Sometimes men would be clad in their dress suits preparatory to some festivity. They would frequently get spattered and would hurry away to their rooms, using very strong language. If the yard were slippery men would fall, and others coming up quickly behind would trip over the fallen man and often an indiscriminate mass of men, bowls, spoons and spilled food would result. They would pick themselves up and laughingly return to the buttery for a fresh supply. This system lasted late into the last century.

The following is the blank of one of the butler's bills for board in commons during the revolution (which, by the way, there was great difficulty in providing for the students):

Mr. —— to ——, College Butler, Dr.
Credit is not given by law for more than forty shillings.
To his bill for —— quarter ending ——
For wines and other permitted liquors——
For other permitted articles——

Thus we have seen how the college commons developed down to the time of the revolution. With that event came a break in the college life, and the first period of the commons came to an end.—*G. P. W. in Boston Traveller.*

THE PIGEON MESSENGER SYSTEM.

Men To-Day Are Sending Out Homers as Did the Captain of the Ark.

From Noah's time to the present day pigeons have been used as messengers, both in peace and war. The Greeks were familiar with their use, and employed them as messengers, teaching their utility to the Romans, who used them to great advantage during the siege of Modena. During the siege of Paris in 1870, communication between the authorities at Tours and the beleaguered city was maintained by means of the homing pigeon. More than one million private messages and one hundred and fifty thousand official dispatches were carried over the heads of the German army, conveying the only intelligence received of the sufferings of those within the invested city to the outside world. The messages were photographed on a thin film of collodion, a single film containing twenty-five messages, and one bird could carry a dozen films. They were inserted in a section of a quill, which was bound to the tail feathers by passing a silken cord through holes pierced in the ends by a redhot steel point.

The importance attached to the use of this bird by the French authorities to-day can be seen from the fact that foreigners are not allowed to release them on French territory, or even enter with them for that purpose without a passport, setting forth the conveyor's name, birthplace, present residence, number of pigeons, number of panniers, number of seals, impression of seals, and name and place of toss. The strict letter of this document must be complied with or the person having the birds in charge will be refused admission and be compelled to return with them. Several shipments of Belgian fanciers were so treated during 1890.

The military pigeon service of Germany is the most perfect in the world. The fortresses of Metz, Cologne and Strasburg have each from four to six hundred trained birds. The annual vote of credit for such purposes is $8,000. The commandant of the place is responsible for the birds, and is assisted by a non-commissioned officer, two private soldiers, and a keeper, the latter receiving $20 per month. On the western frontier Cologne communicates direct with Berlin, 300 miles distant, and is a transmitting station for Metz and Mayence. Strasburg and Metz communicate with the capital through Wurzburg.

France expends $20,000 on her military pigeon system. There are no less than ten stations in Paris, the Capital being communicated with from points at great distances by way of Landes, which communicates also with Marseilles and Perpignan. Lofts are stationed about Grenoble, the Alps, the Pyrenees and the most important towns north and south of the country.

Where the birds are used in one direction about 200 are maintained, 150 for each direction after the first, so that where three courses are covered there are 500 pigeons.

The Russian Government expends 10,000 roubles in maintaining a pigeon system. Posen, Thorn, Konigsburg, Tovarnik, Stettin and Kiel—in fact, every important part of the country is in communication, either directly or indirectly, with St. Petersburg by means of homing pigeons.

Experimenting recently, a photograph of the winter palace was taken in a balloon, the plates packed in envelopes impenetrable to light, and quickly carried to the station at Volkood.

In Belgium, the birthplace of the homer, the mile has been flown in less than one minute at all distances from 54½ to 215½ miles, the last given distance occupying but 181 minutes, or the mile in 50.4 seconds. Pigeon flying is the national pastime in Belgium, as base ball in America and cricket in England.—*Chicago Herald.*

Mr. Figg—"Tommy, my son, do you know that it gives me as much pain as it does you when I punish you?"

Tommy—"Well, there's some satisfaction in that, anyhow."

THE HELPING HAND

IS EXTENDED TO YOU

—BY THE—

Columbian Syndicate of Physicians and Surgeons,

716 J STREET, SACRAMENTO, CAL.,

Who positively and permanently cure Rheumatism, Neuralgia, Sick Headache, Asthma, Epilepsy, Cancer, Ulcer, Tumors, Goitre, St. Vitus Dance, Scrofula, Bronchitis, Catarrh, Rupture, Deafness, all forms of Bladder, Kidney and Urinary troubles, Dropsy, Piles, Constipation, Dyspepsia, Tapeworm and all Diseases of the Stomach, Liver and Bowels, Stammering, Nervousness, Paralysis, Despondency, Loss of Memory, Debility, all Nervous, Blood and Skin Diseases, all Diseases peculiar to sex or age, or resulting from excess, indiscretion or habits.

Capay Valley Lands.

A CAPAY COLONY.

Busy Fruit-Growers in a Pretty Yolo Valley—Tancred and Its Adjoining Farms.

In the spring of last year Robert A. and Neal D. Barker associated themselves with William McKay, all of Oakland, with a view of searching out a suitable location in which to engage in the profitable occupation of fruit-growing. After visiting many localities, they decided on the Capay Valley, Yolo County, and the Rhodes tract at Tancred.

Negotiations were opened with the Capay Valley Land Company, owning the tract in question. With W. H. Mills, the General Agent of that company, they arranged for the purchase of about 220 acres of foothill land. This being more than they had thought of taking for their own use, they spoke to a number of friends about it, with the result that the tract was divided among the following people: B. L. Hickok, 40 acres; W. T. Barnett, 20 acres; N. T. Greathead, 20 acres; Mrs. L. Greathead, 20 acres; W. McKay, 20 acres; N. D. Barker, 20 acres; R. A. Barker, 20 acres; J. P. Brownlee, 20 acres; E. H. Haslett, 10 acres; Joseph Barker, 10 acres; A. W. Kelly' 10 acres, and Frederick Kelly, 10 acres.

So far this had been merely a private venture of the gentlemen above named, but in talking up the question of dividing the land already purchased, it was found that so many more would like to join it than the area of the purchase would admit of, that it was suggested on all hands, "Why not get some more land and divide it up in the same way?" Then followed the idea of a stock company to take hold of a larger tract and arrange for the cultivation of the whole of it, after subdividing it according to the requirements of the subscribers. A provisional board was formed, a prospectus issued, and finally, on the 5th of June, 1890, the Western Co-operative Colonization and Improvement Company was duly registered and proceeded to business, with the following officers: President, William McKay; Vice-President, M. P. Brown; Directors—H. C. Ellis, Charles Brooke and R. A. Barker; Secretary and General Manager, Neal D. Barker; Solicitor, C. E. Snook; Treasurer, First National Bank of Oakland.

The balance of the tract, 373 acres, was purchased. A contract was entered into for the purchase of a large number of fruit trees, vines, etc. This early purchase of trees was the means of saving between $3,000 and $4,000 to the company, the prices in some cases having more than doubled since then.

The ideas which the prospectus set forth have been but slightly modified and the progress of the company has been uninterrupted. Those who went into it doubtingly have become enthusiastic, and almost all the members arranged to set out all their lands in fruit trees, etc., the first year. Consequently in this, the first season, some 40,000 trees and between 20,000 and 30,000 vines will be planted.

The satisfactory working of this scheme has had the effect of attracting considerable attention to the work of the Colony Company, and a number of people are now desirous of joining in with them. An additional 200 acres have been added to the sixty acres originally purchased.

For the company is predicted a very bright future, as well as for the beautiful valley in which their operations are conducted. How this marvelous little garden has come to be so long neglected is a puzzle to every one who has visited it, but one thing is very sure, and that is that this neglect will never again be felt in the valley.

The fruits set out are mostly of the standard varieties—peaches, apricots, Bartlett pears, prunes, figs, raisin grapes, etc., while along both sides of the avenues, throughout the tract, walnuts will throw their graceful shade. A considerable number of citrus trees are also being set out; quite a sufficient number to demonstrate that these fruits can be successfully grown in the valley, about which the colonists appear to have no doubt, provided proper care is given to the young trees. Neal D. Barker, General Manager of the company, resides on the tract, and to his care is to be ascribed much of the success of the venture.

Mention should be made of the town-site, about which there is a pleasant innovation which might with profit be followed by more ambitious places. A small park of some three acres has been laid out right in the center of the town. This park it is proposed to beautify by planting in it from time to time as many of the beauties and curiosities of tree and shrub life as may be obtained by diligent search and a wise expenditure of money. It is not expected that Tancred will ever be a large and busy city, but it is thought that it can be made a very pleasant little place to dwell in.

A petition has been circulated recently and very largely signed, asking the county to accept Island avenue, on the colony tract, as a county road, and to build a bridge across Cache Creek at this point, in order to give the settlers on the east side of the creek access to Tancred Station. The Tancred colonists are quite willing to give the necessary right of way, and are very desirous of having a bridge there, as the colony lands extend along both sides of the stream. It is thought that it would be a very wise expenditure of public money to grant them this very necessary improvement, as the operations of such companies are of widespread benefit to the whole county and State. The attractions and comforts of the cities are well known, but to those who are willing to settle on the land and show that the country also affords attractions and comforts and ways of making money pleasantly, every inducement should be held forth.

The following is a list of the principal members of the Tancred Colony, with the number of acres owned by each, and a fact worthy of mention is that in each contract or deed issued by the Colony Company there is a provision that no intoxicating liquor shall ever be manufactured or sold on the land. The apparent success of the enterprise shows that the ideas and plans of the colony, as set forth in the prospectus some time ago, are not impracticable: C. T. Hull, Berkeley, 5 acres; W. P. Hammon, Oakland, 14 acres; C. S. Kasson, San Francisco, 11 acres; Jos. Barker, 10 acres; A. W. Kelly, Kincardine, Ont., 5 acres; N. T. Greathead, 5 acres; R. G. Greathead, Oakland, 10 acres; R. A. Barker, San Francisco, 10 acres; N. D. Barker, Tancred, 10 acres; Dr. K. Favor, San Francisco, 27 acres; J. P. Brownlee, Kincardine, Ont., 9 acres; W. T. Barnett, Berkeley, 5 acres; M. P. Brown, 10 acres; Chas. Brook, Sr., Oakland, 10 acres; W. C. Boutelle, Berkeley, 20 acres; Mrs. T. A. Crelin, Oakland, 5 acres; C. H. Peach, Tancred, 5 acres; H. C. Ellis, Oakland, 10 acres; J. Vanstone, Winnipeg, 10 acres; E. A. Vanstone, Tancred, 5 acres; E. Wadsworth, Sacramento, 5 acres; M. A. Thomas, Oakland, 6 acres; James Graham, San Francisco, 11 acres; A. Stark, 12 acres; J. Stark, 10 acres; Mrs. M. Vrooman, 5 acres; C. E. Snook, 10 acres; C. T. Greathead, 12 acres; Wm. McKay, 5 acres; Mrs. Wm. McKay, Oakland, 5 acres; Mrs. E. C. Wooley, Brooklyn, N. Y., 10 acres; Mrs. H. Beckley, Oakland, 5 acres; T. A. Marriett, 4 acres; J. C. Harrison, Tancred, 5 acres. The land reserved by the Colony Company, including townsite, consists of 61 acres.

fe15-tfd&w