O youth, sweet youth, how can I part with thee,
Thou who hast filled the fleeting hours with glee,
And lightened all the dark and cloudy days?
Must thou pass on so hurriedly away,
And hush so soon the merry minstrel’s lay?
Few days have passed, it seems, since thou and I
With pleasure walked beneath a cloudless sky,
And culled sweet flowers it seemed would ne’er decay,
And forming them into one lovely spray
To meet what e’er the world might have in store,
And stand upon the pinnacle of power.
But passing days have wrought so great a change!
The world seems now so cold and dark and strange!
My brightest and most sanguine hopes have fled;
My loveliest and most fragrant flowers are dead;
The wheel of fortune has now been reversed;
And in addition to these many woes
Another comes which mortal ne’er outgrows.
For Fate hath said that thou and I must part;
How can I still my quickly throbbing heart?
Thou wast so kind and fond a friend to me
That full of sorrow seems this day to be.
And as I gaze upon thy features fair,
And feel that life will now be full of care,
I clasp thee in one last, long, sweet embrace,
And turn away my sad and tear-stained face,
And bid farewell, nor cast one look behind,
For I, with sorrow’s bitter tears, am blind.

Alius.

Richmond College, March 31, 1891.
OVER THE RIVER.

[Composed for and delivered at the Mu Sigma Rho "Annual Public Debate," March 30, 1891.]

"Ho, boatman! come ferry me over the tide.
I've a sweetheart on yonder shore;
And reach her I must, if it can be, to-night,
Tho' the wind and the waters roar.

"Five years, sir, have passed since I left her there,
And the time has been, oh! so long.
There's danger, I know, for the night is dark,
And the waves and the wind are strong.

"But so is my love, for I know she awaits me; I know that her love is true.
Ah, well I remember the day when she told me, 'Yes, Jack, I will love but you.

"'And, if need be, I'll wait for you twenty years;
Aye, and longer, lad, never fear.'
And smiled as she kissed me and bade me good-bye,
With never the sign of a tear.

"Ah, sir, was there never a time when you loved?
Holds your bosom no memory dear?
Is there nothing can tempt you to brave the storm?
Will not gold buy your service? Here!"

And full at the feet of the boatman a bag Of the glittering treasure fell.
He, stooping, upgathered and handed it back, While his actions his words foretell.

"Lad, take back thy gold; all the jewels and wealth In the world would not tempt me to-night
To put from the shore. Hear the wind how it roars;
And the billows are foam-capped and white.

"But, lad, for the sake of thy pure young love,
I will row you to yonder shore."

"Oh, thank you!" 'There, lad, spare your thanks, or at least
Till I've ferried you safely o'er.

"But tell me the name of this sweetheart of yours,
For I've met with most folk over there.'
"Then, sir, you must know her; she lives near the point,
And her name, sir, is Nellie—Nell Dare.

"But, oh, you are trembling and faint, sir; and why
Do you stare in that pitying way?
What! dead—Nellie dead? 'Tis not so; man, you lie!
Nellie dead—oh, my God, it can't be!

"And think you to keep me by telling me this
From attempting to cross the tide?
I'd cross now tho' death lurked in every wave
Between this and the other side!"

An oar from a nerveless hand hurriedly snatched—
A tug at the boat's mooring chain;
It yielded, and out in the darkness he sped,
But returned, alas, never again.

And anxiously waited the boatman, and long
Strained his eyes in the deep'ning gloom;
But only a faint cry rewarded his pains—
An echo of "Nellie, I come!"

Ho! boatman! go ferry him over the tide
To his love on the other shore.
But Charon alone doth the summons heed,
And carries his spirit o'er.

And may be, perchance, in the great spirit world,
Where the souls of our loved ones dwell,
He meets and enfolds in a lasting embrace
The fair maid he had loved so well.

JAS. COLEMAN HARWOOD.
Alexander Pope, the most famous poet of his time, was born in London, May 2, 1688. His father was a wealthy Roman Catholic merchant. Soon after the birth of this son, who was destined to become so distinguished, the family having accumulated a fortune sufficient to enable them to live in ease, and finding it desirable to be separated from their hot-headed religious opponents, retired to Windsor.

From early youth Pope had a passionate love for anything poetic. He was an ardent admirer of Dryden, whose works had a great influence on his productions. He was an earnest student of the classics, and was especially fond of the poems of Horace and Ovid. His first poem was written before he reached his twelfth year, and exhibited decided talent, which was not long in securing recognition. Excluded by his father's religion from the schools of the country, Pope pursued his education very irregularly. Near his home were several prominent papists of literary tastes, who were attracted by his genius and who took pleasure in giving direction to his eager ambition. Through them he became acquainted with many prominent Catholics, and before he reached his seventeenth year he was admitted as a prodigy to the society of London's wits and men of fashion. Much of his success is due to the wise advice given him by some of his most cultivated and thoughtful friends. This he followed in choosing for his poems subjects in which there was an interest at the time, and which had not already been appropriated by the poets that preceded him.

His "Essay on Criticism," published in 1711, established his reputation and excited his ambition to still greater efforts. While it is in no sense original, yet it is a most beautiful collocation of the principles of critical judgment.

"The Rape of the Lock" soon followed, and its charming simplicity of narrative exhibits the poet's powers in their most pleasing light. Next were produced his translations of the Iliad and Odyssey of Homer. While mechanically correct, they lack that fire and imagination necessary for a perfect poem. His "Edition of Shakespeare," published in 1725, was a failure, exhibiting a lack of that knowledge necessary for the reproduction of an old author.

Pope's genius is nowhere displayed more conspicuously than in the "Dunciad," which was given to the public in 1728, and again revised and greatly improved in 1743. In this he seeks to consign to the realms of "innocuous desuetude" the many enemies that he had made by his rapid rise to fame, and a more powerful literary satire does not exist.

His "Epistles," "Essay on Man," and "Imitations of Horace" were his later works. They are half familiar, half critical, and are models of conciseness.

The last years of Pope's life were gloomy and lonesome. He had, by his spiteful nature, lost the friendship of Addison, which he so much
enjoyed in early life; and many of his other friends had been estranged in the same manner. He died on May 30, 1744.

As to his personal character, he was by no means an admirable man. Sensitive and conceited, he had no bounds to his ambition, and he willingly resorted to any means to gain the end he desired. But we find in his physical deformity and weakness some excuse for his many imperfections of spirit. Born a humpback, and always an invalid, Pope naturally allowed his nervousness to find its way into his poems. To do him justice, we must also remember that in his insincerity and intriguing he was not alone, but that such was the character of political strife at that time, and the men of letters could not fail to share in the evils of the day.

It must be admitted that Pope’s poetry is artificial, but so beautifully artificial that it is generally recognized as possessing the greatest genius. His thoughts were not original, but their perfect form of expression was so peculiar to him that it cannot but excite our sincere admiration. His great sin was correctness, and his great merit rhythmical beauty; his poetry can at least be said to have attained to his ideal of perfection.

H. T. B.

EXAMINATIONS.

Quite a lengthy article appeared in the March issue of the Messenger “reviewing” “a bombastic tirade against the present examination system of our College” in the editorial department of the previous month; and, by the way, it seems that the “reviewer’s” principle is to “fight the devil with his own fire,” or, in other words, to fight bombast with bombast, and he who can produce the most “bombastic bombast” has won the question. But it is with no desire to bandy words or to display any powers of “review” or argumentation that the “editorial man” attempts an answer to that article, but with the sole desire of promoting the interest of the students of Richmond College, and thereby advancing the welfare of the College itself. Nor is it his desire to say anything “new and original,” but solely to bring before the students in as emphatic a way as is in his power the simple, plain truth in the matter. As to what it takes to pass the examinations, we will leave each individual student to decide for himself. How many examinations, fellow-students, have you passed without “cramming” for them? Can you pass them without it? Are you willing to go into your final examinations and risk your diplomas without first “cramming” for them? It is my observation and my opinion that you would not get many diplomas. However, our “reviewer” has other and different “observations and opinions.”
Decide for yourselves, you who have tried it.

“One of the fundamental principles of our faculty,” says our “reviewer,” * * * “is that it is just as honorable to make 80 per cent. on examination as 100 per cent.” What charm—what something—is there about the No. 80 that should make it the dividing line between honor and shame? Why should a man receiving only 80 per cent. be considered as good a student as he who receives 100 per cent? And why should he who receives 79 per cent. be placed in the same category with the most worthless student, who doesn’t make over 25 per cent., or perhaps nothing at all? Imposing, terrible No. 80! Write 80 on your forehead, for in it is kept your fate. Propitiate No. 80!

“But,” says the gentleman, after quoting our sentences concerning the work of Richmond College, “can this work of training and preparation be fully secured without rigid examinations; especially can the faculty judge of the success of their efforts in these directions without these examinations?” It is our position that we must have rigid examinations, but not “these” examinations. We have not space here to elaborate any system of examinations, but shall in a few words attempt to show the proper direction of such a system. The gentleman does not seem to question the statement that intellectual training is the business of the College, and yet he must admit that our present examinations are simply a test of the student’s “knowledge” of a subject. In other words, of what he remembers of a text-book or so. In almost every case the sole faculty exercised is that of memory. Mathematics, perhaps, may be excepted, but very often even here the student depends upon memorizing the text-book. Now, what we want is something that will exercise the other faculties as well as memory. The student should be trained to think for himself, and think deeply, and not just remember what some other man thought. It will be easy enough for him to find that out afterwards, when he has need for it—when there is a possibility of his retaining it and receiving benefit from it. How many of us one year from now will remember enough of our text-book to pass the examinations we have just passed? No, the mental development and training is the great and permanent benefit we receive. The thousand and one little things that we are required to remember to-day are entirely forgotten to-morrow.

I propose two ways in which our present system of examinations may be improved. The first is a partial, the second a total, revolution. First, let the professor in charge, by the monthly marks or otherwise, decide who, in his opinion, is competent and worthy to pass to a higher class or to graduate, taking into consideration improvement and development as well as class standing, but at the same time giving to those whom he considers incompetent the privilege of standing the regular examinations. This, I think, is an improve-
ment on the old, in that it tends more to encourage constant and regular habits of study during the session, and yet it leaves open the same old opportunity to the "crammer." Second, let examinations be given, not twice a year, but frequently—say every month—and they are not to be composed of questions the answers to which are to be remembered bodily from the text-book, but such questions or problems or subjects as will draw out the student's own abilities—such as will cause him to stop and think for himself, as well as to read and study his books. Nor are the students to be jammed down in the lecture-room on hard and exceedingly uncomfortable benches, with nothing else but pen, ink, paper, and a board, but are to be allowed to prepare their paper, thesis, essay, or exercise in their own rooms and at their pleasure—of course under certain limitations. As illustrations of this (though they are not exact, yet appropriate), I would mention the exercises given in the Greek and Latin classes or the essays in the English classes. These will perhaps serve to give a more definite idea of my meaning. And, finally, when the professor comes to pass on the papers, he is not to take each one separately, but all together, taking into consideration improvement, development, and ability, as well as general knowledge of the subject. This is but a meagre outline of a system, but is as much as space permits. However, it is necessary to pull the old down before a new can be reared in its place. Without stopping to notice more of the gentleman's objections—for they are scarcely pertinent—I repeat, with a stronger conviction than ever, the last sentence in my editorial: "* * * If they (the faculty and trustees) would encourage studious habits and close application, and discourage the stuffing process, they must reform and revolutionize the present system of examinations at Richmond College."

J. M. B.

HENRY FIELDING.

Henry Fielding was born at Sharp-ham Park, near Glastonbury, Somersetshire, England, April 22, 1707. He came of an ancient and renowned family. His father, Edmund Fielding, was the great grandson of the first Earl of Denbigh, who was directly descended from the house of Hapsburg. We know but little of his early life. He was probably early deprived of a mother's tender care and elevating influence, without which the young too frequently fall into evil habits; and, from the best information we have, his life in youth and young manhood proved this to be true. His early education was entrusted to the "family chaplain," a Mr. Oliver. He seems, however, to have received but little benefit from his instructor, and at an early age was sent to Eton. While there he
applied himself diligently and gained considerable proficiency, especially in the classics. When he left Eton is uncertain, but it was probably about the end of his sixteenth year. Afterwards he went to Leyden University, where he studied the civil law for about two years. Owing to his extravagant habits and the straightened circumstances of his father, who was burdened with the expense of a large family, his means were insufficient to meet his expenses, and he was forced to return to England. This was probably in 1726, in his nineteenth year. Thus all hope of completing his preparation for his chosen profession was cut off. He therefore gave up the idea of practicing law, and soon began to write for the stage.

The first piece he brought out was a comedy, entitled *Love in Several Masques*, played perhaps in the early part of 1728 at Drury Lane, where it was favorably received. His real connection with the stage did not begin, however, until near the first of 1730, when *The Temple Beau* appeared. This also was well received at first, but afterwards fell into disfavor, and was withdrawn from the stage. Before the end of 1732 he had produced several other pieces, the most important of which was a burlesque entitled *Tom Thumb*. That Fielding had remarkable talent for writing burlesque is shown by the general favor with which *Tom Thumb* was then received, and with which it has been considered by subsequent writers, some of whom have pronounced it the best burlesque ever written.

Most of his dramatic writings, however, show that they were performed hastily, and consequently lack the elegance that, with greater care, his genius could have given them.

During the next three years previous to his marriage, in 1735, he produced several plays, none of which are worthy of special mention except *Don Quixote in England*, acted in 1734 at the Haymarket theatre.

The exact date of his marriage is uncertain, but it was most likely in the spring of 1735. He married a Miss Craddock, of Salisbury, a beautiful and refined lady, and of a highly respectable family. Fielding owned an estate at East Stour, to which they retired. There, with their combined though limited wealth and income, they could have lived through life free from want. But extravagant display, expensive entertainments and hunting parties, hounds, and horses, soon exhausted his means of support, and the novelist was compelled to exert himself for the necessities of life.

In 1736 or 1737 he went to London, and hiring a small theatre, engaged with a company that he called the "Great Mogul's Company of Comedians." The first piece he brought out was *Pasquine*, a dramatic satire on the times, consisting of two plays, viz: a comedy called *The Election*, and a tragedy called *The Life and Death of Common Sense*. This was his most successful effort up to this time, and it brought him considerable profit. But about the latter part of 1837 a legislative act, called the "Licensing Act," so
checked theatricals as to bring to an end Fielding's career as a dramatic author, and thus he was forced to look for support from some other source. He now turned his attention to law, for which he had partially prepared himself about ten years before at Leyden. In November, 1737, he became a student of the "Inner Temple," where he applied himself with remarkable assiduity for nearly two years. He was then admitted to the bar, and for more than a year he had encouragement to hope for a successful practice. But he became subject to frequent and severe attacks of gout, which so hindered him in performing the duties of his profession that he was compelled to abandon the practice of law and seek other employment. He very soon became assistant editor of a tri-weekly paper called the Champion. He also at this time turned his knowledge of law to account by preparing a digest of the "Statutes at Large," which, however, remained unpublished while he lived.

As a writer, Fielding was now at his best. His first novel, Joseph Andrews, published in 1742, while, of course, far from equal to Scott's works, yet is a work that shows remarkable ability, and worthy, perhaps, of a higher place in the ranks of the literature of fiction. Following this were his Miscellanies, which include Jonathan Wild, a shorter, but not less important novel than Joseph Andrews. As a natural consequence of his improper living in previous years his health was now broken down. Gout became a serious affliction, and it is probable that for a while his constitution was so shattered that he was rendered incapable of performing either mental or physical labor. But the height of his affliction was not reached until near the end of 1743 he was called to witness the death of his wife. She was a good and noble companion, and fully worthy of the affection that her husband ever had for her. So great was his distress at her death that some of his friends feared that he would lose his reason. His health slowly improved till in November, 1745, he was able to assume the responsibility of publishing a political paper—a weekly called the True Patriot. This was discontinued after two years, and was followed in December, 1747, by another of somewhat different character, called the Jacobite's Journal. The results of these efforts seem to have been encouraging, and no doubt aided in his subsequent election to office.

In November, 1747, he married a Miss Daniel, one who, though not of so high social rank as was his first wife, yet who proved to be a worthy and valuable helper in his few remaining years. About a year after his marriage he was appointed justice of the peace for Westminster, which office he held till compelled to resign on account of the total failure of his health in 1754.

In February, 1749, he published his novel, Tom Jones. This was, perhaps, a work of greater merit than Joseph Andrews. It had a wider circulation, and probably brought its
author greater profit. With the amount derived from his writings, combined with the small income from his office as magistrate, he contrived to support his family, though his liberality and hospitality frequently placed him in an embarrassing position.

He grew in favor as a public officer, and in May, 1749, he was unanimously chosen chairman of Quarter Sessions at Hicks’ Hall. While engaged in his magisterial duties he wrote a pamphlet entitled *An Enquiry into the Causes of the Late Increase of Robbers*, &c., with some *Proposals for Remediying this Growing Evil* — a paper directed against the prevalent evils of the day, and in which he deals especially with the evil of gin-drinking. A result was the passage of what was called a “Bill for Restricting the Sale of Spirituous Liquors,” which to a great extent brought about the desired result.

About the end of this year, 1751, Fielding brought out his last novel, *Amelia*. This was perhaps not altogether equal to his two previous novels, *Joseph Andrews* and *Tom Jones*; but its character was attractive, and it was widely circulated. Its inferiority was no doubt due to the author’s increasing physical disability and the pressure of his official duties. By constant exertion his constitution was finally completely broken down, and in the winter of 1753–4 he was afflicted at the same time with jaundice, dropsy, and asthma, and consequently he was compelled to give up his office. During the spring and summer his condition was no better, and his friends decided that there was no hope for his recovery except in a more favorable climate. Lisbon was selected as a suitable place, and forthwith preparation was made for his departure from England. In June or July he set out, accompanied by his wife and daughter and two servants, and reached Lisbon without any considerable delay. But the change was of no benefit to him, and after several weeks’ suffering he died October 8th, 1754, in his forty-eighth year. He was buried on a hillside in the beautiful “English Cemetery,” where his tomb now bears a suitable inscription. He was a man of wonderful determination, great kindness of heart, and a tender, loving husband and father, and a citizen true to the best interests of his country.

W. B. J.
Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Allow me to say that while it is with no little trepidation I come before you, yet being on the side of what we of the negative claim to be for the best interests of our State, it is with a feeling of great pleasure that I appear as the defender of our system of public schools. The question before us is a great question, and one of vital importance. For me to say that there are no objections to be raised against public schools would be folly indeed. I do not claim that they are perfect. Like all other works of fallible humanity, they have their faults, but we of the negative do claim that our system of public schools is founded on a true and just principle; that it is for the security of our property and our persons, and that public schools are the best for obtaining this security.

Let us consider some of the objections raised against public schools. It is claimed by some that they crush that individuality which it is the object of true education to develop. We deny the assertion, and shall try to defend our position. What is the object of true education? Is it to develop a monstrosity? Is it to so fashion a mind that it shall stand out entirely separate from all other minds? Is it to so train a mind that it shall be able only to think in one direction upon one subject? No; but it is rather to give the mind a symmetrical development; to strengthen it in all directions; to so train it that it shall be able to think amid all surroundings and under all circumstances. This, we claim, the public school training does far better than the private or denominational training, which the opponents of public schools uphold. The training of the private or denominational schools is of necessity narrow. It could not be otherwise. Only one sect, class, or denomination is there represented. The range of thought is narrow, and the mind does not get beyond its scope of thought. There is no clashing of different sentiments and beliefs; there is not that struggle for superiority of one class over another. In the public school we find a miniature world; all sects, classes, and denominations are there found; there are fought on a small scale the battles that will be fought in maturer life. I have heard such an expression as this from the son of a rich man: “I am not going to let that poor man’s son get ahead of me”; and I have heard the poor man’s son say: “I am going to do my best to beat that rich boy.” So the struggle for the mastery is instituted, and both parties are greatly benefited, and they are both receiv-
ing training that will be of inestimable value in practical after life. The minds from all sects, classes, and denominations come in daily contact with the minds of other sects, classes, and denominations, and the narrowness of intellectual development that would otherwise result is obviated. We do not claim that public schools do not destroy a certain kind of individuality—that individuality which is prone to regard the opinion of self as superior to others. That bigotted individuality public schools hurl into total oblivion, and we raise shouts of rejoicing as it sinks into the abyss.

Another objection raised is that schools supported at public expense destroy self-reliance. A famous opponent of public schools says: “Consider a Virginia boy beginning at five years old to learn his letters in a public school. He advances from form to form, and completes the course of the public high school, enters the University of Virginia, and at the age of twenty-one graduates at that illustrious institution with the highest scholastic distinction known to our laws—Master of Arts of the University of Virginia. He has learned many things,” continues the writer, “but he has not learned the primal civic virtue of self-reliance.” It seems to me that any such position is absurd. The Divine Maker has so fashioned the human mind that it can only by its own exertion become trained and developed. An education cannot be given to anyone; it cannot be bought; it has to be worked for. How often, fellow-students, have we heard the earnest admonitions of our professor, who says: “Gentlemen, don’t ride a pony. He may carry you all right during the session, but when he comes to examinations he’ll throw you; he’ll throw you.” In my humble judgment, self-reliance is the only road to intellectual success. To say that a student has graduated at the University of Virginia with the degree of Master of Arts is to say most emphatically that he has developed self-reliance to a most wonderful extent.

Again, it is claimed that the State has no right to educate. We hope to be able to show that not only has the State the right to educate, but that it is the duty of the State to educate. We claim this, in the first place, because the political condition of any State is dependent upon its intellectual condition. Why is this so? This is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Democracy means a government by the people. Can any one claim that an illiterate, uneducated man knows what is for the best interests of his State? Often he goes to the polls and votes exactly opposite to what would benefit him and his community. And why? Because the eloquence of some scheming politician, whose only desire was to fill his own pockets with gold, has blinded him with his figures of rhetoric and flights of oratory, and, alas! he does not know that “all is not gold that glitters.” Abolish the public schools, and you will in a very great measure stop the education of the masses, and this will result in an educated few
far superior in mental training and intellectual development. This condition of society will finally lead to that of a wealthy few, for they who are superior mentally will rise above their fellow-men in all other respects, and the wealth of this country will at last be in their hands. The breach between the wealthy and the poor, labor and capital, will widen, and—I shudder at the contemplation of such a state of society—this fair country of ours will be darkened by the sway of plutocracy and despotism. The very foundation of liberty is popular intelligence, and allow the masses to sink into the degradation of ignorance and superstition, and you endanger that spirit which is so dear to the heart of every true American—the spirit of liberty. “Educate the people” was the admonition of Penn to the colony he founded; “educate the people” was the legacy of Washington to the nation he saved; “educate the people” was the unceasing exhortation of Thomas Jefferson—and I quote Thomas Jefferson with peculiar pleasure, because, of all the eminent men who have ever lived, the one who most abhorred anything like meddling on the part of governments was Thomas Jefferson. Yet the principal work of his last days was to establish here in Virginia a good system of public education, and we now speak lovingly of him as the “Father of the University of Virginia.”

Again, we claim that it is the duty of the State to educate, because general prosperity is dependent upon general intelligence. How is this so? As is very well known and universally acknowledged, education is something that must be striven for by the person who obtains it, and we feel secure in saying that one who obtains an education, to a very considerable degree develops the spirit of industry. It must be granted that slothfulness and ignorance are companions. Wherever tribes have been found that have made no progress in intellectual development, there has been found an utter absence of anything like industry. I need only to cite the native Africans and the American Indians to substantiate this claim. Let it not be supposed that I intend to say that there are not those among the uneducated, so-called, who have not the spirit of industry. There are such, and I would be among the first to sound their praises. But I do claim that the industry of such has grown out of the influences that intellectual development has thrown around them. But, granting, for the sake of argument, that industry is not the result of mental development, is industry the only essential to general prosperity? No; that industry must be guided by wisdom. A man may be ever so willing to work, but unless he knows how to work, this desire, which is in itself commendable, will come to naught. Which are the most prosperous portions of our country to-day? Are they not those that are populated by the best educated? Are they not those where general intelligence is on a higher plane? It is very evident to any one who will go to the
trouble of investigating that the agricultural condition of the North is far superior to that of the South. And why is this so? It is because the intellectual condition of the masses is far better, the farms are managed by educated men, the soil is tilled by skilled labor, and all is managed in a systematic manner. It is industry, guided by wisdom. The same thing is the secret of their mechanical and commercial prosperity.

Do we wish to see our State dotted with manufactories? Do we wish to see the agricultural interests of our State advanced? Do we wish to see general prosperity far ahead of what it is now? Then follow the emphatic injunction of Penn, Washington, and Jefferson, and “educate the people.”

A third reason why we claim that it is the duty of the State to educate is that general morality is dependent upon general intelligence. Crime, immorality, and ignorance go hand in hand. What class of people do we find in the penitentiaries and jails? The ignorant class is largely in the majority. Let us see some of the facts. In France, in 1868, 50 per cent. of the people were illiterate. Out of this 50 per cent. of illiterates came 95 per cent. of the criminals of that country. In the six New England States, in 1870, only 7 per cent. of the inhabitants over ten years of age could not read and write, yet this 7 per cent. produced 80 per cent. of the criminals. From the statistics carefully gathered from twenty States of this country it was found that the proportion of criminals among the illiterate classes is on the average ten times as great as it is among those who have received at least the elements of a common school education. In Mexico only 7 per cent. of the population between the ages of seven and twenty-one attend school in Brazil, only 3 per cent. What is the condition of these countries? Crime and immorality of all kinds run rampant, and we are not surprised. Can any one in the face of such facts as these fail to see that the moral condition of any community is dependent upon general intelligence? Ever since the dawn of the era which brought civil governments into existence men have been disputing as to what were the correct functions of government, and various have been the ideas upheld, but all the disputants have agreed as to one thing—that it is the duty of all governments to take every precaution to obtain safety and security for the property and persons of their subjects. Now, we claim that there is no greater menace to the safety and security of the property and persons of the people of any State than is ignorance. This we have proven by showing the connection between crime and ignorance, and so we claim that the State does not transcend its authority when it does all in its power to lessen the broad-spread ignorance. If the State has not the right to educate, then it has not the right to punish. The same State that causes a man to swing for murder has the right to exert all its powers for the destroying of that which is the source of so much
bloodshed. “Yes,” some will perhaps say, “we agree with you that the condition of this country politically, financially, and morally, is dependent upon general intelligence, and we will also admit that the State has a right to educate, but we do not believe that education in the hands of the State is the best means for the accomplishment of the end in view,” and they uphold private or denominational schools on that ground. We answer this first by saying that a very large majority of the poor and ignorant classes are indifferent to education. We are not surprised to find this the case. Parents who themselves have grown up in ignorance, not knowing what an inestimable blessing and priceless boon education is, are very naturally indifferent to it and are not willing to put forth any effort to secure for their children that of which they do not appreciate the advantages. Whatever may be the cause of it, it is widely known and acknowledged that there is an amazing indifference to education. Now, the only way to meet this indifference is for the State to open the doors of its schools and provide free education for its children. We plead for an extension of the public schools. Let the good work go on increasing, and the ignorant will be awakened out of their lethargy, and the object in view will finally be accomplished. Let men know that they are being taxed to support public schools, and they are going to try to get their money’s worth out of them.

But suppose it is not true that there is widespread indifference to education, and that all will strive to their utmost to give their children an education; the distribution of wealth is as yet so unequal that a large majority of the children of this grand old Commonwealth would, were it not for the public schools, be compelled to go without an education. In no portion of our State, even in the cities and towns, would the denominational schools be able, in the least degree, to meet the demands that would be made upon them. Private schools would be entirely too costly, and the masses of the people would go uneducated. The system of public schools is the only one that at all approaches to meeting the needs of the people. Let it be perfected, let it be strengthened, let the evils in it be eradicated, and we claim that the education of the masses will be a problem solved.

Shall we abolish public schools? Then we pave the way to the state of an educated few, with thousands grovelling in the darkness of ignorance.

Shall we abolish public schools? Then we widen the breach between the wealthy and the poor, and shall finally bring this, our fair country, into plutocracy and lawless despotism.

Shall we abolish public schools? Then we endanger the spirit that has reigned in the heart of every true American since the day of that hero, statesman, and orator whose watchword was “Liberty.”

Shall we abolish public schools? Then we foster in our very midst nurseries of crime and immorality that shall send out their baneful in-
THE TIMES OF HENRY VIII.

The closing years of the fifteenth century were crowded with events that marked the beginning of a new era. After the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, learned men from the East sought refuge in Western Europe, bringing with them the great works of ancient literature; and the revival of learning was begun just at the time when the introduction of printing made universal education possible. Portuguese mariners had found their way to the far East by way of the Cape of Good Hope. An Italian navigator, aided and encouraged by the sovereigns of Spain, had crossed the Atlantic and brought to light the existence of the Western World; and a little later another mariner circumnavigated the globe. Adventurous England sent out the Cabots, who, after getting a glimpse of the mainland of North America, recorded with more historic exactness, perhaps, than syntactical accuracy: "In the year of our Lord 1497, John Cabot and his son Sebastian discovered that country which no one before his time had ventured to approach, on the 24th of June, about 5 o'clock in the morning."

The invention of gunpowder had revolutionized military tactics. With Bosworth Field feudal England passed away forever, and that mighty system of baronage which had wrested Magna Charta from King John ended with the Wars of the Roses.

One year before the first voyage of Columbus to the New World the second son of Henry VII was born; and eleven years afterwards, upon the death of his elder brother, the young Henry was recognized as heir to the throne; and in 1509, at the age of eighteen, we find him beginning a reign that in many respects was one of the most remarkable in human history.

If asked to mention the three names most prominent in the history of this period, I should without hesitation answer: Christopher Colum-
bus, Martin Luther, and Henry VIII. Soon after the magnificent discoveries of Columbus in the Western World, Martin Luther led the way for discoveries in Europe of scarcely less importance, for it was through the influence of his bold and fearless teachings that the nations of Europe began to open their eyes to the enormous impositions of Papal power, and to see that Christianity might exist independently of the Church of Rome. In the darker years of his reign, Henry VIII was instrumental in teaching England a similar lesson.

Ferdinand and Isabella, of Spain, were honorably connected with the glorious discoveries of Columbus, and their daughter, Catherine of Aragon, was associated for more than twenty years—for the most part bright, blameless years—with the man who in many ways was prominently identified with the history of the first half of the sixteenth century.

In the early years of the reign of Henry VIII we find Scotland at his feet, France and Spain each seeking an alliance with him, and England rejoicing in the rule of a powerful and popular sovereign, and rapidly advancing in civilization and material prosperity. The people were proud of their handsome, generous, gifted king. Alas! that so bright a morning, radiant with rare promise, should have been so soon clouded and succeeded by an evening so stormy and dark. "If he had died previous to the first agitation of the divorce," says Froude, "his loss would have been deplored as one of the heaviest misfortunes which had ever befallen the country, and he would have left a name which would have taken its place in history by the side of that of the Black Prince or of the conqueror of Agincourt. Nature had been prodigal to him of her rarest gifts. In person he is said to have resembled his grandfather, Edward IV, who was the handsomest man in Europe. His form and bearing were princely, and amidst the easy freedom of his address his manner remained majestic."

If he had died—but that unfortunate if remains. The story of his manifold marriages, his quarrels with the Pope, his troubles at home, and the wretched end of his eventful life is too familiar to be traced here. One task remains. We have glanced hurriedly at the condition of England, and somewhat of the world at large, during this period, and now we must endeavor to form some estimate of the character of Henry VIII. The task is a difficult one. Our education and the conditions under which we live are so entirely different from those of his day that it is almost impossible for us to arrive at a just conclusion in this direction. In the change of character and circumstances we have lost the key to the characters of our forefathers. Three and a half centuries have passed since the death of Henry VIII. The world has freely criticized his conduct, and even his motives, and its judgments have been harsh and severe. The verdict of men has been generally unfavorable, while that of the gentler sex has been intensely and uncompromisingly bitter.
They say he was selfish. What of it? Every man is more or less selfish—and ought to be. The man who seeks to advance his own best interests will thereby advance the interests of others; while he who has no regard for his own interests is not likely to have much concern for the welfare of other people. If in Henry’s desire to be divorced from Catherine he persuaded himself that the welfare of his kingdom demanded such a course, the self-deceit was of a kind with which the experience of most men has made them only too familiar. True, his life was far from blameless, and many of his acts are inexcusable; but, in general, some allowance must be made for the influence of his associates and surroundings. He was subjected to peculiar and powerful temptations, and with few outward restraints. Flattered at home and abroad; possessing enormous wealth inherited from his father; recognized as the most powerful ruler of his time, it is not strange that he should have fallen into grave excesses. His disposition, like the poet’s fern in the long ago, “grew and waved its sweet, wild way.”

But whatever may be said of his character or conduct, one thing is certain: during his reign England experienced tremendous changes—changes brought about by the severance of the nation from allegiance to the Church of Rome, by the destruction of the monasteries, and by the rapid diffusion of learning. And who will undertake to say that these changes were not beneficial? And further, these changes were not the result of that indefinable something which we call the “spirit of the times,” but back of them all was a master spirit, a strong hand, a controlling genius; and England and all the world, down to “the last syllable of recorded time,” will owe a debt of gratitude to Henry VIII—will always owe it, I say; for it is not likely that the debt will ever be paid.

W. B. L.

REPLY TO AN EDITORIAL.

In the March issue of the Messenger there appeared an editorial discussing the justice of fraternity news and notices being admitted into the Messenger.

The reasons assigned for such exclusion hitherto are utterly wrong, and the position taken for this admission untenable; and as for any reason on equitable grounds there is none.

Because fraternity news is not published in the Messenger, it says: “The reason of this is, of course, a fear of creating and nourishing too great a spirit of rivalry and contention, not only between members of different fraternities, but also between fraternity and non-fraternity men. Than this there seems to be no other reason. But does this prevent rivalry? Evidently not. Will
the opening of our columns to fraternity men increase this rivalry? We think not."

It starts with the bold language of course, alleging the reason for exclusion, and at the end of this clever strain asks whether the fact for which the assigned reason is given will prevent contention, and answers, "evidently not." Why, then, is this reason advanced which is acknowledged by its own author not to be a cause of contention—the very thing for which fraternity news was alleged in the preceding sentence to be excluded. He was not satisfied with a strong contradiction of his own boldly-worded reason, but emphasizes the contradiction by saying "It will rather tend to diminish it," showing clearly that by the time he reached his conclusion he was convinced that this was not the reason, but did not think to make his assigned reason and conclusion agree. Now, this is aimed at the non-fraternity men, and in substance says that the last-named men are prejudiced and refused to be enlightened. But this is a great mistake. Time and again matters have arisen which afforded the fraternity men ample opportunity for an explanation; nay, we have asked for it, but none ever came; and yet it is claimed that non-fraternity men refuse to be enlightened, and now fraternity men ask to do through the MESSENGER what they never could by a much better means—personal conversation and before crowds—and what from the very nature of fraternities they cannot and will never do.

I feel sure that the non-fraternity men are anxious for an explanation, and will meet, make theirs, if any is deemed necessary, and respectfully listen to yours, at any appointed time; but all who know anything about fraternities know that it is impossible, from their secret and isolated position, to place themselves on tangible grounds with any explanation.

Again referring to the argument above, in which he first gives the reason for the exclusion of fraternity news, and in his conclusion acknowledged that it was not the cause, he now resurrects it, and by some means not shown in this article makes it a valid reason again, and says the MESSENGER has caused to a considerable extent what it sought to prevent. It is a well-known fact that it is not possible to explain through the MESSENGER what cannot be done by personal contact.

Next a plea of injustice is brought up, and the object of the MESSENGER defined thus: "But this is not the only reason why fraternity news should be published in the MESSENGER. The MESSENGER is for the interests of all the students, but about one-third of them belong to one or the other of the fraternities, and yet that which would be of most interest to them is (by custom alone, it seems) prohibited them, and consequently when it has anything to say they must say it through one of the city papers. Is this just? Is injustice ever productive of good results?" That the MESSENGER is for the interests of all the students will do for an ideal theory, but for a practical working basis, such as all enter-
prises, the benefits of which any considerable number of men may share without cost, it will not do; but I am sure it is reasonable to say that it is for the greatest interest of the greatest number. Yet it is argued that one-third may come with matter, as notices of works and policies, the principles of which are below the surface—news and notices with which two-thirds have no sympathy or interest, and concerning which they can get no information, thereby crowding out literary articles and news of general interest.

The natural inference from what was said is that fraternity men have been refused space; but this has been refused no man because he happened to be a fraternity man. If there was room in the Mesenger, and his piece was worthy of publication, and of a literary character, it is published regardless of factions; and further, so far as we know, there has never been any trouble between the two factions concerning the Mesenger.

Now, if men write on subjects opposed to the character of a paper, can they expect that paper to change its nature to suit their subjects? The Mesenger is not a fraternity organ. Let fraternity news be published in fraternity organs, because it is intelligible to fraternity men only.

We are quite sure that the editorial is mistaken in its belief that injustice has been done to the party referred to, but it would be an injustice to the majority of the students and an injury to the paper if the request be granted.

Aquitos.

IS A SWEETHEART AN ADVANTAGE TO A COLLEGE STUDENT?—REPLY TO "F.O."

In the discussion of this question in the March issue, "F. C." says: "The question requires a far more practical, common-sense treatment than was given to it by the author of the article on the subject in the last Mesenger." If the author referred to had a pen which could produce no more "common sense" than that which emanated from the quill of "F. C." in his "Reply to Old Virginia," he would retire from the scene of action and never again think of "that one" who is more precious than rubies, and the computation of whose value would consume not only the days of sense and time, but would reach far into the cycles of eternity.

It does, without a shadow of a doubt, require "common sense" to retain possession of "the sweetest present" that has ever been given to man. We now see that it is the lack of this all-important quality which accounts for a certain writer being unable to retain a sweetheart either at home or at college. Some of the brightest minds of England and America have been those who, while pursuing the course at their Alma Mater, have wooed and won her "who
has a smile for every joy and a tear for every sorrow."

The gentleman, speaking of the student, continues: "If he decides to ally himself with that unfortunate, sentimental, dreamy class of individuals known to some as lovers, to others as fools, he must first decide where his heart is to be." This is, indeed, quite complimentary to the founder of the University of Virginia, to a well-known literary character who was a warm friend of the greatest president that Washington and Lee University ever had, and to at least three of the most thorough professors of Richmond College—for they were among the lovers while pursuing their collegiate course.

It is said that the American Indians hold that our first parents were red, and that the Hottentots believe that mother Eve—the synonyme of fairness—was ten shades darker than the ace of spades. Deluded mortals! A "wayfaring man" may think that others will join with him to form a company "of fools," but, like Tantalus in the presence of the receding water and the elusive bough of fruit, he will ever be doomed to disappointment. He will be a commander-in-chief with nothing in command. Oh, how helpful some "gentle hand" would be to him then; but "there will be lack of woman's comfort, there will be dearth of woman's tears."

Our "common-sense" author then asks, "Are college men generally so lightly laden by studies that they must encumber themselves with a sweetheart for ballast?" We know that some "ships," should they take on such an intellectual and valuable cargo, would sink before they had turned their first knot. It depends entirely upon the boat.

He then says that a girl friend may be a blessing to the student, but the average college man becomes overloaded just as soon as he takes up a sweetheart. We are told by a gentleman who has had full experience along this line that when he has one "girl friend," he usually has about sixteen others. Now, in the name of "common sense," which is more likely to overload a student, one or seventeen? We fear that a so considered sweetheart has said to "F. C." that she would continue to be a friend to him. If this is so, we can well see how a sweetheart, in his experience, has come to be such a burden.

Once for four-and-twenty hours we had a similar "friend," and we felt as if the very hills and mountains would grind us to powder. On the following afternoon, however, as the old College bell was pealing forth for the last time, we stole away from the "haunts of men," and soon found ourself amid a scene of budding trees and splashing fountains. There we sat down. In a short while a gentle maiden greeted us, and, like Jacob when he met the fair Rachel, we lifted up our voice and wept. The hours passed on, and we began to forget the "friend" of the day before. As the sun was sinking to sleep and the katydids were beginning their twilight chant, she who sat by our side said that she would be "our own." Then it was that our burden rolled
away, and ever since that time our barque has glided peacefully over the once-troubled waters.

In our first article we remarked that it is as natural for the heart of man to be drawn to the heart of woman as it is for the bee to gather honey from the opening flower. In reply to this "F. C." says: "This may be true; but the writer fails to carry the analogy far enough. He seems to forget that the bees have a season for making honey. After this season, by instinct, the bees take a rest. His reason should dictate to him to follow the example of the bees, and give the girls a rest."

Bees have indeed a season for making honey, and that season continues just so long as there is a single bud or bloom. Does not the gentleman know that the bees in Florida and other tropical lands never cease from their good work? They cease from their labors in this latitude only because they are compelled to do so. "Instinct," is it? That is some more "common sense." As to the next "allegation," we would gently whisper to the "overloaded" writer that the American girl always lets it be known when she desires "to take a rest." One does not have to blow his little whistle and ask if she wants to stop. When she gets ready, she shuts down the brakes so suddenly that you will think that old mother earth herself is about to cease to exist. It seems from the gentleman's lamentations that some "little patriot" has given him "a rest." No doubt he wishes that they would be a little less "patriotic," and not have quite so much "instinct."

He then says something about the student spending his affections and money upon "the girls." The student understands what he is doing. He knows that the more he spends of his affections, the more he will have to spend. On the other hand, he knows that what he invests in such "valuable property" to-day will increase more than a hundred-fold in those days when others shall bid, but will be unable to buy. One talent shall gain two talents, and five shall gain ten.

The "common sense" gentleman closes by trying to give us the following advice: "Poor fellow, save up and do not go to the expense of hiring a diamond yet. Save up, and finally when you are ready to keep one, you may be able to secure a jewel for good, and for yourself alone. He who loves last loves best."

Does a man have to hire that which he already has in his possession? We even now have a "jewel of the jewels" "saved up" for us, and "that gem" is to be ours and ours alone. He who loves last may love best, but that is in no sense of the word saying that he will be loved in return. Put off your love until the last, and you will be another Senator Jones of Florida, vainly walking the streets of a Detroit and "wasting your sweetness upon the desert air" in trying to obtain merely an interview with the one you admire. You may scale the mountain tops and descend into the depths of the sea in her behalf, but she will pay no more attention to you than if you were a "common sense" shoe.

OLD VIRGINIA.
With the present issue a body of brand-new editors take control of the columns of the MESSENGER. The period of our control is not to be very long, but so long as we shall conduct this magazine we bespeak the indulgence of our readers. It is not without trials that a college editor conducts his paper. But with a recital of these the public is neither entertained nor concerned.

In our opinion a college magazine is not the place for a discussion of the topics of the day, further than those topics relate to educational matters. Whether the free coinage of silver is a good thing, or whether McKinley and his unfortunate bill will ever again receive notice from the American people, or discussions of labor problems, are all matters entirely foreign to our editorial cognizance.

The college magazine has a distinct sphere. It has a mission which no other agency can perform. This mission can be all the better accomplished by restricting the paper's limits to territory which has not been pre-empted by other kinds of publications. It may be instructive for students to speculate on subjects of national policy or economic concern, but it is equally instructive to write on subjects more in line with the purposes of the paper. The instruction of the writer, while an important object, is, nevertheless, subordinate to the purpose of instructing the reader. It is nothing less than absurd for student publications to compete with periodicals whose writers have a practical experience with the very matters they are treating.

The field that is the especial domain of the college magazine is both broad and productive. This is a land of colleges. These colleges are commonly supposed to be inspired with a common object—the training and broadening of young men and women. In the course of this training many problems arise. Improvements in instruction and government are being constantly demanded and constantly made. Every college has individualities, some good, some bad, according to its patrons and its officers. The duty of a college magazine is to reflect the system of the college it represents—to discuss its problems as they arise, so that the college world may have the benefit of these discussions. Each college is a community that is striving after knowledge and truth. The papers, which are the exponents of these communities, should report to the outside world how well and in what way they are succeeding in the struggle.

Such interchange of ideas must be productive of incalculable good. The best methods are placed at the
disposal of all. The bond of sympathy between the members of different colleges is made strong, as it should be, between those who are striving for a common end. By this kind of sympathetic intercourse through their papers all our colleges will be drawn into an educational organism, which will vastly increase their effectiveness, just as co-operation is more effective than individual effort.

By making the college magazine thoroughly representative of the college, the interest the alumni have in their Alma Mater will be increased. It is rare for a college paper to have an extensive circulation among old students. This is perfectly natural, so long as the papers devote their columns to subjects which are more ably treated in other publications. On the other hand, let the magazine undertake to represent its college. It then supplies a want which no other agency can fill. There is no better way to strengthen the hold of a college on its graduates than by keeping them constantly informed of its progress and its needs. We should like to see the Messenger carry on such an important work as this.

We pause for a word of explanation. From the foregoing remarks some may infer that we wish to see the Messenger devote its columns exclusively to the serious field of the pedagogics and the like. This is far from our meaning. If in the future it shall be one of the distinct purposes of the Messenger to carry out the policy suggested above, our wish shall have been fulfilled.

SHALL THE MESSENGER HAVE AN EDITOR-IN-CHIEF?

We are constantly hearing kind words about the Messenger. This shows that our efforts to make the magazine worthy of the college are appreciated. We regret, however, that the neglect of one provision compels our magazine to stop far short of the position which it is capable of reaching. This neglect is the more to be regretted because the deficiency which it occasions is one that may be readily supplied. We refer, of course, to the need of an editor-in-chief for the Messenger.

In the first place, reason demands, on general principles, that there should be an official head to every organization. No successful business corporation, no praiseworthy government, exists without some recognized representative, who exercises a general supervision over the whole. No one can suppose it is a reflection on the editors to need a chief any more than it is a reflection on the members of business corporations to need one. The management of a monthly is not such a lofty and dignified occupation that it requires methods entirely different from those pursued by other branches of business. Indeed, there are so many diverse ideas going to make up a college paper that the conduct of such a publication is a business which especially demands some centralized direction.

To be more specific, the Messenger, as the reader may observe, is divided into several departments. Each department is under the espe-
cial control of one or two of six editors. No editor has control over any department except his own. There is no one whose business it is to know all the contents of each issue, and to preserve that harmony and unity so essential to the well-being of a magazine; there is no one who, knowing the necessary extent of all the departments, may direct one editor to extend or compress his matter; there is no one authorized to regulate the class of matter of which the Messenger is to be composed. These are some of the defects which our present arrangement occasions. The present method of conducting the Messenger reminds one of soldiers contending without a leader. We do not deny that this kind of work is sometimes effective, but how much less effective it is than if there were some one to mass the editorial forces.

The most successful college magazines are those which are under the direction of editors-in-chief. If there are any exceptions to this rule there are probably local causes for it. The literary societies of Richmond College have no excuse for permitting the Messenger to be, in this respect, behind her contemporaries.

Furthermore, it is far more usual to find one student who is competent to direct a magazine than to find a half dozen who are competent to do it. As it now is, the Messenger has six miniature editors-in-chief. Would it not be easier to find one editor-in-chief whose duty it would be to advise and aid his assistants? How well it would be to have, in addition to the several editors, each of whom is particularly ambitious for the excellence of his own department, one editor who would be particularly ambitious for the excellence of the whole.

The most bitter protests against the proposed change are made because of the fear of bossism. "Nobody shall boss me" is the battle-cry against the movement. This is a false alarm, for, in the first place, the editor-in-chief would operate more as an aid than a boss to the other editors. In the second place, any one who is actuated by proper feelings would be willing to endure a little school-boy jealousy if thereby the Messenger should be improved.

JOLLIFICATION.

The faculty have granted the students permission to have a "jollification" at the end of this college year. The Richmond College "jollifications" are a kind of variegated theatricals by which the students celebrate the conclusion of the year's college work. It is deplorable that these entertainments nearly always meet with some opposition, and are sometimes even omitted. Nothing happens during a student's college life around which cluster so many pleasant memories as cluster around a jollification. It is the most prominent event of the year. The work of the session is over; books are cast aside; lecture-rooms are closed. The tired student, weary with the labors of a year, finds time hanging heavily
on his hands. Anything for amusement! Here comes in the beneficence of the jollification, whose highest object has been accomplished if it has afforded fun.

The argument that jollifications draw too heavily on the student's time is absurd. It would be as sensible to say that Latin or mathematics take up too much of his time, for it is well-known that the practice thus afforded requires useful study and is a great help to the dramatic powers of the student. In this way the jollification is an important auxiliary to the course of instruction in expression now given at the College. The student who learns his part successfully for the jollification gains a practice which is just as beneficial as learning an imaginary dialogue or repeating some hackneyed speech from the classics. Such practice has the additional advantage of affording amusement to others.

Another argument that is sometimes heard against jollifications is that they are immoral. The truth of this charge depends entirely on what is meant by immorality. If it is immoral to black your face, or dance a jig, or sing a song; or if it is immoral for a young man to squeeze the hand of another young man when the latter is dressed in girl's clothes—if all these things are immoral, then we admit the charge. We may easily become prudish about matters of this kind. To be prudish is bad for morality, bad for religion, bad for the College. It is gratifying to think the faculty have taken this view of the matter.

Every member of the College should give his sympathy and support to our jollification. Let those who do not contribute their physical help give their moral support and encouragement to the movement. Men always work better when encouraged by those around them.

At present all signs point to a successful jollification. The various departments have gone to work with a will. We believe there is in College a considerable amount of ability suited to this kind of performance. It is hoped that those who are going to take part in the performance will continue to practice faithfully, so that they may reflect credit on themselves and the College.

May the greatest success attend an enterprise so commendable.

A SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY.

For a long time the authorities of Richmond College have felt the need of establishing some institution in connection with the College where students may learn a practical application for the advanced training which they here and elsewhere receive. A vast majority of the students of this College are poor young men. Outside of those who study for the ministry, but few engage in professional careers. A large number of our students, after leaving college, are thrown upon their own resources, equipped with nothing but a theoretical education. This is something like pitching a man overboard who has learned to swim from a book. It therefore is not strange
that the struggle for existence is about as severe with the college graduate as it is with one who stops study at the high school. There is but one business which the college student feels himself competent to follow—that of teaching. They almost all seem to think they can teach. Hence the great number of unwilling, awkward teachers, who should serve their country better by doing nothing.

The college man has a great advantage in learning and in mental training, but unless he can use this learning and mental training they are of no practical benefit. He has stopped one step short of that superior position which his education qualifies him to attain. It is wasteful to allow a cultivated mind to remain idle when it might easily be made a power for usefulness. Such considerations as these induced the Board of Trustees of this College, at their meeting held December 16, 1891, to pass the following resolutions:

Whereas there is a manifest necessity for the establishment of a school of technology in or near the city of Richmond, and the establishment of such a school on a proper and permanent basis will require a large outlay of money in order to secure a site, buildings, teachers, and apparatus of instruction; and whereas Richmond College has for some years declared its purpose to apply scientific instruction to practical life, and is anxious to co-operate with enterprising citizens who are interested in the establishment of a school of technology; therefore,

1. Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed, to whom shall be referred this whole subject, and that they be instructed and empowered to consider carefully and in detail the desirability and feasibility of the establishment of such a school in connection with the College, and to confer freely and fully with citizens and others interested in such a school, with the view of securing the desired results.

2. That the College will offer on its grounds a suitable site for the necessary buildings of such a school, and until the plans can be arranged and the buildings erected the school will be furnished with lecture-rooms and the use of library, etc.

3. That to facilitate the early opening of such a school the College will, under proper regulations, consent to the giving by its faculty of such instruction in the school as is legitimately connected with technological instruction or industrial science.

This offer is clearly a liberal one, since the College, by placing its equipment—library, instructors, grounds, and lecture-rooms—at the disposal of the proposed school, will obviate a large part of the first cost.

To found a reasonably complete and independent school of technology would require a large amount of money. A much smaller sum will be required if employed in conjunction with the courses of scientific instruction already established at the College.

Richmond College offers to supply a school of technology with the use of its commodious buildings, apparatus, library, etc., until the school becomes firmly established. This will save the school, according to an estimate from Dr. J. L. M. Curry in
the Richmond Times, about $100,000. Dr. Curry also estimates that the instruction the College offers in English, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and modern languages will further save the school an amount equal to the income from $200,000. Furthermore, the College offers a beautiful site for the technological buildings in the most valuable and attractive quarter of the city.

Generous as they are, some objection has been made to the proposals of Richmond College. It has been argued that to establish a school of technology at this College would be to set up a rival to the present Mechanics' Institute of Richmond. This argument we believe to be due to a misunderstanding of the objects of the proposed school. As we understand it, the Mechanics' Institute and the proposed school would minister to almost entirely different needs. The one is a night school, where elementary courses in science and art are taught. The other is to be a regular school where advanced scientific instruction will be given. The school of technology purposes to begin where the Mechanics' Institute leaves off. The object of the former is to teach men the technical principles of their art and fit them for administrative positions. The object of the latter is to make men more skillful artificers, or perhaps teach them a trade. The Mechanics' Institute may produce a good draftsman, but it does not pretend to turn out a civil engineer. Undoubtedly the Mechanics' Institute is doing a good work, and should receive the hearty support of the community. It is, however, doing an entirely different work from that which we should like to see pursued in our proposed school of technology.

Surely, if a school of technology is ever to be established in Richmond, no more tempting offer is likely to be made than that extended by the College. A great institution, prompted by that generosity and public spirit which should characterize all who are interested in the education of our citizens, places the accumulated resources of generations at the disposal of the general good. It only remains for some enterprising and philanthropic citizen to cooperate with this College in establishing an institution which must wield a great power for practical good in the community.
Mud! Mud!! Mud!!!

Did you get a synopsis?

What next? Those who "have the interests of the Society at heart."

Critic: "Mr. White curled clean out of sight."

Mr. T., translating Latin: "Those things which are above the head in the top of the air."

Jaspers tall; Jaspers low,
With a stump stormed the door.

Mr. D., in Sen. Eng.: "Professor, doesn't the astronomer name the stars he invents?"

Mr. R., who was formerly paying particular attention to junior psychology, is now devoting his whole time to the science of dudeology.

Mr. W. has a Texas pony which he calls Xenophon.

Mr. B. in Society: "Gentlemen, I could place my heel in New York and my toe would be in London." Mirabile dictu!

What's the difference between a mouse and a maiden? One harms the cheese and the other charms the hes.—R. F. I.

Professor of Latin to Mr. W.: Explain dictu.

Mr. W.: "It is in the ablative case."

Professor: "What ablative is it?"

Mr. W.: "Ablative of lamentation."

Mr. J., since his adventure with the whale, has a perfect abhorrence for water and has approached it only once, and then under the impulse of an irresistible external force.

Two ladies walking very rapidly; two gents following.

First gent: "The sun do move." Second gent: "The daughters do, too."

Extract from Mr. W.'s Theory of Heat: "I believe that when water is at 212° it is full of heat, and if you force any more heat into it, it will blow up."

Love and the Moon.—Scene—The Garden:

"I love the moon," said Eve, and Adam "wished he were a mooney."

He won. And since, the golden moon has governed all things spooney.

Mr. G. to his room-mate: "I wish you would curtail the superfluity of the nocturnal luminary."

Mr. H.: "I saw a young lady who was just recovering from a long spell of sickness, and she certainly looked emancipated."

Mr. L.: "I know cattle and horses do come under the head of real estate."
Mr. C., translating Greek: “He stirred up with his feet a spotted, antlered, horn-bearing doe.”

Mr. L., a devotee of chemistry: “Transport me the crystallized saccharinity.” (Sugar).

An institute miss, upon hearing of Denver, Colorado, asked who he was, and was with difficulty convinced that it was a city and not a person.

Mr. R. (preparing to go visiting): “Oh, pshaw! I have sent all my collars to the brewery.”

Miss ——, of a city on the upper James: “I think Mr. B. is sweet enough to eat.”

If she could see him on “boss day at the mess” she would not only think that he was “sweet enough to eat,” but also that he was storing away something for years to come.

Mr. D.: “Who wrote Poe’s Raven?”

Doctor (to Mr. D.): “Rub your throat well with iodine.”

Mr. D.: “Must I lubricate the iodine?”

A REAL TRAGEDY.

Student A: “Say, B., this tariff business is getting to be a terrible thing, isn’t it?”

Student B: “Well, I don’t know; I never thought much about it. What’s the matter now?”

Student A: “Why, when my brother returned from France last month, they weren’t satisfied to make him pay duty on a silk handkerchief he had bought in Paris, but his hair had grown considerably while he was away, and they taxed him $2.50 on that.”

Student B (reflecting): “By George! this is a serious question.”

Student A: “Indeed it is; and they are now trying to pass a law to tax the introduction of moustaches.”

Student B: “Well, I am exempt from that, for the revenue inspector would have trouble in detecting mine.”

Student A: “Yes; but they’ll tax you $40 a year on the prospects of raising one.”

Student B (in barber shop next day): “Shave my moustache closely, please.”

Barber: “There’s no moustache to shave.”

Student B: Well, annihilate the prospects.”

THE LAW TRIUMPHS AT LAST—THE OFFENDER BROUGHT TO JUSTICE.

[Stenographically reported for the Messenger.]

On Friday night, March 20th, the Mu Sig Hall was the scene of one of the most exciting trials ever witnessed in the Hustings Court of Richmond College. It was the trial of J. R. “Jonah,” on the charge of general misdemeanor. The proceedings attracted a large number of spectators, both on account of the gravity of the offense with which the prisoner was charged and the unusual amount of legal talent arrayed on either side. The session of the court, which was to have been held at 10 P. M., was delayed on account
of the escape of the prisoner, and it was not until after midnight that the offender was captured and brought into the court-room, whereupon immediately Sheriff W. J. West announced the court in session. Judge Roger T. Gregory occupied the bench, and the following jury was empanelled: Charles H. Bauch (foreman), J. M. Burnett, W. R. Barksdale, J. L. Bradshaw, W. R. Clements, H. S. Corey, J. S. Fletcher, Maury Anderson, George T. Harris, G. E. Lewis, J. A. Mill, J. A. White.

Clerk John G. Winston then commanded the prisoner to stand up and read to him the following indictment:

State of Virginia—City of Richmond, March 10, 1891:

Be it known to the high and honorable tribunal having jurisdiction over the sacred precincts of this College, that whereas "Jonah" alias "Cock-eye" hath feloniously and with malice aforethought been guilty of general misdemeanor, to wit: First, presumptuous freshness; second, upsetting Prof. Reid's battery, thereby seriously endangering the life and limb of the assembled citizens of Richmond; third, habitually sleeping in his clothes, to the detriment of the welfare and health of those about him; fourth, engaging in pugilistic encounters with "coons" and other persons of African and Ethiopian descent, thereby seriously reflecting on the dignity and majesty of this College; fifth, refraining from all external contact with water for the space of twelve months, to the serious discomfort of himself and those with whom he is associated—of all of which offenses he hath wilfully and maliciously been guilty, against the peace and dignity of this Commonwealth.

It is therefore ordered that the said "Jonah" appear before the said court on the 20th day of March, 1891, to answer and defend himself against the aforesaid charges.

Commonwealth of Virginia.

N. Heaton, Jr., was the first witness called. He approached the clerk's desk and took the oath that he would not tell the truth, the whole truth, nor nothing like the truth, kiss ed the dictionary, and took the stand. He said that he had known the prisoner nine hundred years, during which time, to his certain knowledge, he (the prisoner) had not come in external contact with water except once, on which occasion he plunged into the ocean at the north pole, and immediately every water animal from the pole to the equator perished. Later on in his testimony it was brought out that in January last the prisoner was seen to engage in a pugilistic encounter with three coons, out of which number he killed six. Mr. Heaton was then subjected to a rigid cross-examination by the counsel for the defense. The honest face and the straightforward statements of this witness greatly impressed all present.

Law. Smith, Henry Burnett, and Joseph Childrey were in turn called to the stand, and corroborated the testimony of Mr. Heaton.
The examination of the witnesses being complete, Major H. St. John Coalter opened the argument for the prosecution. He made a careful review of the evidence, and reminded the jury of the great danger to which they would subject society by allowing the criminal to go unpunished. He was followed by his colleague, Hon. E. C. Laird, the well-known attorney of the Atlanta bar, who was employed, by the indignant sufferers from offenses of the prisoner, to aid in the prosecution. He said that he was surprised that the officers of the law had so long allowed such a personage to remain at large; that the prisoner was a nuisance to the community, and that he hoped the gentlemen of the jury would see to it that such an injustice should no longer be perpetrated on decent society. Before closing, this eminent attorney said that he had now been practicing at the bar for forty years and he had never seen a case in which the guilt of a prisoner was more manifest.

Lawyer J. G. Pollard next took the floor and opened the argument for the defense. He said that he would not attempt to controvert the arguments of his learned friends of the prosecution, nor would he deny an iota of the testimony given in against his client, but he rested the whole defense on section 4030 of the Code of Virginia, which distinctly says that "no person while insane shall be tried for any offense." He then went on to prove the insanity of his client. He produced a paper signed by the faculty of Richmond College, to the effect that the prisoner was insane and wholly irresponsible for his actions. "The first name that appears on this document," said Mr. Pollard, "is the name of Professor E. E. Reid, a man with whom the prisoner had frequent and daily association, and if there is a man under the broad canopy of heaven who is capable of judging as to the sanity of my client, that man is Professor E. E. Reid." However, he said that he was not dependent on this document to prove his point. "I would have you, gentlemen of the jury, to gaze on the countenance of the prisoner at the bar. Insanity gleams from his every feature. Gentlemen, what stronger evidence could I bring before you?"

In closing, the attorney said that he was perfectly willing to leave the case with such an impartial, intelligent jury, feeling sure that his client could receive justice at their hands.

Mr. C. M. Wallace next spoke in behalf of the prisoner. He said that the defense had introduced no witnesses in this case, because they needed no better testimony to establish the insanity of the prisoner than the evidence of witnesses for the prosecution. He showed that all their statements went but to prove that his client was not in his right mind. In referring to the gentleman who had come all the way from Atlanta to assist in the prosecution, he said: "The learned attorney has told us that he has been practicing at the bar for forty years, and after looking at the color of his nose I am not disposed to doubt his statement."
Mr. Wallace made a powerful and touching plea in behalf of his client, and several times brought tears to the eyes of the jurors.

The arguments were closed by our distinguished Commonwealth's attorney, Col. F. F. Causey. He said that the prisoner was no more insane than either of his honored friends of the defense. Both his sanity and his guilt was conclusively proved by his prolonged efforts to evade justice. He knew no greater injustice that could be perpetrated on this College community than the acquittal of this prisoner. Col. Causey brought out his arguments with great force, and his speech evidently had great weight with the jury, who immediately after the Colonel had ceased to speak, without leaving their seats, agreed upon a verdict of "guilty of refraining from all external contact with water for the space of twelve months," as charged in the fifth clause of the indictment. Judge Gregory accordingly ordered the sheriff and his deputies to conduct the prisoner to the bath-room, and according to the laws of the Commonwealth, with lye, sand, scrubbing-brush, and water, to render the prisoner no longer a nuisance to the community. The verdict was carried out in the presence of many spectators.

There is great rejoicing among the good citizens of the College at the result of this trial. It is a great triumph for law and order; for, as our readers will remember, the last session of the court preceding this one was broken up by a band of lawless men, who battered down the doors of the court-room and snatched a guilty offender from the clutches of the law. Since that time lawlessness has reigned supreme, and high-handed crime has gone unpunished, but now it is felt that such a condition of affairs is at an end.

Special mention is to be made of Deputy Sheriffs L. B. Samuels, J. L. McGarity, J. E. Etchison, Hatcher Bagby, Joseph Childrey, and Benj. W. Coleman, who rendered valuable assistance in the capture of the prisoner.

Mr. "Jonah" was seen by a MESSENGER reporter after the trial, but he didn't seem at all disposed to talk. He said, however, that he did not blame his counsel for his conviction, but was of opinion that the jury was bribed.

LATER.

March 30th.—Messrs. Wallace & Pollard, attorneys, have entered suit in the Chancery Court against J. R. Jonah for non-payment of fees.

OUR BOAT CREW.

The Richmond College Boat Crew is now an assured success, and it will only be a short time when persons visiting the James will see a four-oared gig gracefully ride the water, while across the water will come:

Pull, boys, pull, the cup is in sight;
Pull, boys, pull, we must win this fight.
The Virginias they are pressing hard, Mc-Cabes are very near,
The Harry Lees are "in it," too, but—we've won, there is no fear.

The boys are now hard at work after subscriptions for their boat,
which they hope to be able to order in a few days. Among those prominent in aiding our crew may be mentioned Mr. E. H. Bissell, Mayor J. Taylor Ellyson, and Mr. M. W. Thomas, of Washington, D. C.

The regatta will take place at Richmond on July 4th. The crews competing for the cup will be the Harry Lee crew, of Washington and Lee; the Virginias, of Richmond; the (McCabes) University School crew, and the R. C. V.'s.

More details of the men, boats, etc., will be given in the next issue of the Messenger.

VIRGINIA PUBLISHERS.

A short time since we visited the publishing house of Messrs. B. F. Johnson & Co., in this city. This company does as large a business as any other firm in the Union. It has about 35,000 agents employed, its men being in every State as well as in Canada, Mexico, and the West India islands. This firm now has in press a "Life of Hon. William E. Gladstone," by Hon. J. L. M. Curry, president of the trustees of Richmond College. This work will be in great demand, not only on account of its subject, but also from the fact that J. L. M. Curry has written it. "From Manger to Throne," by Talmage, and "The Beautiful Story" are marvels of the press of these wide-awake days of the nineteenth century.

Mr. B. F. Johnson, the head of the firm, was born in Culpeper county, Va., about thirty-five summers ago. He started life as a book-agent, tramping from house to house. He has since travelled extensively in the interest of his business both in America and in Europe. He not only knows what our people need in the literary line, but he also knows how to furnish them in a most substantial way. We are glad to see this Virginia firm now at the front among the publishing houses of the world.

MU SIGMA RHO PUBLIC DEBATE.

Sunshine after storms; brightness and beauty succeeding wintry gloom and warring winds; howling tempests and bitter cold, followed by the virgin glow of a mild spring evening; and as the glorious afternoon of March 30th faded into mellow evening and moon-lit night, many of Richmond's best men and fairest women assembled in our spacious chapel, by invitation of the Mu Sigma Rho Society.

With choice music from one of Richmond's best bands, with an eloquent prayer by Rev. Dr. Landrum, and with a neat and appropriate address of welcome by Mr. B. T. Gunter, Jr., president of the society, the programme of the Mu Sigma Rho public debate for 1890-'91 was introduced. Mr. W. Owen Carver, of Tennessee, delighted the audience with a charming and graceful declamation. Mr. James C. Harwood, of Virginia, recited an original poem, which convinced the audience that he deserves the title "Poet Laureate of the Mu Sigma Rho Society." The proposition: "Resolved, That Virginia should
abolish her system of public schools," was elaborately discussed by Messrs. D. S. Garland and J. G. Pollard, of Virginia, for the affirmative; and Messrs. R. E. Chambers, of Maryland, and Harry L. Watson, of Virginia, for the negative.

We regret that our limited space will not permit us to give an abstract of each of the speeches of these gentlemen, and yet but little idea of the excellence of these speeches and the exceedingly favorable impression they proclaimed could be conveyed by brief outlines. It is no flattery to say that all of the gentlemen who took part in the exercises of this interesting occasion were worthy representatives of the grand old society that has a record of rare lustre and distinction, and their efforts brought fresh honor to themselves, to the society, and to the College.

THE G. AND H. SOCIETY.

Reference has been made in these columns to the recent organization of a Society for Geographical and Historic Study in our College. We desire to emphasize the value and importance of the work proposed by this society. Special attention is given to the study of individual sections, cities, and counties of our own State, in their geographical and historic relations. No part of the world, perhaps, affords a richer field for such investigation than the Old Dominion. The study of Virginia's history, especially, has been too much neglected. A full and complete history of this old State would be one of the most valuable additions to standard literature that could possibly be produced, and the author of such a production would fully merit the meed of gratitude and fame that would most assuredly be his. It is hoped that the G. and H. Society will succeed in gathering a large amount of material for such a history. Professor Boatwright, who is well known as a wide-awake and earnest advocate of progress in every direction that promises to lead to interesting, worthy, and practical results, deserves the thanks of the College, of the State, and of our entire country for inaugurating this important movement.

At the last meeting of the society, in March, interesting and instructive papers were read by Mr. C. W. Duke, of Nansemond county, and Mr. L. R. Christie, of Portsmouth. Mr. Duke outlined the leading geographical features of his own county, including the Dismal Swamp, with its romantic lake, the resort of lovers and the inspiration of poets; and also gave an interesting sketch of the history of the county. Mr. Christie presented a similar sketch of Princess Anne county, which has quite an interesting history, dating back to the earliest colonial times.

It is hoped that the interest excited by the work of this society will culminate in the establishment of a chair of history and geography in Richmond College.
the free use of an accessible endowed library, free from old rubbish, and becoming daily more complete along the lines they may wish to pursue. The appreciation and use of the library keeps pace with its growth, and the number of students who frequent the hall and borrow books increases with every session. The records for the past two or three months show an average of twelve to fifteen volumes taken out daily. This does not include the large number of books borrowed for use in the Library Hall, nor 350 volumes (dictionaries, encyclopedias, commentaries, etc.) kept in revolving cases and constantly used for reference.

The character of the reading done is shown by the following list of one hundred books selected at random from last month’s record: Religious, 13; scientific, 2; texts and translations, 4; history, 11; biography, 7; fiction, 36; poetry, 7; general literature, 20.

The proportion of novels is not nearly so great as in most public libraries, although it would seem that the student is especially tempted by light literature when we remember how much very solid reading he has to do in preparing for his classes.

Many borrow books who are not regular readers of the magazines and periodicals on the tables in the hall. Twenty-five monthly and twenty weekly magazines and newspapers, comprising all the best literary, scientific, educational, and religious publications, are subscribed for regularly. Prof. Boatwright supplies a full line of French and German periodicals, and the editors of the Messenger contribute the best college magazines among its exchanges.

During the present session 1064 volumes have been added to the library, making the total number of 10,900. The largest single gift came from Mrs. H. H. Purell, of Loudoun county, who presented the law library of her brother, the late Senator Henry Heaton. This valuable collection consists of 680 well selected volumes in excellent condition, and costing originally $8,000.

The collection of portraits which adorn the walls of the Memorial Hall has been augmented by an excellent likeness of Dr. George B. Taylor, painted in Italy by the famous De Sautis, the gift of Rev. John H. Eager.

The Library Committee has purchased one of the rare first copies of the engraving from Washington’s celebrated painting, “The Burial of Latané,” and a bust of Bismarck, pronounced an excellent likeness by a gentleman who saw the great chancellor several years ago. Mrs. James Thomas has recently given a large and handsome globe, and Mr. R. B. Lee, of Richmond, has loaned several plaster copies of famous statues, which will add to the beauty of the Thomas Hall. Plans are on foot to fit up this hall in the near future with cases for the museum, which is being crowded out of the lower hall by the growing library.

Before next session opens Dr. Ryland expects to have completed a card catalogue—the most perfect
system for cataloguing libraries in existence—and to print from it an edition for distribution among the students. This will greatly facilitate the use of the library for original work as well as general reading.

LECTURE ON ELECTRICITY.

During last month, Prof. Winston, of the school of physics, delivered three very interesting and instructive lectures in the college Chapel. They were open to the public and each one was largely attended. The first, delivered on the third of March, was on the subject of "Frictional Electricity." The Professor entered first with his usual power into the discussion of the nature of frictional electricity. He gave a clear and concise history of its origin and successive stages. He dated its beginning with Thales, one of the wise men of Greece, who knew simply that amber when rubbed would attract light substances. This was about all that was known of the science until Dr. Gilbert, who was the first physician to Queen Elizabeth, discovered that many other bodies also possessed the power of attraction. He wrote a book containing an account of his researches and discoveries. This famous book was called "De Magnete." The next electrician referred to by the Professor was Otto Von Guericke, who became famous as the maker of the first electrical machine. He made several other additions to the electrical knowledge of the day. The work of Sir Isaac Newton was next mentioned—his use of the globe of glass and the experiment of the dancing dolls before the Royal Society of London. Stephen Gray's famous experiment on conduction was also represented. Gray had an idea that electricity was similar to lightning long before Franklin's kite experiment. The Leyden jar was shown to the audience, and the principle of its working explained. A cut representing Franklin's experiment with the kite was thrown upon the screen, and the danger and also the success attending the experiment were fully discussed. The Professor made mention of a philosopher who was killed about a year afterward while trying the same experiment.

An extract from a letter of Franklin was then read, as follows: "A turkey is to be killed for our dinner by the electrical shock, and roasted by the electrical jack, before a fire kindled by the electrical bottle, when the health of all the famous electricians are to be drank in electrical bumpers under the discharge of guns from the electrical battery."

A number of other philosophers were rapidly mentioned, the time each lived, and what each added to the advancement of electricity. As the Professor reached a stage of advancement sufficient to insure successful experiments he interested the audience with experiments with the electrical machine and his own electrophorus. The Holtz machine was also exhibited, but owing to the dampness of the atmosphere the brilliant experiments prepared were only partially successful.

The second lecture of the series
was delivered on the 10th. The subject was: "Battery Electricity."

The Professor contrasted the use of frictional electricity with that of galvanic and voltaic. He said: "Frictional electricity belongs properly to the 'old,' inasmuch as it reached its present state of completeness about the close of the last century, little or nothing having been done in that line since." For practical purposes it is of little value, whereas the steady stream which the battery produces can be utilized in a thousand ways. So persistently does it follow a wire that it will make the circuit of the globe rather than jump over a space of an eighth of an inch. This electricity was discovered by Luigi Galvani, a professor of anatomy. Alessandro Volta then began a series of experiments which produced the "contact theory"—i.e., that the current was caused by the contact of two metals. He constructed the "voltaic pile," and was also the inventor of the "crown of cups."

From Galvani and Volta battery electricity received its name—galvanic or voltaic. Nicholson and Carlyle discovered the decomposition of water by electricity, thus showing its constituents to be oxygen and hydrogen. Sir Humphrey Davy made the first electric light in 1810. Christian Oersted first observed the magnetic effect of electricity. He placed a wire conducting a current near a magnet, which was immediately attracted to it, thus laying the foundation of the telegraph. Marie Ampère discovered the mutual effect of currents upon each other, and invented the "theory of magnets." The electro-magnet was invented by William Sturgeon in 1845. Following close upon this came the invention of the telegraph by Baron Shelling. This great invention has revolutionized the world. Professor Joseph Henry greatly improved the magnet and first used the telegraph. He also studied the principle of induction. The invention of the "bridge," which was perhaps one of the most important accessions to the knowledge of electricity, is due to Wheatstone. By means of this instrument the location of a break in the line can be accurately determined. An American, S. B. F. Morse, gave the world the telegraph as it is today. The great beauty of his discovery was that it enabled us to express our ideas by means of a dot and a dash. The storage battery was the next important invention. By means of this battery electricity is stored up, and can be used without connection with anything else. Alexander Bell invented the telephone in 1876. The Professor said: "Thomas A. Edison stands out as the chief of electricians, and does not hesitate to undertake anything. While he can hardly be called a scientific discoverer, he surpasses all in the talent of doing what he wants to do." The Professor closed after performing many beautiful experiments.

On the evening of the 17th he delivered the last lecture of this interesting series. The subject of this lecture was "Dynamo Electricity." The Professor gave a brief history of
this kind of electricity, and the sev­eral steps by which it has reached its present state of development. Mi­chael Faraday made the first electric motor in 1821. Ten years later he developed electricity from a magnet. He also made the first dynamo and studied the principle of current ind­uction and the laws of electrolysis. In 1827 Paxii, of Paris, constructed the first magneto-electrical machine. "Clarke's machine" was first made in 1835 by the inventor, from whom it received its name. The Professor referred to Wheatstone, Siemens, and others, mentioning the fact that the name "dynamic" was applied to this kind of electricity by Dr. Warren Siemens.

From 1878 to 1883 Farmer, Brush, Weston, Thompson, and Edison, of our own country, devoted consider­able attention to dynamic electricity, and the result of their improve­ments was the dynamo as it is to­day—perfect. Edison and others found out that electricity could not only be managed, but also measured by its effects. The incandescent and arc lights were fully explained. The modern motor was invented in 1873, or before. Short railway lines were owned by Davidson in 1842, Page in 1852, and Edison in 1880; but Rich­mond may boast of having built the first electric railway of any impor­tance in 1888. The Professor said that this might well be called the "Age of Wires." He gave a list of the different currents and their strength. He explained Dr. Bur­ton's heater. A motor constructed by Mr. Bluford, of Richmond, was shown and used as a dynamo.

All these lectures were illustrated by magic-lantern views, which were interesting as well as instructive.

The popular Professor, who has long been distinguished as a lecturer, added fresh laurels to his reputation.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE STUDENT VOLUNTEER MOVEMENT.

From February 26th to March 1st, 1891, there was held at Cleveland, Ohio, a convention in many respects the most remarkable ever held for religious purposes—not for its num­bers, as there have been many larger religious gatherings; not for ornate and well-rounded speeches, as very little formal oratory was indulged in; not for learned discourses upon topics that are puzzling the best thinkers of every country to-day, for the discussion of such topics was not the object for which the convention assembled; but it was remarkable first and most of all for the very greatly manifested presence and power of the Holy Spirit. The con­vention was held in the interest of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. The opening ad­dress on the "Holy Spirit in Mis­
sions” was well fitted to begin a meeting where the Spirit’s power was to be so felt. The writer, who was present at every session of the convention, heard old gray-haired saints, presidents and secretaries of Foreign Mission Boards, and returned missionaries say that they never before felt so powerfully the presence of God’s Spirit in any convention. In a prayer-meeting held Sunday, March 1st (from 9 to 10:45 A.M.), the assembled delegates spent over an hour on their knees. Many a heart felt something of the meaning of those words, “And when they had prayed the place was shaken, where they were assembled together.”

This leads me to mention the next most prominent feature of the convention—prayer. It has never (at any time) been the privilege of the writer to see a more prayerful gathering of God’s people. All the sessions of the convention were opened with at least fifteen minutes spent in prayer. The doors were locked during that time, and positively no disturbance was allowed. Frequently during the sessions earnest, pleading prayers were offered. The speakers all came directly from the secret chamber to the platform, and it was felt by all who heard them that they had communed with Him in whose name they spoke.

Another thing that made this convention a most remarkable one was that among the delegates were nearly six hundred student volunteers, who are expecting soon to enter the work in foreign fields, and over one hundred Foreign Mission Board officials and returned missionaries who had done active service in different portions of the world.

One session of the convention, at which about twenty Foreign Mission Board officials gave their advice to younger delegates, and another at which about thirty foreign missionaries gave the listeners the benefit of their wide experience, will never be forgotten, and the influences for good that were then started will be revealed only when “in His light we shall see light.”

Another remarkable feature of the convention was the large number of topics discussed. It was the opinion of all whom the writer heard express any that never before had they attended a meeting so completely filled with good, solid work. It was amazing—wonderful—to see how the interest increased, never growing less, the last discussions being those most heartily engaged in. Some of the principal topics were: Problems of the Student Volunteer Movement; The Volunteer’s Preparation; Prayer and Missions; How Can Volunteers Help the Cause Before Going? The Perils and Privileges of the Student Volunteer Movement.

The motto of the convention was “The Evangelization of the World in this Generation,” and its carrying out was shown to be not only a possibility, but a probability.

Here are a few of the pithy sayings jotted hastily in my note-book:

“He who apologizes for foreign missions apologizes for his own conversion, for Christianity, for Christ.”
“Sow God’s seed where you will and God’s holy spirit will use it.”
“Labor on and trust; victory will come.”
“Cultivate your own piety.”
“The cry of all the missionaries: ‘Pray for us.’”
“It is not what you do, but what God does through you.”
“Learn to live in an atmosphere of prayer.”
“Not pity for the heathen, but love for Christ, should draw us to the foreign field.”
“All missionary success in all places depends upon the Holy Spirit.”
“Theology without the Holy Spirit is not bread, nor even a stone—it is poison.”
“A small minister with a large gospel is more than a large minister with a small gospel.”
“Do not neglect personal work. Christ’s teaching by the wayside was the most effective.”
“The churches have plenty of money and would be willing to give, but they are ignorant of the needs of foreign missions.”

B. B. Robinson (’90), who has been pursuing a course in law at the University of Virginia, is in the city under treatment for his throat. He leaves this month for his home in California, but expects to return next session.

We were glad to see the smiling countenance of T. R. Carr, M. A. (’85), on the campus a few days ago.

Otis Hughson (’89) is preaching in Amherst county, Va., and is studying also at the University of Virginia.

Alfred Bagby, Jr., B. A. (’85), is a candidate this session for the degree of Ph. D. at Johns Hopkins University, Md.

R. L. Motley (88) is pastor of the Baptist church at Ripley, Tenn. We were pleased to receive recently a communication from him.

L. R. Bagby (’81) is teaching school in King and Queen county, Va.

Dr. J. P. Massee, B. A. (’88), is making quite a reputation as a physician at Iron Gate, Va.

C. W. Trainham (’89), preaching in Caroline county, Va., has been in the city a few days.

Wm. F. Bagby, (’78) is a successful merchant at Stevensville, King and Queen county, Va.

H. N. Quisenberry (’89) has been called to the Baptist church at Berkeley, Va.

W. J. Creath (’89) is pursuing his studies at the seminary, Louisville.

A. R. Bowles (’88) graduated last month in the dental department of the University of Maryland with the highest honors in a class of 72. “R. C.” is ahead again.
The ex-editor of this department gave a farewell column in the last issue of the Messenger, and in his eloquent manner stated that "he now lays aside the robes of this kingly office and delivers the scepter to his successor."

Perhaps he speaks of the robes in which other editors have clothed him; and if this is the case, no doubt he is quite willing to lay aside the somewhat unpleasant garments of this kingly position for a new and spotless robe. However, we notice with pleasure the editorial sympathy which he tenders the present staff.

It would be more convenient, to say the least, if some of our college periodicals, whose contents are very awkwardly arranged, would heed the suggestions given in the Roanoke Collegian in regard to their arrangement. Readers, and especially strangers, like to know some few things about a paper before they read the whole of it. Why not place the name of the paper, college, and where situated on the back of your publication?

About four years ago one of our prominent college papers stated that Daniel Webster was the editor of the first college paper in this country. Notwithstanding the age of this story, editors keep publishing the same statement, and scarcely a paper comes to our view but what something is said about Webster and the college paper in its columns. How many times we have read this statement, we cannot say; but we are forced to say that some editors are either short of news or they are special admirers of Mr. Webster. No doubt the fact that Daniel Webster was an editor of a college paper adds greatly to the inspiration of some young aspiring editors.

Will some one be so kind as to inform us as to who was the second editor, as he should be the next in the ascension?

The Rev. Dr. Dillard, of Illinois, has been elected by the board of directors of La Grange Baptist College (Missouri) to raise an endowment for this institution. This step should have been taken ere this, but still it had better be done now than never. We extend our best wishes to this movement, and anxiously await the time when the proposed endowment will be a happy reality. Let the friends of this college, many of whom have acquired a love for her sacred halls from their mother's knees, be awake to this wise and beneficent plan which has for so long been needed.

The article in the February number of the Messenger, entitled "Is a Sweetheart an Advantage to a College Student?" seems to have created no little sensation among the different college journals. Whether
or not she is we cannot tell, for inex­perience has given us no opportunity of finding out; but we do know that this discussion has been an advantage to the Messenger, and we hope that the discussion will continue. The following are some of the articles from other magazines.

The Messenger contains an interesting article entitled “Is a Sweetheart an Advantage to a College Student?” The writer mentions Thomas Jefferson as a great favorite of the young ladies while in college, and shows that he himself has not been without experience.—The Wabash, of Wabash College.

Considerable space in some of our late exchanges has been devoted to discussions in regard to the fair sex. In the Messenger is quite an article entitled “Is a Sweetheart an Advantage to a College Student?” In a general way we might answer the question in the affirmative; provided, however, the sweetheart is further advanced in the curriculum than the college student. If such were the case we may easily see that very often this would be an advantage to the student. We copy the following from the above-mentioned article:

“The student enters into a temporary partnership with some gentle maiden, they invest in bonds of affection, and before his college days have ended said bonds are drawing such an interest that the parties involved will part with them under no consideration.”

This is an ideal case. It frequently happens that the interested parties enter into partnership blindly, they invest in the bonds of affection, and before very much time has elapsed the temporary partnership has become permanent. Soon the bonds will not be worth their face value—in other words, they will be below par, and unless there be a rise in the market there will be a panic in Wall street, and the result will be a total loss to the partners on account of worthless bonds which they retain. These they would fain get rid of, but they cannot, and their only consolation is in singing “I wish I was single again.” Perhaps it would be well for the Messenger to discuss in the next issue whether or not a college student is an advantage to a sweetheart.—The Hesperian.

Two rather unique articles come in our exchanges this month. First, in the Richmond College Messenger is, “Is a Sweetheart an Advantage to a College Student?” in which the author comes to the conclusion that it is a benefit in spite of many examples to the contrary. We notice that he does not state whether the benefit is mutual or not. The second is in the Emory and Henry Exponent, on “Shall we Stop Kissing?” The author is emphatic in his belief that we should not stop, “microbes or no microbes,” “not if the court recognizes her own photograph.” We are inclined to agree with him.—Vanderbilt Observer.

Seldom have we the good fortune to peruse a more interesting journal than the Richmond College Messenger. In a diligent search from cover to cover we succeeded in unearthing not one uninteresting para-
To mention in detail all the good things gracing the thirty-five pages of its February number would more than fill the space allotted to this department. "Gossip" is a most interestingly written treatise on that evil so predominant in high schools, and the anecdotes which season this article vividly illustrate the writer's point. A novel discourse follows, entitled "Is a Sweetheart an Advantage to a College Student?" The sentiments so attractively laid down by the writer of this essay will be echoed, we feel safe in saying, by every college student of to-day. We cannot conclude our notice of this most progressive magazine without mentioning the extremely able manner in which the editorial department is handled, for within the "inner shrine" of this journalistic temple topics of the day are discussed with a forceful grasp of subject. — The Review, of Washington High School.

After reading an article entitled "Should a Student Have a Sweetheart?" in an Eastern college paper, which argued very strongly the affirmative side of that question, Starr, Vanderbilt, Adams, and J. C. Van Nuys each determined to make immediate search for that heretofore lacking element of their college life. — Wabash.

The Messenger, of Richmond College (Va.), has announced that there will begin a discussion on the important question, "Should a College Student Have a Sweetheart?" in their next issue. We await the coming thereof with pleasure.—Focus, Kentucky University.

The Messenger, of Richmond College, contains in its March issue two papers of a distinctively literary turn. One marks out the course of the quiet, mournful life of the poet Longfellow; dwells on his sweet and loving disposition, and throws light on the practical value of his works. The other deals with Dryden; gives a chapter on the state of literature and morals in the period preceding the poet, the obstacles that beset him, the prejudices and faults which he had to remove and avoid. One must read the life of Pope to really appreciate Dryden. The thought suggests itself that it must be a rather puzzling reflection for those who claim that our literature is Protestant to remember that both the founders of our present poetic system were Roman Catholics.—Washington and Jefferson.

An interesting production was in one of our late exchanges, entitled "Shall We Quit Our Kissing?" The writer handled the subject as though he had had personal experience, and naturally enough decided the question in the negative. And why should he decide it in any other way? We are told that when the Scripture is addressed to men it also includes women; when addressed to son, it also applies to daughter. Now, if these words are used interchangeably, when the psalmist said "Kiss the son, lest he be angry," we understand it to mean that we must also "kiss the daughter, lest she be angry."
Articles on Chaucer and Spenser are contained in the current issue of the MESSENGER. Though that on the latter is rather historical than critical, we are pleased to see these old knights of the quill being brought into notice. The remoteness of the time in which they lived, and archaic form of their writings, cause them to be, perhaps, too much neglected by students of the present day. The exchange department of the MESSENGER is particularly good.—The Owl.