

The Dalhousie Gazette.

ORA ET LABORA.

VOL. XIX.

HALIFAX, N. S., MARCH 31, 1887.

No. 10.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF HENRY VIII.

J. S. SUTHERLAND.

During the present century great and increasing attention has been given to the study of English Literature, and especially of the literature of the Elizabethan age. Shakespeare particularly has come to be widely studied, and the most searching investigations have been made to discover anything that would throw light on the life and works of the greatest of dramatic poets. Considerable discussion has arisen as to the share that Shakespeare had in several plays, formerly assigned either wholly or in part to him, and one of the chief questions of this kind is about the authorship of Henry VIII. It is this question that we intend to consider in this essay.

Up to the year 1850 this question was not publicly raised. The play had been printed as entirely Shakespeare's in the Folio of 1623, and most men did not even think of questioning its authorship. The play, moreover, contained many beautiful passages which seemed to some to be among the finest Shakespeare had ever written.

Some of the best critics had, however, felt that there was something in the play which made it different from any other of Shakespeare's dramas. Dr. Johnson, who admired the character of Katherine above almost all the other female characters of Shakespeare, said that "the genius of Shakespeare comes in and goes out with Katherine." Coleridge too, seems to have noted some peculiarities in the play, and Roderick had pointed out peculiarities of versification, but no one had accounted for the differences between this play and the other plays of Shakespeare,

nor explained what these differences really were, when in 1850, Mr. Spedding in an essay contributed to "The Gentleman's Magazine" maintained that Henry VIII. was not entirely the work of Shakespeare, but that fully half the play had been written by Fletcher. He thought also that in some passages he discerned the hand of a third writer, but of this he was not quite sure. Not only did Mr. Spedding assert that there were two authors of Henry VIII., but he proceeded to divide the play between them.

Immediately after the publication of this essay, a confirmation of the theory it maintained appeared in a letter from Mr. Hickson, who stated that he had some time previously come to the same conclusion as to the authorship of the play, and had made a division of the play between Shakespeare and Fletcher which exactly corresponded to that made by Mr. Spedding.

This theory as to the authorship of the play has since been confirmed by various metrical tests and has been accepted by a majority of the best critics of the present century.

The question is one the deciding of which requires some care, especially that part which deals with the division of the play between its two authors. However, after having considered the matter for some time, I feel certain that there were two authors at work on this play, and that these two authors were Shakespeare and Fletcher. I think also that Mr. Spedding's division of the play is in the main correct, although judging the scenes by themselves, apart from metrical considerations, it is sometimes difficult to say whether a certain passage or scene is by Shakespeare or by Fletcher.

In cases of this kind, however, the character of the metre generally decides the question.

The arguments in favor of a dual authorship of the play may be divided into two kinds; first, those derived from the consideration of the play as a literary work, and second, those which are drawn from the metrical and stylistic peculiarities of the different parts.

Perhaps the great fault of the play is a peculiar looseness of structure, and the want of consistency and coherency of design. In a well-constructed drama everything conduces to one end. All the incidents of the plot lead up to the denouement. Every scene is necessary for the complete understanding of the plot. The action goes steadily forward to the end, and when the drama ends, it does so at a time when we feel that there is a natural pause in the history of the personages in whom we have been interested. The drama may end tragically as in Hamlet, or happily as in the Tempest, but in both cases we feel that the history we have seen represented to us has come to a natural termination. Nothing more is added. We are not asked to interest ourselves in other incidents and personages. The drama is complete.

But in Henry VIII. this is not so. The action of the play goes forward smoothly enough through the first four acts, but culminates in the fourth act. The history of Katherine and of Wolsey, the two personages in whom we are chiefly interested ends with Act IV., and in Act V. we are introduced to characters in whom we have hitherto had no interest, or with whom we are unacquainted. It is as if we had in Act V. the beginning of a new play. Henry is the only personage that binds Act V. to the rest of the play, and in him we do not have any very particular interest, and what interest we do have is certainly not sufficient to keep us from feeling that Act V. is an addition which by no means adds to the effectiveness of the play.

There is a great want of unity in the play. Had Henry been the central figure of the drama, the unity of interest would not have been destroyed by making the action end amid his joy and prosperity; but in such a case, Katherine would have been kept in the background and

the whole structure of the play would have been different. As it is the addition of Act V. destroys the unity of the work.

The whole play is very loosely joined together. In this respect it is in marked contrast to the acknowledged works of Shakespeare's maturity, in which every scene is fitted into its place with the skill of a master-hand, in which nothing seems superfluous or unnecessary, and where strict attention is paid to the preservation of dramatic unity. This furnishes a strong argument in favour of the view that Shakespeare was not the sole author or the designer of this play. Had he been so, he would not have left it with this radical defect, for it is inconceivable that in the full maturity of his powers he would have written a work containing defects from which even the works of his youth were free.

Again, in all Shakespeare's plays there are certain persons around whom the other characters group themselves. It is in these personages and the events that happen to them that our chief interest lies. We are interested in them and our feelings are depressed or elated according as fortune frowns or smiles upon them. We see them acting their parts in life before our eyes; we perceive their faults and foibles, the nobility or the worthlessness of their characters, and our feelings are aroused in favor of some and against others. The poet makes us sympathize with his heroes in their trials, admire their good qualities, and then by the way he ends the play gratifies the feelings he has excited. We see the characters of the play rewarded or punished according to their deserts; and, though in some of Shakespeare's tragedies we may be saddened by the fate that overtakes those who have excited our sympathies, we yet see that their misfortunes are due to some fault of their own, or that what seems a misfortune is not one in reality. Thus the poet gives impartial retribution to all his characters, and poetic justice is satisfied. Our own moral sense too, is satisfied, and acknowledges the justice of the judgment. We are gratified by seeing the triumph of the good and the downfall of the evil. In some cases, it is true, the good and the bad are alike removed from our gaze and we are left to meditate on the injustice that seems to reign in the world, but even then there is generally something in the circumstances of the case that makes us feel that the good have the advantage.

This, however, is not the case in Henry VIII. The sorrows of Katherine are brought prominently before us; the nobility of her character is clearly portrayed; her intellectual activity and penetration are made apparent; her noble patience and sweetness of disposition are strongly exhibited; every attempt is made to arouse our sympathies for her; and yet the play ends with her humiliation, disgrace, and death, the triumph of her rival, and the joy and prosperity of her faithless husband. Here our moral sense is outraged. There is no just moral purpose in the play and poetic justice is condemned. We see the downfall of good and the triumph of evil. Our sympathies are all on the side of Katherine, while we are asked to rejoice at the prosperity of Henry, which serves to increase our sense of Katherine's wrongs. In no other play of Shakespeare's is such a demand made upon us. In other plays the sympathy of the spectator or reader goes along with the action of the play. This want of a "just moral feeling" in the play, seems to me to be another strong argument in favour of Mr. Spedding's theory. It seems also to show that the play, as we have it, must have been designed by Fletcher "whose characteristic defect" according to Mr. Spedding, "is the want of a just moral feeling."

Another argument in favour of Mr. Spedding's theory is this,—The same persons have different characters in the scenes assigned to Fletcher, from those which they have in the Shakespearian portions of the play. In the first scene of the play Buckingham appears as a proud, high-spirited, self-sufficient nobleman; but in the first scene of the second act, where he is being led to execution he is one of the meekest of men. Hazlitt has said of this scene that it is "one of the most affecting and natural in Shakespeare." That it is very beautiful and affecting I admit, but that the character of Buckingham is natural, in the sense that the character by the approach of death, is, I venture to think, not quite true. The difference between the characters of the two scenes is very great. The change is so great as to be unnatural. As Mr. Spedding remarks, "The difference in the two scenes is too great to be accounted for by the mere change of situation without supposing also a change of writers. The presence of death produces great changes in men, but no such change as we have here." The character of Katherine also is different in the Fletcherian and Shakespearian portions of the play.

It may also be remarked that the characterization is stronger in the parts of the play assigned to Shakespeare than in those supposed to have

been written by Fletcher. In Shakespeare's parts the characters are more clearly delineated, the individuality of each is strongly shown, and we have many of these minute touches by which the greatest of dramatists is wont, in a very brief phrase or clause, to give us a complete conception of a certain phase of the character he is portraying.

From these various considerations it seems to me that Fletcher as well as Shakespeare must have had a hand in the composition of this play; and this conclusion is confirmed by differences of style and metre, between the two portions of the play.

But before we pass on to consider peculiarities of metre and style it will be necessary to say something as to the division of the play between its two authors.

Mr. Spedding and Mr. Hickson made the following division of the play: They assigned to Shakespeare the first two scenes of Act I, the third and fourth scenes of Act II, the first half of the second scene of Act III, and the first scene of Act V. The rest of the play they assigned to Fletcher. Mr. Spedding, however, thought it possible that Beaumont had helped Fletcher in Act IV. This supposition has not been confirmed by metrical tests and Fletcher and Shakespeare are generally thought to be the only writers who had a share in the composition of this drama. Mr. Spedding's division of the play has been generally adopted by all who have accepted his theory as to its authorship, and is probably correct.

Shakespeare's hand is clearly seen in the animated dialogue with which the play opens. That this scene is his is rendered still more probable by the clearness and distinctness with which it places before us the facts necessary for our understanding the actual state of affairs at the opening of the play. The next scene is also in Shakespeare's manner. The dialogue is full of life and force and we get a good idea of the various characters. When, however, we pass to the last two scenes of the act we are conscious of a change. The dialogue is no longer bold and free, but constrained and languid. The attempts at humour are failures. The characters try to appear witty, but fail miserably.

The first two scenes of Act II. are also given to Fletcher. Certainly the style and metre of Buckingham's speeches are distinct from those of Shakespeare. The style is diffuse and languid and far removed from the "close-packed expression" that characterizes the works of Shakespeare's last period. With scene three we return to Shakespeare. In this scene is portrayed with great skill the character of Anne.

Shakespeare in short space gives us a thorough idea of her character, and traces in a masterly manner the changes that take place so slowly and almost imperceptibly in her mind. If we compare the slowness of this change in Anne with the rapidity with which Katherine changes in the first scene of Act III., I think we will be convinced that the two scenes are by different authors.

The Trial Scene in Act II. is evidently by Shakespeare. It has many marks of resemblance to the Trial Scene in Winter's Tale, and a comparison of the two convinces us that they are by the same author.

The first scene of Act III. appears to be by Fletcher. The dialogue is, however, animated and vigorous, and there might be some doubt as to the authorship of the scene were it not that the character of Katherine is entirely different from what it was in the preceding scene without a corresponding change in her circumstances, and that the metre points clearly to Fletcher as the writer. The change in Katherine's character to which we have referred does not seem natural. I do not think that Katherine, as Shakespeare conceived her character, would have been duped by the fine speeches of Wolsey, whose designs she seemed formerly to completely understand, and of whose character she had formed no very high opinion. The suddenness of her yielding is I think another point which shows that this scene is not by Shakespeare. After an animated dispute with Wolsey and Campeius she suddenly weakens and consents to their proposals, although nothing is said that would account for this rapid change in her feelings towards them. It seems as if the writer took this means of bringing the scene to an end without considering whether or not this ending was in keeping with the character of Katherine. The next scene is divided between Shakespeare and Fletcher. It contains two of the most famous passages in the whole play, namely Wolsey's soliloquy and his address to Cromwell. Both of these passages are in the part ascribed to Fletcher, and, although we have long been accustomed to consider them as Shakespeare's, we are now disposed to admit that they do not seem altogether Shakesperian in style and conception, and certainly not so in metre.

Act IV. is considered by both Mr. Spedding and Mr. Hickson to be the work of Fletcher. In scene 1 there is no characterization, and though scene 2 is one of much beauty, yet the speeches do not appear to me to be wholly in Shakespeare's manner. The conception of the scene is however very fine, and I have some difficulty in assigning it entirely to Fletcher,

although the character of the metre points to him as its author.

The first scene of Act V. is by all the critics assigned to Shakespeare, and the rest of the act to Fletcher. That Shakespeare should have had any hand in the writing of an act that destroys the unity of the play as a whole is rather singular, but as this scene appears to be by Shakespeare we may perhaps get over the difficulty by accepting Mr. Spedding's solution and believing with him that scene 1 is "a genuine piece of Shakespeare's work, spoiled by being introduced where it has no business." The rest of the act bears all the marks of Fletcher's workmanship and may be pretty confidently ascribed to him.

Having thus referred to the division of the play let us briefly consider the metrical and stylistic peculiarities of the different parts, and compare them with the known works of Shakespeare and Fletcher. The chief characteristics of Fletcher's verse as seen in passages from plays acknowledged to be his are:

1. A great abundance of lines ending with an extra syllable.
2. A great number of double endings.
3. Rare use of unstopped or run-on lines.
4. A very sparing use of weak endings.
5. Frequency of cases in which the extra syllables at the end of lines are monosyllabic words.

The end-stopped line and the double-ending are very often united, and this is perhaps the most characteristic peculiarity of Fletcher's verse.

Comparing the metres of Shakespeare and Fletcher we find that Shakespeare is distinguished by:—

1. A much more moderate use of extra-syllabic lines and double endings.
2. A much more frequent use of run-on lines and weak endings.
3. The rarity of cases in which the extra-syllabic lines end in monosyllables.

That these are the general characteristics of the versification of Fletcher and Shakespeare respectively will appear from the following figures. In several passages taken from Fletcher's plays I found the proportion of lines ending with an extra-syllable to be 1 in 1.44. The proportion of double-endings in the same passage was 1 in 2, and of run-on lines 1 in 4.3. Taking two other passages in addition I found that in all the passages examined, taken together, the proportion of double-endings was 1 in 1.95, and of run-on lines 1 in 3.72.

Again on examining several passages from the Winter's Tale, one of Shakespeare's latest plays, I found that the average of extra-syllabic

lines was 1 in 3.16, while in one passage it was 1 in 4.2. The proportion of double-endings in these same passages was 1 in 3.92 and of run-on lines 1 in 2. I think that these figures represent pretty accurately the proportions that hold throughout the Winter's Tale, as the three passages examined aggregate over three hundred lines and are taken from different acts.

Thus in the passages from Fletcher and from Shakespeare which we have compared, we find that the extra-syllabic lines and the double-endings are twice as numerous in Fletcher as in Shakespeare, while the contrary is the case in regard to run-on lines.

Let us now look at the metre of the different parts of Henry VIII. When we do so we find that in those scenes of the play which are thought to be by Fletcher the proportion of extra-syllabic lines varies from 1 in 1.8 to 1 in 1.3. This is nearly the same proportion as we found in Fletcher's acknowledged work where the average was 1 in 1.44. On the other hand in the supposed Shakesperian portions of this play the average proportion is 1 in 3, while in the passages from the Winter's Tale the proportion is 1 in 3.16.

Again the proportion of double-endings in Fletcher's part of Henry VIII. is 1 in 1.7 and in passages from Fletcher 1 in 1.9, while in Shakespeare's portion of the play the proportion is 1 in 3 and in the passages from the Winter's Tale 1 in 3.9.

In the case of the end-stopped lines Mr. Furnival finds as the result of his examination of the play, that the proportion of unstopped lines in the Fletcherian parts is 1 in 3.79, and in the Shakesperian parts 1 in 2.03. These are almost the same figures as we found in the passages from Fletcher and the Winter's Tale which we examined, where the proportion was respectively 1 in 3.72 and 1 in 2.

Another difference between the verse of Shakespeare and that of Fletcher is that while in his later works Shakespeare uses weak and light endings in considerable numbers, Fletcher rarely uses them at all. This difference is also clearly seen in the two portions of Henry VIII. According to Prof. Ingram, who has applied the weak-ending test to Shakespeare's plays, there are in the Shakesperian portion of Henry VIII. 82 light and weak endings, or a per centage of 7.16; while in the Fletcherian part of the play there are only 8 light and weak endings, or a per centage of .005. It is a fact worth noting in regard to this test that weak or light endings occur in every scene which is assigned to Shakespeare. This test shows clearly a marked difference between the two verse

systems of the play and their similarity to the verse-systems of Shakespeare and Fletcher respectively.

Another characteristic difference between the verse-systems of Fletcher and Shakespeare is that while in the former extrasyllabic lines frequently end in a monosyllable, in the latter this is rarely the case. Dr. Abbot calls attention to this peculiarity of Shakespeare's metre, and adds, "The fact that in Henry VIII. and in no other play of Shakespeare's constant exceptions are found to this rule seems to me a sufficient proof that Shakespeare did not write that play." Although we may not agree with Dr. Abbot that this one circumstance is sufficient evidence to disprove Shakespeare's authorship of the play, yet when joined to the other metrical peculiarities which we have noted, it confirms the opinion that this play was not entirely his work.

By examination of several passages from Fletcher and comparison with supposed Fletcherian passages in this play, we find the proportion of monosyllabic endings in extra-syllabic lines to be about the same, being 1 in 2.2. When on the other hand we compare a passage from one of Shakespeare's acknowledged works with a passage from the Shakesperian portion of Henry VIII., we find that we get a similar result, the proportion being respectively 1 in 6.8 and 1 in 7.

Thus we have clearly shown by the application of various metrical tests that there are two different systems of versification in this play; that the differences between these systems are clearly marked; and that these differences are those which characterize the verse of Shakespeare and Fletcher respectively.

The method of showing the differences between the two systems by means of figures enables us to comprehend at a glance their extent, but I think that they may also be clearly perceived by a careful reading of the play. The effect produced by the verse of the different portions of the play is entirely different.

In Shakespeare's work the verse as it were leaps and bounds along, and the rhythm rapidly changes to suit the swift turns of thought, while Fletcher's verse moves slowly along in measured cadences. Shakespeare's lines are free, bold, and vigorous. The words seem to flow naturally into verse. There is no constraint; and the rhythm seems admirably to suit the thought.

On the other hand Fletcher's verse, though oftentimes very pleasing, is inclined to be languid. There is noticeable in his lines a peculiarly liquid smoothness, in which Shakespeare's lines and combinations of words though not

harsh are generally lacking. As a result of this smoothness, and of the frequent use of end-stopped lines and double-endings, Fletcher's verse is often monotonous. It lacks variety. All the lines have the same swing, and have little or none of that careless freedom, vigour and music so characteristic of Shakespeare.

Before concluding this essay we will quote a passage from each portion of the play to illustrate the differences between the two writers.

The passage we quote from the supposed Fletcherian portion of the play is Buckingham's speech when he is being led out to execution. It is as follows:—

"All good people,
"You that thus far have come to pity me,
"Hear what I say, and then go home and lose me.
"I have this day receiv'd a traitor's judgment,
"And by that name must die; yet, heaven bear witness,
"And if I have a conscience, let it sink me,
"Even as the axe falls, if I be not faithful!
"The law I bear no malice for my death,
"Thas done upon the premises but justice;
"But those that sought it I could wish more Christians:
"Be what they will, I heartily forgive 'em.
"Yet let 'em look they glory not in mischief,
"Nor build their evils on the graves of great men;
"For then my guiltless blood must cry against 'em.
"For further life in this world I ne'er hope,
"Nor will I sue, although the king have mercies
"More than I dare make faults. You few that lov'd me,
"And dare be bold to weep for Buckingham,
"His noble friends and fellows, whom to leave
"Is only bitter to him only dying,
"Go with me, like good angels, to my end;
"And, as the long divorce of steel falls on me,
"Make of your prayers one sweet sacrifice,
"And lift my soul to heaven.—Lead on, O God's name!"

ACT II., Sc. 1, lines 55-78.

This passage is a fair example of the non-Shakesperian portion of the play. We notice here most of the peculiarities of Fletcher's verse. There is a very large proportion of extra-syllabic lines and double-endings, while there are only two run-on lines and not a single weak or light ending. Another noticeable thing is the smoothness of the verse and the regularity of the accent. The style is somewhat diffuse and languid, and very different from that of the works of Shakespeare's last period. The whole passage has a certain beauty, but lacks vigour of thought and language.

Let us now take a passage from the Shakesperian portion of the play, such as the following speech of Katherine:—

"My lord, my lord,
"I am a simple woman, much too weak
"To oppose your cunning. You're meek and humble-mouthed;
"You sign your place and calling in full seeming,
"With meekness and humility, but your heart
"Is cramm'd with arrogancy, spleen, and pride.
"You have, by fortune and his highness' favours,
"Gone slightly o'er low steps, and now are mounted

"Where powers are your retainers; and your words,
"Domestics to you, serve your will as 't please
"Yourself pronounce their office. I must tell you,
"You tender more your person's honour than
"Your high profession spiritual; that again
"I do refuse you for my judge, and here,
"Before you all, appeal unto the pope,
"To bring my whole cause fore his holiness,
"And to be judg'd by him."

ACT II., Sc. 4, lines 105-119.

In this passage we see many of the characteristics of Shakespeare's work. There is a comparatively small proportion of extra-syllabic lines and double-endings, and quite a number of run-on lines. The effect produced by the metre of this passage is altogether different from that produced by the speech of Buckingham. There is none of that monotonous cadence which so often detracts from the pleasure afforded by Fletcher's lines. The verse is bold, free, and vigorous, and strikes us at once as Shakesperian. Another noticeable feature in the verse is the manner in which it is adapted to the thought which it expresses.

When we examine the style of the passage we find still further marks of Shakespeare's workmanship. While the speech of Buckingham is diffuse and wordy, this passage is concise and vigorous. There is besides in this passage a greater wealth of thought and imagery. The lines—

"You sign your place and calling in full seeming,
"With meekness and humility, but your heart
"Is cramm'd with arrogancy, spleen, and pride,"

and the metaphor that follows describing Wolsey's rise and position seem to me to bear strong marks of Shakespeare's workmanship. The language of the whole passage too is calm, vigorous, and majestic, and indeed everything about the passage points to Shakespeare as its author.

We have now considered somewhat at length the various arguments in support of Mr. Spedding's theory, and I think it has been pretty conclusively shown that his theory is correct. There is however one great difficulty in the way of accepting this conclusion, and that is the fact that the supposed Fletcherian portion of this play is far superior to anything in the acknowledged works of Fletcher. I am sure that a great difference will be at once perceived by anyone who turns to the Fletcherian portions of Henry VIII., after reading an acknowledged work of Fletcher. Even however admitting this difficulty, I think there is abundance of evidence to warrant us in accepting Mr. Spedding's theory, against which no very strong arguments have as yet been brought.

The Dalhousie Gazette.

HALIFAX, N. S., MARCH 31, 1887.

EDITORS:

W. R. CAMPBELL, '87.	R. J. McDONALD, '89.
W. M. McDONALD, '88.	T. J. CARTER, LAW, '87.
J. S. SUTHERLAND, '88.	HECTOR MCINNIS, LAW, '88.
A. M. MORRISON, '88.	} <i>Financial Editors.</i>
E. H. ARMSTRONG, LAW, '88.	

Twelve numbers of the GAZETTE are issued every Winter Session by the Students of Dalhousie College and University.

TERMS:

One collegiate year (in advance).....	\$1 00
Single copies.....	10

Payment to be made to E. H. ARMSTRONG, Box 422, Halifax, N. S. Other business communications to be made to A. M. MORRISON, Box 338, Halifax, N. S. All literary communications to be addressed to Editors "Dalhousie Gazette," Halifax, N. S. Anonymous communications will receive no attention.

We respectfully ask the Students to patronize our advertisers.

CONTENTS:

The Authorship of Henry VIII.—(J. S. Sutherland).....	121-126
Editorial.....	127
A good time in the Library.....	128
Correspondence.....	131
Dalhousiensis.....	131
Personals.....	132
Acknowledgments.....	132

EVER since the Law School was started in connection with the College, the final examination before the Barrister's Society has seemed to the students a matter of unnecessary trouble and expense. All who have given the matter any consideration agree with the students, and many letters advocating their views have appeared in the city papers. It seems strange that some move has not been taken in the matter. Why is it that the very professors under whom the students study, and under whom they pass successful examinations, should think it necessary to subject the pupils to the annoyance and expense of a supplementary and less difficult examination? We know then our governors have our interests at heart, and only need to be reminded of this evil and they will take action in the matter. We now have friends

in the proper places, and it seems to us that something should be done at once. Students have rights, though these may not always be recognized, and this is a matter of as much, if not more importance to us than a new building, and so we respectfully ask the governors and professors to push it through.

A NEW regulation has been made with regard to the Library, by which students are required to deposit the full value of books taken away. We learn with regret that the librarian has resorted to such a regulation as the above. It is practically prohibitory, as honour men especially will be unable to take the books necessary for their summer's work.

Apart from the financial difficulty which such a regulation will entail, it is a direct insult to the honesty of every student who takes a book from the library.

We believe in reform, and will heartily co-operate with the professors in any measure tending to the benefit of the College. We believe moreover that reform is needed in the library regulations. There should be a limit to the number of books one student is allowed to take, and no one should be allowed to keep a book as long as he pleases. All who use the library will be pleased to know that such grievances are to be remedied, but we earnestly desire the Senate to carefully consider the consequences of such a resolution as the above, before carrying it into effect.

WE publish a letter from Queen's College which clearly shows the sentiments of the students. We know that in the future the *Queen's College Journal* will unite with us in discouraging any such discussion. It can only tend to ill-feeling, and can do no good.

SEVERAL interesting articles are crowded out this issue, but will appear in our next. We also regret that we cannot find space in this issue to review the exchanges, some of which are above their usual standard of excellence.

A GOOD TIME IN THE LIBRARY.

Not the Christmas Concert, not the Literary Society, not the Glee Club; but a Dinner. Nor yet the usual *hourly* "feast of reason and flow of soul," dispensed by the Professors to the students—a dinner of meats and drinks; and the guests were the poets who had attended College during the Session.

It was but human that they should crave this, but fair that they should have it. All the Session they had come to class: rainy days, snowy days, windy days and fine, and never a holiday. Never a dinner on Thanksgiving, never a walk on Ash Wednesday, never a drive on Munro day! No football, no fights, no races, no drinks! The sole dependence of the students through all the year, and yet always left behind when a good time was going on; never to Rink, never to the Point, never to Professor's parties, never to fancy bazaars!

Rising up against this injustice, they vowed that unless something pleasant would come into their dreary lives, their names would be missing in the new College calendar. A meeting was held, a Dinner planned, the Library engaged. And at eight o'clock on Friday, the 4th of March, the guests assembled.

At 7.45, a Freshman, wandering down to the town in search of an hour's enjoyment, noticed as he crossed the Parade, lights in the Library. Naturally curious, he retraced his steps, and entered the front door of the College just behind Coleridge, who boarded over in Dartmouth, and was of course late.

"Look here," interrogated the Freshman, overtaking the Poet and grasping the skirt of his coat, "what's going on in there?"

"Now wherefore stopp'st thou me?" panted Coleridge, turning upon the Freshman, "I'm late, as it is."

"I only asked you a civil question," retorted Freshie, taking a firmer grip of the coat.

"Unhand me, greybeard loon!" cried Coleridge. "The guests are met, the feast is set! may'st hear the merry din! it's a Poet's Dinner we're having; hold off!" and freeing himself from the Freshman's grasp, he disappeared into the Library.

"A Poet's Dinner!" repeated the Freshman, indignantly, "A Poet's Dinner! Indeed!" And he pulled from his pocket a copy of the poem he had sent to the McNaughton competition; and muttering in revengeful tones, 'He reckons ill who leaves *me* out,' opened the door and stepped boldly into the Library, just as the guests were taking seats at table.

"Who art thou, and whence comest thou?" cried Shakespere. "Against what man thou com'st? and why thy quarrel? Speak!" demanded the Bard.

"What is it?" cried Dryden aghast, as he and Shelley came in front of the youth, "O what is it?"

"Hush! O hush!" said Addison, "it is a Freshman!"

"Put him out!" yelled Johnson, seizing the youth in his giant arms and swinging him over his shoulder, "put him out! he's often thrown *me* across the room, he's often kicked *me* under the table!" and with all the fiery zeal of a Soph. he attempted to hurl his burden against the stove.

But Gray, who had caught sight of the MSS. in the Freshman's hands, interposed. "Nay, put him not out," he said. "Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest; some Cromwell, guiltless of his country's blood. Who knows into *what* he may develop? A Poet perhaps; let him *stay* to dinner."

'Poet!' echoed Tenneyson, in scorn, "Poet? The Poet in a golden clime is born, with golden stars above—and this fellow came from *Cape Breton*—Put him out!"

But the compassionate Gray had already rescued the youth from the grasp of the irate Johnson, and with a benignant smile and confident pat, placed him at table opposite Milton; and then passed up to his own place at the left of Shakespere, who presided over the feast.

The Freshman, relieved at finding himself free, and already feeling the waves of a great Epic surging up in his soul, glanced across the table with a fraternal look at his sightless vis-a-vis; then remembering his wrongs, the Epic ebbed, and his soul was filled with plans for a Commonwealth, when, not his "brothers-in-

law," but all of the Sophs, and some of the Seniors, should be hanged to public view. And whatever qualms he might have felt at coming uninvited to dinner, were set at rest by Goldsmith; who, after he had said,

"Blest be this Feast, with simple plenty crowned,
Where all the ruddy company around
Laugh at the jest and prank that never fail,
And sigh with pity at some mournful tale,"

added with magnanimous tone—

"Or press the Bashful Stranger to his food,
And learn the luxury of doing good."

The Freshman, thus publicly recognized as welcome, glared triumphantly over at Dr. Johnson. But this "intellectual giant" did not catch the glance; his eyes were tightly closed in deference to the blessing just said; but he was bending eagerly forward, eating everything he could convey to his mouth with his talon like hands. All viewed him with disgust; then Shakespere, remembering his duties as host, said with affable smile:

"You know your own degrees, gentlemen; at first and last, the hearty welcome! Tennyson and Browning, you will wait upon table, being the youngest present."

"Why should *we* only toil?" complained Tennyson, after the first round was served, "*we*, who are the roof and crown of things? There is Milton like a seraph strong, beside him Shakespere bland and mild; why can't *they* do it? I am a weary, a weary!"

"Alfred," said Milton, with a turn of his "helpless eyes" in the wrong direction, "Alfred, they also serve who only stand and wait. I'll have a bit more of that goose."

But Alfred paid no heed to the comforting phrase or the order. He dropped the platter he was carrying, to the floor. "The devil take the goose," said he. "I am a Peer, and *won't* serve others," and sat down in a vacant chair beside Addison, who would not have welcomed him, only that he foresaw a possible listener for his reminiscences, of which he was full.

"*Ourselves* will mingle with society, and play the humble host," said Shakespere. And rising from his prominent position he joined Browning, who, with a patience that was sweet to see, waited on all without a murmur; the constant

strain of standing on his feet being nothing to him, as he often indulged in long walks—a habit acquired in his youth when trying to get a publisher for his earlier MSS.

The bear of the feast was Dr. Johnson. With everybody he quarrelled; and against Addison he seemed to have a peculiar spite. Every time that mild man ventured to make a remark, which was very often, he would get no further than "When I was at Grand Cairo," or "I was once engaged in," when his plate and glass would receive such a lurch, that he would be forced to cease talking and see to his food. And at last when in reply to something Johnson had been saying, he began "Such an event as," Johnson could stand it no longer, and rather than remain by *him*, moved his plate and chair and sat down beside the Freshman, exclaiming,

"I once said, that whoever wished to gain an elegant English style, should give his days and nights to the company of Addison. I take it back. If his nights are like this, what must his days be? Don't you do it, young man! I take it back!"

This re-assured the Freshman, and he now enjoyed it all: the eating, and drinking, and the merry talk. All his native timidity and modesty vanished, and he felt to be a man among men.

How they *all* enjoyed it! The company was divided into little congenial groups. At one end of the table (and a little removed from the others on account of their national dish) sat Schiller, Uhland and Goethe, making merry over a great platter of saeur kraut, and a huge bowl of punch, which Schiller mixed and over which Goethe sang his "Ergo Bibamus." Not knowing how to joke in English any better than their friends did in German, they had their fun to themselves, and were a most uproarious three.

Near the middle of the table sat Dryden; Campbell and Pope, Pope entertaining them with satirical remarks. Down a little farther were Spencer, Chaucer and Sidney, who seemed intent on a good time. As indeed did all, except poor Shelley, who sat at one corner, his head drooped forward, his face pale, and his eyes swollen. In none of the talk he mingled, and at every burst of laughter would say as if in

protest at their gaiety, "O weep for Adonais! he is dead!"

Every one laughed at him, and no one pitied him but the Freshman; who, moved by the insistent cry, called Browning to him and said, "Look here, won't you let that fellow out, to bury his dead?"

But Shelly heard it. "He is *not* dead!" he shrieked, "he is *not* dead! 'tis we who sleep, we—" and then back to his old refrain.

But the merriest group of all was that which contained the Freshman; and it was this group, which was added to in the course of the evening, by the presence of Sir William Young.

Browning noticed first that he was in the Library, and bowing low, said:

"Come down, Sir William, and join us! Your beard is white, but you are not too old to be merry!"

"I am always Young," replied the smiling benefactor, "but I am not a Poet, and therefore cannot join you."

"Your father was a Poet," exclaimed Dr. Johnson, with the first gracious smile he had bestowed that evening. "His *Agricola* letters were as fine a *prose* poem on agriculture as Virgil's *Georgics*. You must have some spirit of this true old poetry lurking in your generous soul; come join us, and be inspired."

But the mention of "prose poetry" by Johnson roused Wordsworth, who had as yet not been heard from, and absently moving over to make room for Sir William, he said with a direct glance at the Freshman,

"Only the ass with motion dull, upon the pivot of his skull, turns round his long left ear," and then waited for applause. But Coleridge not being near enough to hear, there came no plaudit; and the rustic Poet looked into his glass vacantly, as if trying to recall a more appropriate remark.

It was never heard; for Dr. Johnson, who during this time had been wriggling about uneasily, now rose and said, "Speaking of agriculture, and the *Georgics*, and *Agricola*, reminds me, gentlemen, of the honor due our only uninvited guest. Fill your glasses, we drink to the Freshman Poet! may his class never be bashful about coming to a Dinner!"

Muddled with the unusual festivities, the Freshman rose to reply:

"Gentlemen," he said, "it is true I am a Freshman: it is also true that I am a Poet, and from *Cape Breton*, though some day hence I shall be able to write as did the immortal Virgil, "Mantua me genuit—"

"Only that, and nothing more!" rang out in tones almost a cry. All eyes were turned in the direction of the voice, and there, just inside the door, stood Poe. He had been invited by Shelley, but, unmindful of the hour, had just entered; and without having heard the Latin quotation, was repeating in half bewilderment the melancholy strain which so singularly filled the seeming hiatus in the Freshman's memory.

The oddness of the poor Poet's personal appearance, and the prophetic aptness of his words, threw the whole company into uproarious laughter. When the laughter had subsided, the Freshman had also subsided; the rest of his speech had oozed in the direction of Bob Acre's courage, and he sat flat in his chair, trying to make himself believe all the merriment was caused by the melancholy manner of the new comer.

After this, toasts innumerable were drunk. Again and again did Schiller mix the bowl of punch and dispense it to the droughty guests; till when "Our next merry meeting" was proposed, the conquering wine had left none masters of themselves.

"Come let us all take hands," cried Shakespeare excitedly, as the company rose to respond

"And step to a tune!" cried Browning, starting up Auld Lang Syne; and amid an overturning of chairs, and clatter of dishes, each grasped his fellow's hand, and the ring began to circle round the room.

"Only one round, and Tennyson dropped out. At the desk he faltered, at the hall door he reeled, and pleading, "Comrades, leave me here a little," loosed his hands, and fell over into the coal box.

At the next round, Gray, Shelley and Dryden fell. Then Goldsmith; and, one after another, and by twos and threes they broke the ranks, till only the Freshman and Browning and Shakespeare were left.

"Good," said Shakespeare. "We'll have a Lybian measure."

But Browning, forgetful of his condition, stooped for a doughnut that had fallen to the floor. "E'en to the crumbs," he said. "I'd fain pick up the feast."—And he never rose.

"That which hath made them drunk, hath made me bold," exclaimed Shakespeare, as he clasped the Freshman's hands and glanced down on his fallen friends. "That which hath quenched them hath—given—me—fire," and he too, fell.

The Freshman alone was left standing. Once, twice, three times, he walked round the room, gazing with a satisfied air on the prostrate Poets.

"The survival of the fittest," he murmured; and, confident and serene, walked out of the door and to his home.

Whether he reached it safely, and how all the others got to theirs, I do not know, and cannot find out. I have spent an evening with each of the Poets since, but can elicit no information. I have interviewed the Freshman, and he is even more mute than they, and actually denies any knowledge of the affair—but I notice he is much more intimate with these same Poets than he was at the first of the term.

I wonder that the urbane and alert reporters of the *Mail* and *Herald*, ever going about seeking what they might devour in the news line, passed *this* Dinner by. I wonder that the GAZETTE editors received no notice of it. I sometimes doubt that there ever *was* such a Dinner—yet how did I come by these scraps of information? D. D.

CORRESPONDENCE.

QUEENS COLLEGE,
KINGSTON, ONT., March 28, 1887.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—In justice to the College which I still hold as my Alma Mater, and which I left not through any distaste to anything about it, I am fully in sympathy with the article in your last issue of the GAZETTE commenting on article "Queens vs. Dalhousie." It was not the will of the Maritime boys now attending Queens that such an article as that written by "D. W." should have been inserted in our College journal, and all to a man (save "D. W.") refute any such mis-

ception of the facts as that advanced by him. In speaking for all the boys who for some personal advantage perhaps have come to Queens from the Lower Provinces, we do not in the least agree with what was said concerning either, or the building of Dalhousie. Every College has its own plans and methods of work, and no student, it seems to me, should find fault with the working of another College [unless direct to the Senate (?) save that he has nothing else to do, and has been and is careless about his studies, and when this is the case, the idle hand finds some mischief to perform. In regard to the College building, when we think of it, it brings to us memories of happy hours spent within its walls, which a new building however magnificent will not succeed in doing. In conclusion, Mr. Editor, we with yourself regret that occasion did arise for your article. After all it is not the building or work prescribed that makes the scholar, but the ever earnest and honest plodding of the student, not merely for a B. A. degree but for that knowledge which will enable him to be of service to himself and his fellow men.

ACADIA.

The following speaks for itself:—

ADDISON ROAD, PRESTON, ENGLAND,

March 1st, 1887.

Editors Dalhousie Gazette:

DEAR SIRS,—I am so well pleased with the Poetry which has appeared in recent numbers of the GAZETTE, in competition for the prize, that I have pleasure in authorizing you to announce that I shall be happy to offer a prize of the same amount (\$5.00) for competition on the same conditions for next Session.

I am yours, very truly,

S. MACNAUGHTON.

DALLUSIENSIA.

We wish our contemporaries to note that this column is not intended for the public, but belongs exclusively to the students of general attending Colleges, who are alone expected to understand its contents.

"NUNC EST PLACU GENUA," said the Freshman.

At a city church gate
At half past eight,
A little Neph. smiled,
As he watched and whined
The moments away
For his "hairy leg."
But the night was dark,
And he missed her at Park,
Down Gorington Street—
Fitty, patty, and his feet,—
Just a moment too late,—
She had entered the gate,
And the night winds died
As the little Neph. sighed—
"Poor me can't see her!"

FRANK INGRAM, Stewart, and F. H. Crops have joined the Salvation Army. Hallelujah!

D. KENZIE GRANT, J. J. Buchanan and D. McD. Clark, third year men in Arts, are announced by the north end reporter as converts from Gritism. Next.

OUR Junior philosopher has of late been making diligent enquiries as to whether or not a certain young lady drives from church in the evening. Should the carriage be dispensed with, he can assure her, he says, of pleasant walks in "the Ambrosial night."

PEACE! Cousins peace!
Your rivalry cease
Episcopas Sandy,
And young Junior dandy.
Let the Bishop withdraw,
For the "Jun's" asked her "paw,"
And gained his consent
To wed after Lent.
The Bishop may "jaw,"
But it's not worth a cent.

DOES Love make lean?
Not so I ween
If openly confessed;
Will Shakespeare taught
"She pined in thought,"
Love hid within her breast.
Not thus with me,
As all may see
My love I plainly show.
For home from "tea"
With two or three
Fair ones I always go.

AN enterprising student, a friend of the professors, has anticipated the examinations, and for the benefit of honour men gives a few of the more difficult questions:—

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

I. Where was the churchyard Gray talks about, and how many people were buried in it?

II. How much could Samuel Johnson eat at a meal, and state the effect on the literature of the period.

III. Write full notes on the following: "We won't go home till morning," "O whistle and I'll come to you my lad," and "Mary had a little lamb."

IV. Give a sketch of the English you have not read during the term.

CHEMISTRY.

I. What is an atom? Give its boundaries.

II. Show that heat is developed when two salts of Freshmen are dissolved in alcohol.

III. Give chemical formulæ for following: Black sulphate of Hx cranberries, Bin oxide of apple dumplings, and Carbonate of boarding house hash.

IV. Give the chief ingredients of butter as doled out to you at your boarding houses daily, with means for removal of the more virulent, such as hair, lard, &c., &c.

PERSONALS.

REV. J. L. GEORGE, B.A. '78, of Sherbrooke, has accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church, Dartmouth.

J. H. KNOWLES, B.A. '82, M.D., has, we are glad to learn, been appointed "Extern Maternity Assistant" to the Rotunda Lying-in Hospital, Dublin. We are pleased to congratulate Mr. Knowles on his appointment to such a prominent position.

WE regret to learn that Mr. J. W. McKenzie, an Editor of last year, who has been teaching during the winter in New Glasgow High School, has been compelled on account of ill health to resign his position.

[Mac, when in Dalhousie, was a genial favourite, and the news here conveyed must be painful to every student. We tender him our sincere sympathy, and hope that his old time health and vigour may soon return.—Ed's.]

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

Hon. A. G. Jones, \$2; P. P. Archibald, Dr. Lyndsay, Peter Jack, Rev. Jno. McMillan, Dr. J. F. Avery, J. S. Maclean, George Drysdale, Syd. Howe, J. R. Campbell, Anderson Rogers, J. R. Fitzpatrick, E. A. Magee, Rev. A. Simpson, W. Doull, Principal McKnight, C. P. MacLennan, H. D. Gratz, S. McNaughton, Alex. Robinson, David Allison, LL.D., Rev. E. S. Bayne, \$1 each.

WM. GOSSIP,

United Service Book and Stationery Warehouse,
103 GRANVILLE STREET.

Imports and sells all the College and School Books used in Nova Scotia. Writing and Exercise Books, Blank Books, Copy Books, and Drawing Books of every description.

Books handsomely bound for Presents at Xmas. Season, Teachers Bibles, Hymn Books, Prayer Books, &c., &c.
Writing Cases and Writing Desks, Photograph, Autograph and Scrap Albums.

CHRISTMAS AND NEW YEAR CARDS FOR 1886-7—entirely new.

Winsor & Newton's Oil Colors, hard and soft, in handsome boxes and single cakes, Brushes, Drawing Papers, Bristol Boards, Canvasses in frames and per yard, Card Board, &c.

All kinds of STATIONERY, Faber's Drawing Pencils, French Ink, Stevens. Ink, Walkden's Ink, Carter's Ink, Photograph Glasses.

All kinds of Stationery for Civil and Mechanical Engineers, Architects, &c. Orders for Magazines, Newspapers, and every description of Periodicals.

FALL, 1886.

Look for WM. GOSSIP, 103 Granville St.

Printed by the NOVA SCOTIA PRINTING COMPANY, Corner of Sackville and Granville Sts., Halifax, N. S.

NEWCOMBE & BAIRD,

Photographes Artistes,

Offrent aux étudiants des avantages spéciaux pendant la saison d'hiver garantissant le plus artistique arrangement de lumière et pose aux que l'achèvement le plus beau dans la ville
Avant d'aller ailleurs, venez au nouvel atelier.

237 RUE BARRINGTON, au coin de le RUE BUCKINGHAM.