

and took the football craze. So thro' all the succeeding political changes in England—change that at that time were occurring more frequently than sessional examinations—this manly game survived. Fitzstephen, writing about A. D. 1175, speaks of the young men going into the fields after dinner to play at football. In the city records of London, preserved at the Guildhall, is an entry, under date April 13th, 1314, which being translated (I translate, not for the benefit of the High School scholars who of course read Latin as naturally as pigs squeak, but for outside readers) is, "and because of the great noise in the city by some players of large futebals thrown in the meadows of the people, from which many evils might arise, which God forbid: We command and forbid on behalf of the king under pain of imprisonment, such game to be used in the city for the future." By the reign of Edward III the game had grown so popular that the people spent all their time at it to the neglect of their archery. As archery would have to be practised if the English bowmen were to preserve the enviable reputation they had won at Crecy and Poitiers, a statute was passed prohibiting "*pila pedina*." In the twelfth year of the reign of Richard II, a similar statute was passed. This I give in a slightly abridged form:—"Item, it is accorded and assented, that servants of husbandry or laborers, and servants, artificers, nor victuallers, shall not have sword or buckler except in time of war; but such servants or laborers shall have bows and arrows and use the same the Sundays and holidays, and leave all playing at tennis or football and other such importune games. And that doers against this statute shall be arrested." Whether this statute was enforced or not, we have no record. It probably was, and the people grew so restless at being deprived of their excitement that eventually they started the Wars of the Roses. I don't feel positive that this sanguinary civil war was due to the suppression of football, tho' it has been suggested. The year that saw the first

battle of St. Albans—the opening battle of the Wars of the Roses fought—saw also a statute passed limiting the number of lawyers in England to a very small figure; and I incline to the belief that it was this later statute that caused the dreadful strife. This, however, is a matter of opinion and I am dealing with facts.

We might have expected that in Scotland the legislators would have had more sense than to seek to prohibit football. If we did we would be wrong; for we read that "in the first parliament of King James the First, holden at Perth, the xxvi day of May, the year of God one thousand four hundredth twentieth year, and of his reign the nineteenth year," a law was passed saying, "That na man play at the futeball. It is a s'ature, and the king forbiddes, that na man play at the futeball, under the paine of fiftie schillings to be raised to the Lord of the land, als oft as he be tainted, or to the Scheriffe of the land or his ministers, gif the Lords will not punish sik trespassours." Again under James II, in 1457, it was "decreeted and ordained that the futeball and golfe be utterly cryed downe and not to be used . . . and to be punished by the Barronis-un-law and gif he takes not the unlaw that it be taken to the kynges officeres." James III decreed against it at his sixth Parliament held in Edinburgh, in 1471. And in 1491 King James IV enacted "That in na place of the Realme there be used futeball, golfe, or sik unprofitable sportes, for the common gude of the Realme and defence thereof." Not one of these statutes was obeyed or why the necessity for so frequently re-enacting them? One who reads them at this late date first wonders at the foolishness of the men who imagined they would be effective, and then sadly reflects that our forefathers who went to Parliament were mighty bad spellers.

To be continued.

American Humorous Writers.

Max O'Rell in his "Jonathan and His Continent" defines humour to be "an un-