degree, if at all, "misspent," I entirely agree with him in thinking that out of the increased income of those endowments ample provision should be made for the foundation of an University in the North. Indeed, I am so far from not agreeing with him, that about four years ago, being then a member of a committee of the House of Commons appointed to inquire into the studies and revenues of Oxford and Cambridge, I suggested to Mr. Forster such an application of the surplus, or part of it, which I well knew that inquiry would disclose.

The total income of the two Universities will in the course of a few years be not less than £600,000. Of this, I think, not more than two-thirds should be left to the present possessors, with some considerable transfer from colleges to the university in each case. This would leave a surplus of £200,000, of which £50,000 would not be too much for the foundation of a new university. But the transfer might perhaps be made more conveniently and effectively, in kind, at least in part. Two or three of the colleges in each university most connected by property or foundation with the North, say, for instance, for Oxford, Balliol, Lincoln, and Queen's, might be transplanted bodily,—that is, with all their personal staff, and the prestige which belongs severally to each. If the same contribution were made from Cambridge, we should have at once an university, ancient and venerable from its very birth. In the neighbourhood of Scotland "the Master of Balliol" would sound like a title of nobility, and between the Master himself and the Rector of Lincoln there would be a noble emulation as to which should best deserve the name of the Boniface of the North.

Such an University would not only satisfy a reasonable local claim, but might be made the means of filling a gap in our general system of University education. It would, at any rate, enable us to try the great experiment which we are, I think, bound to make, whether by leaving Greek only as an optional study, that is, by throwing open not only the degrees, but the honours and emoluments, and except in Greek itself, the teaching of an University, we should not more than compensate for the loss, by the greater knowledge of Latin in the first place, of history, and modern languages and literature in the second place, and thirdly, by a more general acquaintance with the exact and the natural sciences.

The experiment can only be tried fairly by creating a university which shall be so far on a level with the two ancient Universities as to be equally attractive to students of the highest capacity. It is not necessary for this that the new University should number among its members the same proportion—if any—of noblemen and baronets and country gentlemen, or the sons of such. It would be enough that it should consist chiefly of the sons of educated gentlemen and wholly of young men aspiring to that character, and seeking to qualify themselves, either for the learned professions, including that of teaching or for the public service, under the system of competitive examination; but it would of course be also necessary that they should have the same chances of assistance or provision from endowments which may continue to be possessed by Oxford and Cambridge. Lastly, to place them on a par with those who carry on their studies on the banks of the Isis or the Cam, the new university must be planted by the side of a river, and that river a pleasant and a clean one, which, I fear, would exclude Manchester from consideration as a possible site.

The new University might then safely leave to its older rivals the advantage, which they would probably still retain, of monopolising the education of that class from which statesmen are most commonly taken, who would still continue, in some instances, to earn for Greek iambics the credit of that political success which will have been mainly due to English sense or English acres.—I am, Sir, &c.,

Oriel College, Oxford, Dec. 2. CHARLES NEATE.

[We fear the objection to this really great scheme is that the class in the North which does not wish to send its sons to Oxford and Cambridge, could not send them to such a university as this. Owens' College is the University of the *busy*, and its great function is to give high education to young men more or less otherwise engaged. Help to it would be far more useful than a new University of the old type.—ED. *Spectator.*]

MR. DARWIN ON EXPRESSION.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—Towards the end of your article on Mr. Darwin's new work, you state that "all true expressions must proceed from a desire to communicate something." Now I think that Mr. Darwin has clearly proved that the expression of grief is due to the difficulty in preventing the involuntary action of certain muscles, which are brought into play in a crying fit in childhood. In the same manner he has traced the origin of many other expressions to purely physical causes; none of which, therefore, can be said to "proceed from a desire to communicate something," and if we neglect these—the expressions of grief and sorrow, laughter, smiling, nodding, assent, turning pale, and trembling with fear, blushing, &c.,—how many "true expressions" have we left? I presume that you would bring forward the few instances in which Mr. Darwin applies his principle of antithesis—a principle which you deny, but do not hint at another explanation in its place. The difficulty in part arises as to the exact meaning of the word "expression." In your article it is applied to such an action as a dog, who desires to fetch his master, "running up to him, attracting his attention, and then running away, looking back to see if he followed." The above anecdote appears to me rather to illustrate the reasoning faculty of the dog, that to show his power of expression in the sense in which Mr. Darwin uses the word.

Another part of your article implies that the "inward want to express something" is one of the "primary conditions of all expressions." Taking, again, the case of grief, few people have an "inward want to express" that emotion, in fact, it is the very inward want not to express it that has given rise to its most peculiar feature, namely, obliquity of the eyebrows. If the mere desire to convey to another animal the idea of a certain state of mind had arbitrarily given rise to any expression it would be almost impossible to account for the fact that the same expressions correspond to the same emotions in the different races of man or animals scattered over the whole world. There are several passages in Mr. Darwin's work showing that he considers that if once an expression has been acquired from physical causes, it may be employed perfectly voluntarily, and thus, by use, become greatly strengthened in succeeding generations.—I am, Sir, &c., L. D.

[The question between us and our correspondent is mainly one of definition. We did not deny but assert involuntary *signs of emotion*, but held that the word "expression" should be rather limited to the more voluntary ones, maintaining that such belong as much to the higher animals as to men. Whether the dog's action be referred to its reasoning faculty is not the question. It is surely an expressive action, for it contrives to express something very plainly.—ED. *Spectator.*]

THE ANGLO-FRENCH COMMERCIAL TREATY.

[TO THE EDITOR OF THE "SPECTATOR."]

SIR,—I have been a reader of the *Spectator* for a good many years, and although you have not succeeded in converting me from the wicked ways of Toryism, you have contrived to impress me with a strong sense of your own scrupulous fairness to your opponents, and general desire to hear both sides of every question. I am sure, therefore, that you will bear with me whilst I try to set you right upon a matter of fact. In one of those sparkling paragraphs with which you preface your current number, I find you saying—anent the French Commercial Treaty—that it seems likely that that Treaty "will be simply rejected at Versailles, to the great satisfaction of the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, but to the great sorrow of English shipowners." I am not concerned to defend the Manchester Chamber of Commerce—its members are quite competent to do that work for themselves—but I venture to call your attention to the fact that you are under a misapprehension with regard to the *surtaxe de pavillon*. That impost was devised by M. Thiers and his right-hand-man, M. Pouyer-Quertier, in some degree as a Protectionist measure, but mainly as a means of inducing the Government of this country to consent to a Treaty by which England was to give certain large advantages to France in consideration of its remission. If, however, the English Administration had been patient for a few weeks longer, it is notorious that the tax would have been withdrawn without any consideration whatever. It was well known to every man of business in this city who had relations with France, and it was, moreover, expounded in a Paris letter in the *Times* some three weeks ago, that, thanks to this protective law, the producing classes of France were unable to obtain a market for their goods. The quays of Rouen, Havre, St. Malo, St. Nazaire, and in fact, all the northern and north-western ports, were loaded with agricultural produce. Under ordinary circumstances, that produce would have been exported in foreign bottoms. Thanks, however, to the *surtaxe de pavillon*, English shipping could not be found to carry it away, and the result was that a state of feeling was rapidly arising which, in a very short time, might have led to a new revolution. At this juncture the English Administration yielded; the Treaty was signed, and the *surtaxe de pavillon* ceased. M. Thiers had played a bold game, and had won. Had he lost, had our Government refused to conclude the Treaty—that impost must have gone, and