

LATTERLY—no matter where—I was present at a crowded and expectant meeting. The communication proved tedious, and I could not hear much of it, so from my position at the back of the platform I studied the expressions and gestures of the bored audience.

The feature that an instantaneous photograph, taken at any moment, would have most prominently displayed was the unequal horizontal interspace between head and head. When the audience is intent each person forgets his muscular weariness and skin discomfort, and he holds himself rigidly in the best position for seeing and hearing. As this is practically identical for persons who sit side by side, their bodies are parallel, and again, as they sit at much the same distances apart, their heads are correspondingly equidistant. But when the audience is bored the several individuals cease to forget themselves and they begin to pay much attention to the discomforts attendant on sitting long in the same position. They sway from side to side, each in his own way, and the intervals between their faces, which lie at the free end of the radius formed by their bodies, with their seat as the centre of rotation varies greatly. I endeavoured to give numerical expression for this variability of distance, but for the present have failed. I was, however, perfectly successful in respect to another sign of mutiny against constraint, inasmuch as I found myself able to estimate the frequency of fidget with much precision. It happened that the hall was semicircularly disposed and that small columns under the gallery were convenient as points of reference. From where I sat, 50 persons were included in each sector of which my eye formed the apex and any adjacent pair of columns the boundaries. I watched most of these sections in turn, some of them repeatedly, and counted the number of distinct movements among the persons they severally contained. It was curiously uniform, and about 45 per minute. As the sectors were rather too long for the eye to surely cover at a glance, I undoubtedly missed some movements on every occasion. Partly on this account and partly for the convenience of using round numbers I will accept 50 movements per minute among 50 persons, or an average of 1 movement per minute in each person, as nearly representing the true state of the case. The audience was mostly elderly; the young would have been more mobile. Circumstances now and then occurred that roused the audience to temporary attention, and the effect was twofold. First, the frequency of fidget diminished rather more than half; second, the amplitude and period of each movement were notably reduced. The swayings of head, trunk, and arms had before been wide and sluggish, and when rolling from side to side the individuals seemed to “yaw”; that is to say, they lingered in extreme positions. Whenever they became intent this peculiarity disappeared, and they performed their fidgets smartly. Let me suggest to observant philosophers when the meetings they attend may prove dull, to occupy themselves in estimating the frequency, amplitude, and duration of the fidgets of their fellow-sufferers. They must do so during periods both of intentness and of indifference, so as to eliminate what may be styled “natural fidget,” and then I think they may acquire the new art of

June 25, 1885]

NATU

giving numerical expression to the amount of boredom
expressed by the audience generally during the reading
of any particular memoir.

F. G.

to
an