Some Aspects of Christian Education.*  

BY THE HONORABLE W. BOURKE COCKRAN.

MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP, RIGHT REV. BISHOPS, REV. CLERGY, GENTLEMEN:

To be selected for special commendation by a Catholic institution of learning is the highest honor that can be achieved by a Catholic layman. As I listened to Father Morrissey's description of what the Laetare Medal represents, the high praise which it conveys, the lofty ideals it expresses, and as I realize the noble source from which it proceeds, the association which it creates, the sense of my own unworthiness would make its bestowal on me a source of embarrassment—almost of regret—if I did not interpret it as a shining proof of the inexhaustible tenderness with which the Church through all its agencies treats the least meritorious of her children—which makes her as eager to praise and as generous to reward as she is slow to censure and reluctant to condemn.

Father Morrissey describes in flattering terms the confidence of the great University over which he presides in my loyalty to the Church. If there be any public interest in this ceremony it turns on the interpretation which Catholics place upon loyalty to the Church. It is not for me to undertake a definition of a Catholic's spiritual duty. That is not a subject of human speculation, but a matter of divine revelation. But while matters of belief are not to be debated on platforms, but must be expounded from Catholic pulpits whence no error ever has been or ever can be preached, it is permissible and fitting for laymen to inquire what lessons of civic patriotism are conveyed by Catholic faith. How does loyalty to the Church affect loyalty to the State? What influence on citizenship has the divine law of which the Catholic Church is the depositary and the infallible exponent?

I have always believed, and I have never hesitated to say, nor to repeat at every opportunity, that in my judgment the Christian revelation is the very fountain and origin of republican government. Where can we find a justification for the vital principle of democratic institutions:—that man if clothed with extensive political powers is capable of sufficient virtue to exercise them for his own protection without perverting them to oppression of his neighbor—except in that the Christian doctrine which teaches the perfectibility of man through the saving influence of divine grace? Democracy is indeed the inevitable fruit of Christianity. The general acceptance of the one must lead to the general establishment of the other. The divine truth that all men are equal in the eye of God could not prevail throughout the world without

* Mr. Cockran's reply to the address of President Morrissey, on occasion of the presentation of the Laetare Medal, New York, May 14, 1901.
leading to a recognition of the political principle that all men are equal in the eye of the law. Equality in the eye of God does not mean that all men are of equal merit and therefore entitled to the same reward, but it means that all men have equal power to exercise the free will with which each man is endowed; and by equality before the law we do not mean that all men are equal in patriotism, in ability, in possessions, or in consequence, but that all men have an equal chance to achieve success under a government which stands impartial between them. Spiritual equality—the very essence of Catholic faith—is the fountain of political equality, and political equality is the vital principle of constitutional freedom, the very corner-stone on which this American government rests. Since Catholic doctrine is the root from which republicanism sprang, it must also be the most effective force to maintain republican government. The preservation of Catholic faith is therefore not merely the main object of religious loyalty, but it should be the supreme duty of civic patriotism.

By the preservation of the faith we mean not a mere nominal attendance at Catholic worship with mental reservations or hesitations about any feature of Catholic doctrine, but a loyal acceptance of every line by which the divine revelation was conveyed to man, and full recognition of the authority of the Church to interpret every word of it. This may seem easy in our day when freedom of conscience is almost universally acknowledged; but in every age the most valuable of our possessions is the most difficult to guard. If there is no longer reason to apprehend attempts to drive men from the faith by furious persecution there is reason to guard against insidious attempts to seduce them from it by appeals to their self-love, and to prevent flattery from proving a more dangerous weapon than fear.

We are told, for instance, that the world has outgrown the ancient faith; that intelligent Catholics should modify their belief to meet what some are pleased to consider the spirit of the age; in fine, that a man should exercise his limited and fallible judgment to review the word of the omniscient and omnipotent God. And these assaults upon the very basis of our faith are oftentimes all the more formidable because they are disguised under the attractive name of liberalism. In one sense I hope that every one of us is liberal. Indeed, if we be good Catholics we must be liberal in the broadest significance which we can attach to that word. He who is liberal with what belongs to him is generous; he who undertakes to be liberal with what does not belong to him is dishonest. The faith of Catholics is not founded on any act or agreement of men, but on the revelation of God. No human agency can change or modify the truth. If error can be admitted in the Scriptures, if one word be unfounded or superfluous, the whole ceases to be a divine revelation; and if it be not revelation it is imposture. Neither Church nor Pope can be liberal with the faith of which they are the custodians. Their sole duty is to guard and protect it as a precious deposit for the salvation of men. But while Catholics cannot be liberal in matters of faith they can be liberal in their attitude to those who differ with them. The Church can not compromise with error, nor tolerate it; but for those who reject the truth as she expounds it she has nothing but charity and prayer.

One important agency for the defence of faith and morals the Church maintains under exceptional difficulties but with dauntless vigor, inexhaustible forbearance and unwavering patriotism. The state recognizes now its obligation to prepare youth for the responsibilities of citizenship; but the intellectual training which it provides does not embrace moral instruction, and its attempt to make education non-sectarian has resulted in making it purely material. The Church, believing that any system of education which excludes moral training is incomplete, inadequate to the preservation of morality and therefore to the security of the State, following the whole lesson of her history, has undertaken to supply from her own resources those safeguards of society which the State has been unable to provide. This issue between Christian and purely material education, though surrounded by difficulties, is not hopeless or even discouraging. I can not doubt that it will be settled on the broad lines of justice, patriotism and morality, because the history of the world shows that no enterprise which the Church has held essential to the welfare of society and the progress of civilization, has disappeared from the face of the earth, but all of them are to-day in vigorous operation, and most of them supported by the whole power of the State.

The history of civil institutions for nineteen centuries is the record of a gradual but constant assumption by the State of enterprises
originally assumed by the Church as works of religion. The relief of the sick and the care of the needy, which the Church assumed in rude ages when the man who was unable to bear arms sank beneath the range of human sympathy, and was abandoned to die on the roadside in misery and suffering, the State now acknowledges as an obligation of civil society; and everywhere the support of hospitals and almshouses is imposed on the community through the power of taxation. During the warlike and violent period, when physical prowess was the sole method of attaining distinction, when learning was held in contempt and distrust, when a knowledge of grammar, or "grammarye"—as we find it described in medieval literature,—exposed its possessor to the suspicion of witchcraft, the Church maintained as part of her religious establishment schools which saved the light of learning from being extinguished under the feet of barbarous warring tribes; to-day the State recognizes the education of youth as a precaution essential to its own safety, and everywhere schools are maintained at public expense to prepare youth for the duties of manhood. The Church, believing the education furnished by the State to be inadequate and insufficient, has established at her own expense schools in which moral instruction is added to intellectual training. She does not believe that Catholics should be taxed twice for educational purposes—once by the law of the State for the support of the public schools, and again by their own sense of duty for the support of Christian schools; but while refraining on the one hand from encouraging what she regards as injustice by approval or acquiescence, and on the other from seeking justice through disloyalty or disorder, she pursues her work of morality, civilization and patriotism, relying upon time, circumstance, and above all on truth, to convince a highly intelligent people that the education which embraces moral and secular instruction is a powerful influence for the maintenance of order and law, and therefore a force to be encouraged by every supporter of republican government.

Why should not every citizen, Catholic or Protestant, Christian or pagan, commend and approve every force that operates to preserve and confirm Catholic doctrine? What influence can Catholicism exercise that does not make for order, for law, for progress, and for prosperity? There is not a service demanded from the citizen by the State as a matter of civic duty which the Church does not enjoin upon him as a matter of conscience. There is no act prohibited by the State through its laws which the Church does not condemn by its censure.

It is true that the State appears to sanction some things which the Church condemns. It may be said, for instance, that the law allows divorce, while religion holds the marriage tie to be indissoluble, but even here very slight reflection will show that the Church and the State are not in conflict but in harmony. While in some states divorce is allowed, nowhere is it encouraged. Where it is permitted it is defended upon the ground that it is the lesser of two evils. Viewed merely from its political effect, the attitude of Catholics on this question is surely the sounder. The distinction between Christian civilizations and all the civilizations which it has supplanted is the sacred character with which it surrounds the home. The family is the foundation of Christian society. The Christian state is but an aggregation of families. Especially is this true of a republic which depends for its safety and strength, not upon the splendor of its government but upon the integrity of the hearthstones on which that government rests. The very existence of the family depends upon the Christian marriage. We Catholics believe that as well might we permit the stones in these foundations to be separated without endangering the structure which rests upon them, as to permit the marriage tie to be relaxed, dissolved, or imperilled without danger to the State which is built upon it. But whether men believe that divorce is permissible or indefensible, nobody believes that it is desirable, and everyone regards its increase as deplorable. The way to check divorce is to check the causes for which it is granted and on which it is defended. Catholic influence, Catholic doctrine, Catholic education, are the most effective agencies to accomplish this result. Their growth and activity are therefore contributions to the foundations of the State which good men of all sects and creeds should encourage. And so I think we may say with perfect safety that every commandment of the Church is an incentive to patriotism; every one of her prohibitions is a precaution against disorder and crime.

What more patriotic wish could anyone express than a hope that the moral law embraced in Catholic doctrine should become
the governing influence of every citizen's life? If the value of a tree is to be judged by its fruit, surely the merit of religious belief is to be judged by the results which it has produced. To realize what Catholicism has effected for humanity we have but to contrast the social conditions of to-day with those which prevailed when the Gospel of peace and love was first preached on the shores of Lake Galilee.

In the Gospel read during the Mass on the Sunday before last it is recorded that our divine Saviour conversing with His Apostles said that there were many things which He had yet to tell them, but they were not then able to bear them. How clearly these words show that His omniscient glance ranged through the corridors of time and discerned the fruits which His revelation would bear through the centuries. Suppose at that moment—in the midst of that society corrupt and debased, where the bonds which held men in social relations were those of fear and distrust; where all labor was servile; where the slave hated his master; where the master feared the slave; where Caesar distrusted the noble and the noble plotted against Caesar; where a few rioted in profigate luxury, while vast multitudes preferred to accept a miserable existence supported by tribute levied on conquered nations rather than win abundance from the soil by honest industry; where ferocity was the dominant characteristic of all classes and the lust of blood the dominant appetite, both imperatively demanding satisfaction by the murder of human beings; where corruption of morals was so universal and so hideous that the very existence of the race was imperilled, —suppose at that time our divine Saviour had undertaken to foretell that a day was coming when under the influence of His revelation, through the spread of His Gospel, nations would base their laws, not upon distrust of men's vices, but in confidence in their virtues; where a mighty republic should overspread a continent where men would engage in toil, not through fear of the lash but through voluntary co-operation; where labor would not be servitude and degradation but dignity and consequence; where, instead of maintaining amphitheatres for the destruction of human life, the public revenues would be used to maintain hospitals for the saving of human life; where instead of military camps to force obedience to laws which the people hated, the State would erect ballot boxes for the people to enact the laws through representatives of their own selection; where the chief power among men was not the sword which destroys, glittering in the hand of mercenary soldiers, but the cross, typifying the immeasurable sacrifice through which men were saved, casting its gentle shadow over the highway from the steeples of churches in every village and town, where at the close of each day the sun did not sink upon millions discontented, silent and subjected, but upon multitudes free, contented, prosperous and hopeful—if He had prophesied that the general acceptance of His word would bear these fruits in the course of nineteen centuries, would not His hearers have been more deeply shocked than they were when they heard Him declare that His "flesh was meat indeed" and His "blood was drink indeed?"

In the light of the fruits which Christianity has borne we may measure, though faintly, the fruits which it may yet produce. If the moral law was universally observed, can anyone doubt that government would be relieved from any necessity of exercising its punitive or coercive power, and that it would become merely a powerful device to promote the co-operation of man, to reinforce industry by facilitating means of transportation, to modify the harshest decrees of nature by providing for the relief of sickness and of misery? Conceive to yourselves a society where justice is so universal that courts would be closed for lack of suitors to complain, where no man need be withdrawn from industry to preserve the peace because everyone would respect the rights of his neighbor; where armies would be disbanded because right and morality would govern the relations of states as of individuals; where every pair of human hands would be employed in the productive fields of industry, none diverted to the wasteful enterprises of war, resulting in such a vastly increased production of commodities as would spread measureless comfort and prosperity through all classes of society, and you can form some conception of the fruits which Christianity has yet to produce. Is this a fanciful picture? Am I foreshadowing the millenium rather than measuring the natural course of human progress? Remember, my friends, it is but a hundred years ago since every man was forced to carry his sword because every person that he met in the highway was a potential enemy to his life and to his liberty, while to-day a man can walk in the dead of night through the most lonely highway and if he meets his fellowman he shows no fear of him,
but approaches him cheerfully and confidently with very little doubt that if he need assistance on his journey he will get it.

I do not believe the wildest dream of improvement that we can indulge is extravagant in the light of the progress which man has already achieved. But however that may be, this much at least is true: the number of those who yield obedience to law only through coercion is steadily diminishing, while the number of those who loyally support it is every day increasing. Their widening circle of morality and justice is a distinct triumph of Christianity. To broaden it still further is the task to which every good citizen must address himself. And surely the best way to accomplish that result is to support the agencies by which regard for the moral law is implanted in the bosom of youth—to encourage Catholic education which is at once the mainstay of religion and the bulwark of citizenship.

It is with a sense of the most profound satisfaction and gratitude that I accept this honor from a great Catholic University, and that I interpret it as enrolling me among the number of those who by contributing in some way to the defense of Catholic faith are strengthening the foundations of this government and helping to make this Republic a mighty engine for the regeneration and uplifting of the human race.

Shelley as a Romancer.

EDWARD T. LONG, 1900.

At the age of six Shelley began the study of Latin together with his sister Helen, who is his best biographer, from the Rev. Mr. Edwards, a good old country parson. From this man, doubtless, he learned to admire the heroic works of missionaries and isolated country parsons irrespective of their creeds. The lad often surprised his parents and his master, but Shelley always admired his old instructor. About this time he would astonish all at Field Place "by repeating word for word Gray's lines on the 'Cat and the Gold Fish.'" At eight Shelley tried verse writing, and a few stanzas of "Lines to a Cat" have been left. At ten he left home to attend school at Sion House, Isleworth, near Brentford.

The great man, the man that is a power in the world, whom the future world will know did exist, in his youth either intentionally or unawares shows what he as a man sincerely believes and will be. Milton at school frequently gave marks of the deep things he was to portray; Michael Angelo even in childhood was inspiring; Rousseau was always insincere, and the companions of Voltaire never found him believing in established and holy truths. Shelley has often been blamed for his atheistical tendencies, and many of his works are decidedly atheistic; yet in some there is a laudable praise of all Christian institutions, although Mr. Shairp would have us believe that he was an utter infidel. Shelley admired all sincere ministers of the Gospel, and rightly hated all impostors. He believed that "sin came into this world by man himself." If his "Queen Mab" is atheistic, I think it is the production of an overeager and unphilosophic mind. In any manner, it is contradicted by this narrative of Peacock, one of the boys that Shelley ever made a friend and confidant:

"We were walking in the early summer through the village where there was a good vicarage house with a nice garden, and the front wall of the vicarage was covered with corchorus in full flower. He stood some time admiring the vicarage wall. The extreme quietness of the scene, the pleasant pathway through the village churchyard and the brightness of the summer morning concurred to produce the impression under which he suddenly said to me: 'I feel strongly inclined to enter the church. Of the moral doctrines of Christianity I am a more decided disciple than many of its more ostentatious professors. Consider for a moment how much good a good clergyman may do. It is an admirable institution that admits of the possibility of diffusing such men over the surface of the land.'" Shelley was always a man of impressions, of many moods, more changeable than the winds, and as unfixed and unstable in his youthful thoughts and aspirations and also in his manly actions as the bloom of beauty on a maiden's cheek.
magicians. The one that delighted him most was "Peter Wilkins and his Flying Wives." He also read the forbidden and pernicious works of Richardson, Fielding and Smollet, but they were too tame, too sober, too realistic, for young Shelley. "He liked tales of thrilling adventure, of heroic and superhuman passion." The romances of Mrs. Radcliffe delighted him and thereafter Shelley was loved and admired by all except by the two defeated heroes. One man at Eton, however, influenced Shelley more than any man he ever met. This was Doctor Lind, a learned physician and chemist living at Windsor. He initiated Shelley into philosophy and guided him in the reading of the ancients. He also instilled into his youthful hearer a dislike for the royalists. He was a man that Shelley then particularly needed to bring out all that was hidden within him. He was more of a friend and guide to Shelley than the poet's father. Shelley writes of him: "This man is exactly what an old man ought to be: free, calm, spirited, full of benevolence and even of youthful ardor. I owe to that man far more than I owe to my father." Shelley never forgot this friend, and all his pictures of good and kind old men are pen-paintings of his Eton mentor. The aged Hermit delivering Laon from prison and Zonoras in "Prince Athanaise" are undoubtedly the poet's old master. Under his supervision Shelley read Plato, Pliny the Elder, and had partly translated "Natural History." Shelley's lessons were easy for him, and he spent most of his time reading and translating the ancients. He always had a solar microscope and tales of fairies and goblins beside him, and was continually dwelling in a world superhuman and marvellous. The old man understood the genius of the lad and supplied him with everything that his youthful mind and fancy desired.

The vacations and the months Shelley was absent from school he used to spend with his sisters teaching them verse-writing, but loving especially to show them chemical experiments and his galvanic battery. He delighted in the blue flame of electricity and would spend hours gazing in ecstasy at it. His greatest amusement with his sisters was to dress them up as angels or fiends and to tell them the fantastic and romantic stories of the "Great Tortoise and the Old Snake." The story that amused his sisters most was that of the alchemist, Cornelius Agrippa. Already the marvellous, the wonderful, the strange, the unnatural, appeared natural and best to this
young Etonian, and he tried to instil his fancies and ideas into the mind of his sisters. They were the fond admirers of their beautiful and gifted brother and they were the only home-tie of Shelley. He disliked his father as the description of old Cenci testifies. When his mother died the traditional novercal, of Puritan ideas at that, was placed over him, and henceforward Shelley was never allowed to remain long with his sisters lest he ruin them forever. The description of Shelley's strange and weird genius from the age of fourteen to eighteen is best given in the language of one of his school-fellows: "I was too young to form any estimate of character, but I loved Shelley for his kindness and affectionate ways; he was not made to endure the rough and boisterous pastimes at Eton, and his shy and gentle nature was glad to escape far away to muse over strange fancies, for his mind was reflective and teeming with deep thought. His love of nature was intense, and the sparkling poetry of his mind shone out of his sparkling eyes when he was dwelling on anything good or great. His was a disposition that needed a special, personal superintendence to watch, cherish and direct his noble aspirations and remarkable tenderness of heart." Shelley was always known as a dreamer.

Although Shelley loved to gaze at the stars, to people the heavens with strange beings, to live in a fantastic world of his own romantic imagination, still his genius would not leave him idle. At fourteen he wrote Latin verses very well and translated Greek creditably, and at this age he wrote plays with his school-fellow, Amos, and they brought out their productions before an audience of one every night during sleeping hours. He delved into Shakspeare, and remembered all that was romantic, weird and strange. At sixteen he began his romances that were the source, the nourishing spring, the exact prototype of the Oxford Atheism, "Hellas," "Queen Mab," "The Revolt of Islam," and the life and actions of the poet himself. The romances of Shelley are not well known, nor are they of much literary value, yet in them the great and strange poet of maturer years is in embryo. In my opinion they are the keynote to Shelley's character and his work, without which it is almost impossible to understand him and his poetry adequately. They are the logical outcome of his reading, a satisfaction of his youthful fancies, the output of his younger days before he met the philosophers of Oxford and before his true genius was discovered and perfected.

The characteristic mark of Shelley's whole life was his intense ardor for action. He mus always be doing something. His experiments, his digressions with his sisters, his fight against faggers, his wonderful application to dead languages, his youthful and dreamy writings, are continually urging him onward in the pursuit of his ideal. His was a ceaseless activity, and to think, with Shelley, was the same as to act. He asked not the why nor the wherefore, but always acted with the fire of youth and disliked any one that dreamt too long of consequences. In everything he saw something that could be amended, and the mission he set himself to fulfil was that of reformer. At sixteen he was already the author of a romance in which the idea of reformation is most prominent.

Shelley is the author of two romances, "Zastrozzi" and "St. Irvyne." In 1810, the former, a romance that is as wild and incongruous as the title is odd, was brought out by Shelley. The publisher gave forty pounds for it, the critics shunned it, and no one bought a copy. The book is full of the bombastic speech of his day; but the qualities—scene, painting and naturalness in some of the characters depicted, are remarkable for a lad of seventeen. In it are all the theories, wild fancies and hallucinations of his after years. Three years after the publication of his romances Shelley writes: "Though quite uncharacteristic of me as I am now, nevertheless these romances serve to mark the state of my mind at the period of their composition. St. Irvyne and Zastrozzi represent my boyish visions which were wild,"

The hero of "Zastrozzi" is the bastard son of an Italian duke and Oliva Zastrozzi who has been seduced and shamefully abandoned by the duke. On her death-bed the boy promises under oath to wreak vengeance on his father and all that bear his detested name—Verezzi. He is not satisfied with planting the poniard in the heart of his father, but he pursues the young Count Verezzi with refined torture to enjoy the delights of revenge at leisure. Zastrozzi strikes his victim with the sharp weapon of love. Two women are infatuated with Verezzi: Julia, to whom the young Count has devoted his heart and life, Matilda, a bewitching siren. Both are beautiful and burn with the same jealous passion.

(CONCLUSION NEXT WEEK.)
PRAYER.

I strolled among the hills at evening's close,
And watched the world lapse into night's repose.
I hoped when all the din of day would go
My soul should feel the calm—I dreamed 'twas so.

But shadows passing into deeper gloom
Seemed but the pall that curtains in the tomb.
And like a gull blown farther from the shore
My soul seemed burdened greater than before.

And then a sigh broke from my troubled breast.
"'Tis vain to search if here I find no rest!"

But turning blindly to the sky, a prayer
Escaped my lips half mingled with despair.

And lo! I felt the throb of trouble cease
And in my soul I knew the joy of peace.

The Dreamer.

When oft by sleepy night beguiled,
My mind to seek repose is gone.
My soul will, like a straying child,
From land to land go wand'ring on;
I listen to the sea's commotion,
I see the waves break on the shore,
My heart is full, and its emotion
Keeps running o'er and o'er.

Then to my native land in dreams,
My vagrant fancy oft takes wing.
And though I'm sad, to me it seems
A purer love these sorrows bring;
I seek again a new-made mound,
A simple stone placed o'er its head.
For underneath that flowery ground,
My youthful soul lies dead.

Now more I'll let my fancy fetch
My wearied heart to distant lands:
No more I'll stand a lonely wretch,
Amourning on bleak foreign strands,
But far above on Sinai's top,
I'll watch my slowly coming doom.
The blazing stars my funeral lamps,
The entire world my tomb.

WHY.

'Tis not at all my lady's grace,
Nor eyes of deepest blue;
'Tis naught about her lovely face,
That keeps me always true.

'Tis not the sheen of golden hair
Above a brow pure white;
'Tis not her charming winsome air,
And not her smile so bright.

'Tis not for these I am in thrall
Of Cupid, dainty elf;
It is because, and this is all,
My lady is herself.

Few legends are more pathetic than that of the Wandering Jew. Poems of merit have been based upon it, but as yet no genius has appeared to do it justice. Only when a writer who has an accurate knowledge of ecclesiastical as well as of profane history, together with a touch of poetic fire, takes the matter in hand, shall we enjoy a production worthy of its subject.

The first European author to speak of this legend was Matthew Paris, who wrote in the thirteenth century. He says that in 1229 an Armenian archbishop arrived in England, bringing interesting information concerning the Orient. When asked if he had heard anything about a certain "Joseph," concerning whom many strange reports had reached England, he answered that he had spoken with the man; had dined with him and received a minute account of his life. The Jew, called Calphurnius, had been a janitor at the time of our Lord's sufferings. He was standing at the door of his house when Jesus passed on His way to Calvary. Our Lord stopped before Calphurnius' house, and the latter striking Him on the back said: "Walk on, Jesus, walk on." Our Saviour looked mournfully at the poor wretch, and said: "I shall walk on, but thou shalt remain until I return."

Soon after this Calphurnius was baptized by Ananias, took the name of Joseph, and thenceforth became a homeless wanderer. Once every century he fell ill and became rejuvenated, always appearing at the time of recuperation to be thirty years old, his age when he insulted Christ.

The next mention we have of the Wandering Jew is in the chronicles of the sixteenth century. He appeared in Hamburg in 1546; very tall and emaciated, in beggar's rags, and repeated the story of his insult to our Lord. He was seen in Naumburg shortly after this; he never sat down, being forced to a continuous walk. His history and portrait were for sale at Tournay in 1616. He also appeared in England in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Colerus, a lawyer of Lubeck, says that the Jew displayed an intimate knowledge, as far as men could judge, of the careers of the various Apostles, and that he knew thoroughly.
the events, trivial and great, of the past centuries of the Christian era.

Ahasuerus, as the Jew called himself, next appeared on the Matterhorn and in France and Hungary. He claimed that he belonged to the Tribe of Naphthali; that his father was a carpenter and his mother a seamstress, employed at the temple of Jerusalem in embroidering the vestments of the Levites. He was born in the year 3962. His father trained him in the knowledge of the Moasic law, and taught him many wonderful historical facts. When Ahasuerus spoke of the Passion of Christ he gave a minute account of his insult to our Lord: "I was standing at my door," he said, "when the crowd which accompanied Jesus to Calvary approached. I lifted up my child that he might have a good look at the Victim. When Jesus, staggering under the weight of the Cross, had arrived in front of us, He stopped as though He would like to rest. 'Away with You from my door!' cried I. 'No ribald shall rest here.' Then Jesus directed a sorrowful glance at me and said: 'I go, and shall find repose; but thou shalt travel and find no rest. Thou shalt walk while the world is the world; and then thou shalt behold Me on My throne at the right hand of My Father, when I judge the twelve tribes of Israel who are now about to crucify Me.' I put away my boy and followed Jesus. The first person whom I met was Veronica, who was just approaching to wipe the sweat from Christ's holy face. As you know, the imprint of His features was fixed upon the towel. Then I saw Mary and other weeping women. A workman was carrying a hammer and some nails very close to us, and I seized one of the nails, and thrusting it directly under the eyes of the Mother of Jesus, I gloatingly cried: 'Look, woman! this is one of the nails which will fasten thy Son to the Cross.' Then came the crucifixion."

Soon after the death of our Lord, Ahasuerus cast a mournful look on Jerusalem and began his travels. He tells that he travelled for a whole century before he saw Jerusalem again; how he yearned for death, for all relatives, friends and acquaintances were gone. All his attempts on his life were in vain. He fought in many battles, receiving thousands of apparently deadly strokes; but he could not even be wounded, for "his body was as hard as a rock and inpenetrable to mortal weapon." He tried to drown himself, but "he walked on the waves, or floated like a feather." He sometimes ate, but needed no food; he never had a serious illness, and his clothes and shoes did not wear out.

Many have claimed to be this mysterious individual during the centuries, but no one has so impressed the people with the idea of his veracity as did this Ahasuerus. Among the writers who speak of Calphurnius there is a great diversity of opinion as to the genuineness of his claims. Matthew Paris has no doubt of his veracity. Many of the seventeenth century show some hesitancy; Boulanger does not believe and says: "Credat Judaeus Apella; non ego!" Most of the consideration given to this tale comes from very incredulous parties—namely, the German Protestants.

Such was the legend of the Wandering Jew as believed twelve centuries ago. "That the story was accepted by many Christians as well founded in its essential features, is not at all surprising; for probably it was regarded, when it first originated, as a mere allegory, illustrative of the condition of the Jewish people since their final dispersion—scattered over the earth, deprived of their national existence, and immovably obstinate in their rejection of Christianity." In Ahasuerus was recognized the Jewish race, bearing the punishment of that awful imprecation: "His Blood be upon us and upon our children!" Perhaps the most interesting point to be debated in this tale is that the Jews, as the end of the world approaches, will admit Jesus as their Messiah and God. After centuries of hopeless wanderings without rest or comfort they will come to the feet of Jesus of Nazareth, and washing them with tears of repentance will cry out: "My Lord and my God!" Great has been their sin, but the Christ whom they crucified on Calvary came to bring the sinner home; and will receive them at the last day, and this is the beautiful part of the legend of the Wandering Jew.
Notre Dame's Debaters Win Once More.

(Special telegram to the Notre Dame Scholastic.)

To-night Notre Dame won in debate from the University of Indianapolis. The victory is creditable, for Indianapolis had a very strong team. Before the contest the students of Irvington were very hopeful, and they freely expressed the opinion that their team was much stronger than last year.

The question was: Resolved, that the permanent retention of the Philippines by the United States is undesirable.

The debate was opened for the affirmative by Charles McElroy. He argued that the negative must show that more benefits will result to the United States and to the Philippines by permanent retention than by temporary retention. His strong point was that, according to our precedents and the spirit of our Constitution, we can not hold the Philippines as dependencies or colonies.

The negative side was opened by George W. Kupper, who not only destroyed the force of the arguments of the preceding speaker, but completely turned the tables on his opponents, and demonstrated that the burden of proof of the whole subject rested upon the affirmative. Mr. Kupper established decisively our constitutional right permanently to retain and to govern the Philippines as territory.

The second speaker of the affirmative aimed to prove that because of mixed racial conditions the people of the Philippines could never be assimilated. He further contended that permanent retention is undesirable.

The second speaker for Notre Dame was H. P. Barry. After showing in a lucid manner the fallacy of the previous speaker's contention, he proved that permanent retention was demanded by every reason of justice and humanity, and for our political safety as a nation.

Mr. W. Mehring, the last speaker of the affirmative, reviewed the arguments of his colleagues, and showed that no economic benefit could be derived by permanent retention. He argued that the retention of the islands would not secure the trade of the Orient.

The closing speaker for the negative was Byron V. Kanaley. He pointed out the inconsistency of the previous speaker's economic arguments, and demonstrated that upon permanent retention depends our commercial strength as a nation, and that fundamentally
upon this depend our welfare and existence; that economically it is for the best interest of the people of the United States and the people of the Philippines.

The rebuttal for Notre Dame was made by George Kuppler. In a sweeping argument he thoroughly reviewed the contentions of the affirmative and showed the weakness of their arguments. He then recapitulated, giving in order the points which the negative had established, and concluded by a stirring appeal.

Mr. Mehring in beginning his rebuttal created a sensation by making a demand unusual in collegiate debates. Our speakers had presented their arguments in full, and felt that they could do no more for the negative side. Mr. Mehring, however, gave them another opportunity by insisting that the negative proved by every precedent of our national career that we can hold the Philippines as territory.

The second negative speaker stated that if the Filipinos ever became capable of exercising the rights of self-government, they would probably be admitted into statehood. There is no inconsistency here. It is the logical continuation of our argument.”

At this point of Mr. Kanaley’s answer, Mr. Mehring nervously said: “That will do.” It had done, and Mr. Kanaley, instead of taking a mean advantage of the affirmative’s blunder by continuing the argumentation for the negative, gracefully closed.

Our men were encouraged by the presence of a number of Notre Dame supporters, among whom were Sherman Steele, ’97, Maurice A. Neville, ’99, Vincent D. Dwyer, 1900, Anthony F. Dorley, 1900, and F. Dwyer. Elsewhere we quote from the Indianapolis Sentinel, May 23.
Notre Dame Wins the Triangular Meet.

For the third consecutive time our athletes succeeded in winning the banner at the Third Annual Triangular Meet with Indiana and Purdue held at Bloomington last Saturday. Notre Dame secured almost one half the total number of points, scoring 63, Purdue, 38, and Indiana, 34. It had been generally conceded that we would win, though it was thought that the score would be somewhat closer as we were without representatives in either of the bicycle races or the mile run.

So far as the performance of the athletes is concerned, the meet was a success. The poor track and a stiff wind, which was blowing all afternoon, prevented any fast work. But even under these circumstances two state records were broken by our men; Uffendall lowering the half mile from 2.02—which was formerly held by Connors of Notre Dame—to 2.01 3-5 and Kirby the 220-yard hurdles to .26.

The runs were easy for our men. Captain Corcoran, as usual, ran away from the “bunch” in both the dashes without much exertion, his team-mate, Staples, easily securing second place in both events. The quarter mile was a walk-away for our speedy runners; Murphy, Kirby and Gearin finishing in the order named. The Indiana rooters had evidently figured on their man, Teeter, winning the half, and when this event was begun the band struck up a lively air in anticipation of a victory. However, Mr. Uffendall had not been reckoned with, and when he broke the tape in 2.01 3-5, at least 25 yards to the good, the rooters fell back with groans and the band ceased playing. Murphy also ran a pretty race in this event, finishing third after setting a fast pace. The 120-yard hurdle race was one of the most interesting events of the meet. Endsley of Purdue and Herbert of Notre Dame were neck and neck up to the tape when Endsley lunged forward and won out by about three feet. The other hurdle race, the 220, was easy for Kirby, Herbert second. Considering the fact that this was Kirby’s first trial in a Varsity meet, his work was very good.

In the field events our men were not quite so strong, as Glynn and Eggeman were both suffering from sore ankles. They had no trouble, however, getting first and second in the shot-put. Glynn’s ankle prevented him from doing any work in the other events. In the hammer throw Elfers of Indiana won out from “Big” John on his last throw by three inches. Kearney did good work in the pole vault, but was handicapped by having to use one much heavier than he has been accustomed to, his own having broken at the first trial. The hardness of the ground and the blunt end of a pole threw Joe Sullivan entirely out of form in the pole vault. Richon deserves praise for his good work in the high and the running broad jumps. This is also his first appearance in a Varsity meet, and with a little experience he will make a good man.

The result of the meet was evident from the beginning, and the interest of the spectators was centred in the fight between Purdue and Indiana for second place. They were tied when the last event, the pole vault, was reached, but Endsley of Purdue soon placed his Alma Mater in the lead by winning it. Endsley was easily the star of the Purdue team, securing first in the 120 hurdles, high jump, and the pole vault. Miller was their star in the field events. Indiana’s best performers were Elfers and Shockley. The latter displayed good form in the running broad jump which he won at 21 feet 7 5/8 inches. This meet practically decides the championship of Indiana, although our men are down at Lafayette to day competing for that honour.

**SUMMARY.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Notre Dame</th>
<th>Stanford</th>
<th>Purdue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One hundred yard dash</td>
<td>Corcoran, Notre Dame, first; Staples, Notre Dame, second; Rice, Purdue, third</td>
<td>Time, .10 3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hundred and twenty yard dash</td>
<td>Corcoran, Notre Dame, first; Staples, Notre Dame, second; Rice, Purdue, third</td>
<td>Time, .22 3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four hundred and forty yard dash</td>
<td>Murphy, Notre Dame, first; Kirby, Notre Dame, second; Gearin, Notre Dame, third</td>
<td>Time, 53 2-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight hundred and eighty yard run</td>
<td>Uffendall, Notre Dame, first; Teeter, Indiana, second; Murphy, Notre Dame, third</td>
<td>Time, 3.01 3-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One hundred and twenty yard hurdles</td>
<td>Endsley, Purdue, first; Herbert, Notre Dame, second; Smith, Indiana, third</td>
<td>Time, .16 2-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two hundred and twenty yard hurdles</td>
<td>Kirby, Notre Dame, first; Herbert, Notre Dame, second; Gwinn, Purdue, third</td>
<td>Time, .26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mile run</td>
<td>Miller, Purdue, first; Neher, Indiana, second; Jordan, Indiana, third</td>
<td>Time, 4.44 1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarter mile bicycle</td>
<td>Rawlins, Indiana, first; Clark, Indiana, second; Kiebel, Purdue, third</td>
<td>Time, 38 4-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer throw</td>
<td>Elfers, Indiana, first; Eggeman, Notre Dame, second; Gesner, Indiana, third</td>
<td>Time, 304 feet 7 inches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pole vault</td>
<td>Kiebel, Purdue, first; Kearney, Notre Dame, second; Foster, Indiana, third</td>
<td>Time, 10 feet 6 inches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running high jump</td>
<td>Endsley, Purdue, first; Smith, Indiana, second; Richon, Notre Dame, third</td>
<td>Time, 5 feet 8 inches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running broad jump</td>
<td>Shockley, Indiana, first; Richon, Notre Dame, second; Corin, Purdue, third</td>
<td>Time, 21 feet 7 5/8 inches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some of our exchanges have a special column not found in the ordinary college paper. One of the most noticeable is the "Free Press" in the *Wellesley Magazine*. Woman always believes in free speech and free press, and in this case we quite agree with her. So long as this is not used as a medium for the expression of personal enmity, it could well be imitated by other college magazines.

*The St. John's Collegian* holds a creditable place in college journalism. In the April issue, however, there is but one piece of verse. Nothing is more desirable, nothing lends more grace and sprightliness to a magazine, than a bit of verse interspersed among the stories and essays. A magazine without verse is a field without flowers. The criticism of "The Ancient Mariner" is somewhat brief. In his conclusion the writer shows that Coleridge's personal feeling influenced the poem, and that he was forced unwittingly "to lay bare his own heart, and most sacred emotions."

*The Red and Blue* from Pennsylvania never fails to please. Much amusement is to be found in "The Sketch Book"; and the editorials are never loose but always show good judgment. The stories have a light, easy movement, and the strain usually seen in our college tales is avoided. "The Ideal" touches a melancholy heart-chord that vibrates long after the words are forgotten. "A Cradle Song" is a pretty little lullaby with a calm and soothing tone. "The Nepah" is a successful departure from the ordinary magazine article, and it has a note of weirdness that makes it fascinating.

*The Tennessee University Magazine* is particularly noticeable for its short stories and sketches. Many of them show much skill and ingenuity. In the May number "The Hero Worshipper" paints the character of the coquette in a pleasing manner. The conversation is ably handled. The negro characters in "A Possum Hunt" and "Uncle Josh's Mule" say some very amusing things. In "Sharps and Flats" are some entertaining sketches. The vein of humour running through the revision of "Little Red Riding Hood" indicates that the author is an ardent admirer of Bill Nye.

Last Wednesday the annual Preparatory and Collegiate elocution contests were held in Washington Hall. Remarkably good work was done in both contests, and it was a very difficult matter for the judges to choose the winners. Professor O'Connor is certainly to be congratulated on the ability displayed by his students. The Junior medal fell to Master Louis Wagner. The Senior medal, given by the Hon. P. T. Barry of Chicago, was won by Mr. Fred Schoonover. The judges were Rev. Father Maguire, Dr. Austin O'Malley and Professor Edward Walsh.

The selections given by Master Leport Van Sant were well interpreted. His comic selection, "The Young Actor," especially showed ability and promise. The ease and naturalness displayed by Master Cornelius Hagerty was particularly commendable. His presentation of the "School-boy of the Period" would almost lead one to believe that he was detailing a personal experience. Master Louis Wagner, the successful contestant among the Juniors, showed remarkable finish for so young an elocutionist. Like the other young men his comic piece excelled his serious effort.

As was to be expected, the collegiate men showed more elocution and mastery of emotion than did their younger fellow-artists. Mr. F. G. Schoonover's interpretation of "The Polish Boy" was very realistic and touching, and, coupled with his laughter-provoking presentation of "Shamarocka de Sullivano," won for him the justly-prized Barry Medal, a no slight honour when the high merit of his rivals is taken into consideration. Mr. Leo Kelly, a new man in the field, gave a thrilling recital of the last ride of "Skimpsey," the jockey. Mr. Orrin White, who achieved a so marked success as the Queen, in "Hamlet," may be said to have almost realized the possibilities contained in "Ben Hur's Chariot Race," and that is saying a great deal.

**THE PROGRAMME.**

**JUNIOR DIVISION—SERIOUS RECITATIONS.**

Overture—"Morning, Noon and Night".........Suppé
"The Polish Boy".......................Leport Van Sant
"The Vagabonds".......................Cornelius Hagerty
"The Boy Hero".........................Louis Wagner

**COMIC RECITATIONS.**

"The Young Actor".......................Leport Van Sant
"Schoolboy of the Period"................Cornelius Hagerty
"O, I Dunno".........................Louis Wagner
Gavotte—"You and I"....................Delsarte
SENIOR DIVISION.—SERIOUS RECITATIONS.

"The Polish Boy".............. Fred B. Schoonover
"Skimpsey"..................... Leo J. Kelly
"Ben Hur's Chariot Race"......... Orrin White

COMIC RECITATIONS.

"Shamarocka de Sullivano"..... Fred B. Schoonover
"Calling a Boy".................. Leo J. Kelly
"Wakin' the Young Uns"........... Orrin White

Serenade—"La Paloma".......... Czilmlka

JUDGES.

Rev. Joseph A. Maguire, C. S. C.
Austin O'Malley; M.D., Ph.D., LL.D.
Edward Walsh, A. B., LL. M.

Another Defeat.

MINNESOTA, 5; NOTRE DAME, 4.

Minnesota took another game from our fellows Tuesday, but the contest was so close that the victory was not a certainty until the last man was put out. With the score five to three against us in the ninth inning Notre Dame made a last desperate attempt to overcome the lead of their opponents. One run was the result of our work, and the second game had been lost to the Gophers. Fleet stood on the slab throughout the nine innings and pitched magnificent ball. Had the team given our pitcher proper support Minnesota would not have scored. Lynch was the only in-fielder to keep his name out of the error-column.

SUMMARY.

MINNESOTA

Plymat, 3 b 3 2 1 3 0
Cameron, s s 2 2 1 1 1
Allen, 1 f 1 1 2 0 0
Metcalf, 1 b 1 0 1 3 1 0
Leach, c 1 2 1 2 1
Hurley, r f 0 0 3 0 0
Solem, 2 b 0 1 3 2 0
Varco, c f 1 1 3 0 0
Jordan, p 1 1 0 7 1

Totals 10 10 27 16 3

NOTRE DAME

Lynch, s s 2 1 1 2 0
Morgan, 1 b 0 2 6 0 0
Farley, r f 0 0 1 0 0
Donahoe, c f 1 1 6 0 0
Bergen, 3 b 0 2 1 2 1
Walsh, 2 b 0 0 5 3 0
O'Neil, c 0 0 3 1 3
Ryan, p 1 2 0 1 2
Duggan, 1 f 1 0 1 0 0

Totals 5 8 24 11 4

MINNESOTA—o 1 2 0 0 1 4 2 * 10
NOTRE DAME—o 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 2 = 5

Wisconsin Defeats Notre Dame.

There must be some kind of a hoodoo following our baseball men on this Northwest tour. After losing two games to Minnesota, games that, according to all the rules of baseball we should and would have won ordinarily, we now go down before Wisconsin's mediocre team. Ryan's arm was so seriously hurt in the first game with the Gopher team that he will be unable to pitch for some time. On account of this accident Jimmie Morgan was sent in to twirl against the Badgers. "Red" had speed enough, but he was as wild as a colt. Harry Hogan supplanted Morgan, but he was little better than the former. O'Neill had a bad day, owing in a great measure to the wildness of the pitchers. The field was in a bad condition after a heavy rain, and the men fairly skated over the ground. Score: Wisconsin, 16; Notre Dame, 6.

**Scores**

**Wisconsin**—2 2 0 5 1 1 0 2 =16  
**Notre Dame**—0 0 1 0 3 1 0 1 = 6

Bases on balls—Off Morgan, five; off Hogan, 4; off Matthews, 2. Struck out—By Matthews, 4; by Morgan, 1; by Hogan, 2. Three-base hits—Ware, Pierce, Love, Morgan. Two-base hits—Pierce, Lynch. Passed balls—O'Neill, 5; Pierce, 2. Hit by pitched ball—Harkin. Time of game—2:00. Umpire—Tindall.

**Beloit too Strong.**

For the fourth consecutive time away from home Notre Dame has been defeated in as many days. Beloit by a second victory has proved its superiority. In a pretty game with the score a zero for both sides until the fourth inning, the Wisconsin team took on a batting streak and batted out four runs. The grounds were in miserable shape for a baseball game, but both teams played excellent ball. Beloit evaded the error column altogether, and our fellows are credited with only three. The great Adkins did the pitching for Beloit, and held Notre Dame to seven singles. Fleet began the game in the pitcher's box, but gave way to Hogan in the sixth. Our fellows played a magnificent game in the field.

**SUMMARY.**

**INNINGS**—1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9—R H E  
**Beloit**—0 0 0 4 2 0 2 1 ——0 15 0  
**Notre Dame**—0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0—0 1 7 3

Bases on balls—Off Fleet, 2; off Hogan, 1. Two-base hits—A. Merrill, Slater, Morey. Hit by pitched ball—Adkins, E. Brown. Struck out—By Adkins, 4; by Hogan, 3. Time of game, 2:00. Umpire—Tindall.

Indianapolis Debate.

We quote the following from the Indianapolis *Sentinel* of May 23:

Notre Dame won the annual debate with Butler last night for the third successive time. The decision of the judges could not be questioned. The debate was held in the chapel at Butler and was fairly well attended. The question was: "Resolved, that the permanent retention of the Philippines by the United States is undesirable." Butler had the affirmative and Notre Dame the negative. . . .

The Notre Dame team advocated the retention of the islands on account of their commercial and strategic importance, while Butler's orators opposed this on the ground that it is unjust to the Filipinos, and would be violating all precedents. There are no advantages to be gained either by permanent retention which can not be obtained through temporary occupancy, they held.

The debate ended in a fiasco through an attempt on the part of Orval Mehring to make it appear to the judges that Notre Dame had argued two different questions. Mr. Kanaley pointed out the error of his statement in vigorous style. The blunder put the Butler team in a hole, from which the excellent efforts of McElroy and Kerr were unavailing to extricate it.

**Local Items.**

—This is the last lap, fellows. Be sure and make a good finish.

—"Big John" was unfortunate enough to hurt his ankle while batting flies to the fielders at Beloit Thursday, and may not be able to compete.

—The track team is competing at Lafayette this afternoon with representatives from all the Indiana colleges. This meet will decide the State Championship. Our men are all in splendid shape with the exception of Eggeman.

—The Hon. Judge T. E. Howard of South Bend, and a member of the Law Faculty of the University, has been honoured by the State Governor in being appointed to represent Indiana in the meeting of the National Civic Federation at Buffalo. Owing to our long association with Mr. Howard as a teacher, we take pride in publishing any new honours he may attain.

—The baseball team from Father Stoffel's school paid a visit to our Minims last Thursday afternoon and incidentally administered a severe drubbing to our young hopefuls. In a game replete with hits and errors the South Bend youngsters carried off the honours. The Minims were weak in batting and profuse with their misplays, while the visiting team was stronger with the willow and less generous with their errors. The result of the game was twenty-one to fifteen in favor of Father Stoffel's little men.

—Messrs. John Hart and D. W. Casey have just completed the invention of an electrical.
apparatus which they will call “The Time Extractor.” The machine is a labor-saving device which will probably be to the coming generation what the malaria is to the present. Mr. Hart, it might be as well to mention, has made deep researches, and, according to statistics, has saved more labor than any other one man in existence.

—Susannah is heart broken. After spending one whole week formulating plans, signing contracts, organizing, etc., she now finds that she has an elephant on her hands. All her players have jumped their contracts and refuse to come back under any circumstances. Take our advice, Susannah (C. O. D.), and leave baseball alone; it’s too jarring for your nerves. There are other good games, such as duck on the rock, marbles, tag, etc., that you would make a success at. Try them.

—Extraordinary happenings during the past week:

An almost total eclipse of the moon.

Hair-oil Agents have organized a trust and expect to make fortunes out of Tommy.

Count Meyers astonished himself and the world at large by declaring that golfies should not be worn by gentlemen. Result: an increased demand for golfies.

Milo did not do anything wonderful during the week. Critics declare that his star is on the wane.

Kirby parted with his mustache at so much per part. At the post mortem examination it was found to be false.

—One of the oldest Literary Society celebrated its golden jubilee last Wednesday. A very attractive programme was rendered. When Monsignor Dames, the celebrated Italian baritone, came upon the stage, great, greasy tears, like dew on a cabbage stalk, floated round the eyes of every member of the assembly. So far did his emotion get the better of Mr. Dubbs, that he took a fit of sneezing and spoiled his beautiful shirt front, which was the most attractive feature of the evening. Several orators made for themselves a lasting fame, but the greatest honors were reserved for Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins is the famous Kentucky humourist and sonneteer we have heard so much of; and it is with his poetical genius that he charmed his hearers on this occasion. We should like to give a specimen of this man’s jokes, but we have too great a regard for our reader’s feelings.

—Yok Hee’s Life.—Translated by Judge Lavelle under adverse circumstances and many other such commodities. Given to the world at large for the benefit of scientists and the education of the young and unsophisticated. There was once a young fellow of prepossessing disappearance, whose minute perceptions, ponderous advoirdupois, and baggy golfies, endeared him to the hearts of all who were not better acquainted with him than I was. This young fellow contained a few globules of blue blood and could trace his name back to the flood. His name was first invented by Noah when shoving the Ark off from the land he shouted: “Yok Hée!” The name then passed through the Sanskrit, the Gaelic, the Arabian, and the Mogul, finally being adopted by our hero as a nickname. Yok Hee literally means, “The Silent One,” or in Sanskrit, “The One without Thoughts.” Despite this handicap our hero was a genius whose works, however, were not appreciated.

Born in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the lad soon grew thick and fast. After passing the greater portion of his youth at his father’s homestead he determined to break away from the parental roof, and journeying for some time through many vicissitudes and dark alleys he finally landed at the University of Notre Dame. Here he first displayed those qualities of mind which betrayed his genius. At the advice of some of his friends he wrapped up these qualities in his wardrobe and acted sensibly for a time. Then his restless spirit became annoyed and he turned his attention to politics. For two months he talked and fought for his candidate, and so much faith did the people put in his word that at the election they unanimously declared for the other candidate. He then found solace in his books, and for three long dreary months our hero went about with arched eyebrows and curved neck, trying to do the impossible—look wise.

But this state of affairs did not continue very long. One beautiful morning in May while the birds were singing sweetly in the tree tops and all nature seemed glad, Yok Hee sat in his room inhaling the fresh air, his thoughts soaring high above the white-capped clouds. It was a beautiful scene. But suddenly, all was changed. With one wild shriek that shook the very foundations of Sorin Hall, the lad tumbled under his bed and remained there for two days without a bite to eat. His friends discovered him, and upon inquiring the cause of the catastrophe learned that he had seen the dreaded poll tax collector. This Mr. Collector was an unaccommodating sort of a fellow, and so annoyed the lad that he refused to pay. The result was that our hero woke up one day shortly afterward and found himself cracking stones on the Niles’ road. It was a sad sight to behold the once brilliant luminary of the bar, his beautifully curved thumbs nestling tightly on a 4 lb hammer, the sweat pouring off his alabaster brow in large chunks, and a far-away-wish-I-had-paid look in his steely gray orbs. But such is fate. I remember reading some place “Those that exalteth themselves shall be humbled,” and vice versa: It’s sad, but what is the use of living unless we find thorns in our paths.

Moral:—Beware of politics, or the pole tax collector will get you.