The Firefly.

VARNUM A. PARRISH, '07.

As I wandered down the dale
Fireflies flashed their glowing mail.
Some were near, and others far
Twinkled like a distant star.

How your flashes do remind
Me of lives of human-kind!
Now they glow, a moment bright,
Then forever fade from sight.

They are like the joys of earth;
All its pleasure and its mirth
Last a moment, bright and gay,
Then in darkness pass away.

Like to glory and to fame
Is thy momentary flame.
Though there's splendor and display,
Darkness follows every day.

So with all that earth can give,
All for which the fool doth live,
Less of pleasure gives a man
Than of light a firefly can.

— In the New World.

Adrian IV. and Ireland.

JOHN M. RYAN, '06.

Among the many questions that
have puzzled historians, there
is perhaps none more bitterly
discussed than the justice and
authenticity of the “Bull” which
gave Henry II. of England per-
mission to invade Ireland. England, for
two centuries based her claim to rule Ireland
upon the famous grant of Adrian IV., the
only Englishman who sat in the chair of
Saint Peter. Although nearly two centuries
were allowed to pass before anyone ques-
tioned the Bull, since the seventeenth century
both sides of the question have been bitterly
upheld. Not only has it been made a politi
cal question, but, like so many others, it
has been distorted into a religious one also.
Those opposed to the Bull bring forth three
principal objections. They question the
Pope’s right, the justice, and finally the
authenticity. The first two, as may be
readily seen, tacitly admit that the Bull was
by some fair or foul means obtained and
used. The third objection denies the Bull
was ever issued by Adrian. The most they
admit is that if produced at all in con
nection with the invasion of Ireland it
was a forgery of Henry.

Whether the Pope had a right to issue
such a bull can hardly be questioned by a
student of medieval history. All who are
acquainted with society from the tenth to
the thirteenth century know that civilized
Europe was ruled feudally. Moreover, the
western world was Christian, and the Pope,
as supreme Bishop of the Christian Church,
became naturally the head of the feudal
system. In the papal court and by papal
legates nearly all the great disputes of
this period were settled. Christian princes,
knowing the great influence of the Pope’s
sanction or condemnation, were careful not
to unnecessarily offend him by their actions.
Thus this condition of affairs gave the popes
a right to judge and decide whether an
invasion could be made. Of course their
decision was not always respected, but the
fear of papal censures which would take
the great prelates from the field, and the
still more terrible power of deposition
generally brought the monarch to terms.
Adrian was not the first to make use of
this great weapon, though strangely enough his is the only case where the right has been questioned. Alexander II. blessed the expedition and gave William, the Norman, permission to invade England. His only reason was that Canterbury was ruled by a schismatic archbishop named Stigand. If Adrian's reasons for sending Henry II. to Ireland are insufficient, yet much stronger than this, how can any one say Alexander was justified, and yet no one has made the opposite accusation. The right of the popes to preach a crusade against Spain was no more just than that of Adrian to send Henry to Ireland. The crusaders were sent to recover the Christian lands and restore faith and peace. What more or less did Henry undertake or promise? He told the Pope that he wished to stop the unending internal strife and anarchy, reform the government, and give freedom to the Church. If this was necessary, and it unquestionably was, then why pick out this act and abuse it as a case of injustice?

But let us consider the question of right and wrong. Are not the terms meaningless unless used in connection with the moral law. It is only in reference to beings of free will that we apply them. We never say a horse or a dog had no right to do such and such an act. It is only because man is responsible for his actions that he can be said to do them either right or wrong, for if he had no free will he would have to act in a certain definite way and could not be blamed. If you deny there is any such thing as the moral right or wrong, then let any one who has the power, whether he be pope or king, step in and conquer, since there is no rights to consider; but if there is such a law this act must be judged like all others. Although Adrian was a pope we must in considering his actions refer them to the moral law. Who then is to judge whether the act in question was morally right or wrong? For Catholics there is one appointed by Christ to teach us the moral law and interpret its meaning, one who is infallible in such matters, one supreme judge, and he is the Pope. If, therefore, Adrian issued this "Bull" acting as the infallible judge whether it was right or wrong, for us now, as well as for the people of England and Ireland at the time of its promulgation, there is no question whether he was morally right or not.

Now let us take up the question as to whether Ireland needed a reformer from without. In order to show this was undoubtedly the case it is only necessary to glance into that great authority on Irish History the "Four Masters." For nearly three centuries before 900 Ireland was noted for her piety and learning. During the ninth and tenth centuries she was continually ravished and invaded by pirates, northmen and immigrants. The effect upon religion and education was disastrous. These marauders made the almost defenceless but rich monasteries and church property their special prey in Ireland as elsewhere. After centuries of fierce struggle against these invaders, who were finally crushed in the civil strife at Clontarf in the year 1014, one would think that the people of Ireland would look for repose and apply themselves to the cultivation of the peaceful arts and the reconstruction of society. This was not the case. The death in victory of Brian Boru left Ireland entirely upset. The annalists tell us that Ireland was the scene of constant strife, each little chieftain strove for supreme power, while the aim of the head kings, who one and all ruled "with opposition," was not to harmonize the discordant factions but to depose weak or obnoxious minor chieftains and substitute for them their own children or dependents. These men would neither live in peace themselves nor allow others to do so. Even monasteries and churches were not safe from the constant plundering, burning and harrowing. The bishops of one province who attempted to attend synods in another section were often seized, robbed and either murdered or sent back again to their homes. At the end of one hundred and forty years of this confusion, Ireland was in a similar or worse condition than she was immediately after Clontarf. There was still no central power, nor the least possible hope of one. It is true such men as Saints Malachy, O'Toole and others lived and did good work; but at their death it was all undone again through envy or greed. We must remember that simony, by this time mostly stamped-out in the rest of Europe, was still unchecked in Ireland. It is unnecessary to go through.
this century and a half, or even the half century, to see the deplorable condition of Ireland. Let us follow the "Four Masters" through the year that preceded the grant of 1154.

They say that during this year "your lords or princes were slain; that a fleet of Turlough O'Connor swept the northern seas, plundering Tirconnell and Inishowen with dreadful slaughter on both sides; that an army was led from the north by the O'Lochlain who banished the O'Reilleys from the principality of Brefni, and destroyed the crops; that the said Turlough O'Connor went on a predatory excursion in which his son was slain; that a battle was fought between the O'Briens and people of Carlow, in which the chief of the O'Nowlans fell; that Fienian O'Rorke led a devastating army, plundering churches and the whole country; that the people of Melsinnia were plundered by the great Melseachlan of Meath and afterwards hunted into Connaught; that Desmond preyed on the Dalgais, and that the Dalcassians preyed on Desmond; that Deorah O'Flinn put out the eyes of his son for assuming the lordship of Hi-Tintre; that Deorah himself was banished into Connaught by the O'Lochlain; and that the chief of Collemore was done to death even at door of the Church of Birr."

This was not only the program for one year but repeated yearly from 1014 to 1155 and after in a country whose area is less than that of the state of Indiana. Can anyone in the face of such facts say that the Irish could rule themselves or that a chieftain would rise and unify them; can it be said there was no need of a reform? Under these conditions religion and learning could not flourish, and therefore the Pope not only had the right but was if possible bound to restore peace. He saw then as well as we do now that no reformer or ruler could come from within, so he looked for and found one without Ireland who was not only capable but willing to undertake the task, and he, Adrian, accepted.

Some may complain: that Adrian made a poor choice. So let us examine Henry's position at that time and see if the charge is true. "In 1154 when Adrian made his selection, Henry II. was the most powerful and promising monarch of Europe. He was not only king of England and Wales, but feudal lord of over two-thirds of France. He had been placed upon his throne by the Church. He was young, energetic, ambitious, and swayed, it might easily be supposed, by the generous impulses of youth to restore peace and happiness to a distracted land. Under the Norman rule religion and learning had prospered. Henry appeared honest, and it was not the Pope's business to judge rashly or without cause to question his sincerity. He was the man most capable of doing Adrian's work and as he willingly offered himself he was accepted. The Pope could not foresee Henry later proving himself an enemy to the Church, that his coming to Ireland would be a source of evil rather than of good. At the time the Bull was granted Henry appeared an excellent choice, and the best Europe could produce both as a legislator and king."

Now that we have seen the pope acted justly and within his rights, let us briefly consider the question of authenticity. For the last few centuries some historians have asserted that the "Bull of Adrian" was a forgery. Others, without any substantial evidence and contrary to the opinion of nearly all authorities upon the subject, claim the Bull was not only never issued, but that the one brought forth is only an exercise of a Latin student. As this last assertion has no responsible authority behind it, and furthermore is against the almost universal opinion of historians, we can discard it at once. As to the Bull being a forgery, this theory is frustrated by the writers of Henry's own age and also discarded by the majority of historians. Besides the absolute assertion of John of Salisbury who said that he himself as a personal friend of Adrian procured the grant, we have the confirmatory brief of Alexander III. who says: "Inasmuch as things granted for good reason by our predecessors are to be allowed and confirmed, we, following the example of the venerable Pope Adrian, and looking to the realization of our own wishes, do confirm the donation of Ireland made by him to you, reserving to St. Peter and the Church of Rome the yearly revenue of one penny out of every house in Ireland as in England; and provided that the barbarous people of Ireland be reformed, etc."
Again if this Bull was not authentic why should Rome bear the stigma that it has brought to her. Why should the popes suffer all the abuse that bigoted and ignorant people cast upon their illustrious predecessor. Rome never denied the authenticity, in fact, Paul IV., speaking in reference to making Ireland a kingdom, says, in the latest edition of the Bullary, "ever since the kingdom of England obtained the dominion of this island through the Apostolic See, the English kings have had the custom of taking the title simply of lords of Ireland." Furthermore Alexander III. approved of the work of Henry in the commendatory briefs, and the Bull itself was published in the year 1175, at the synod of Waterford, in order, no doubt, to remove the stigma of Becket's murder, since its publication had no effect upon the situation or power of Henry in Ireland. At this same synod Henry appointed a bishop for the Irish church. This act alone is sufficient to show Rome recognized Henry's right in Ireland, for otherwise she would have at once refused the bishop his see. Even the commendatory letters are declared to be forgeries by some, but they are accepted as authentic by no less authority than Dr. Moran and the Abbot Gasquet.

We must, therefore, either accept this grant as authentic with the majority of modern historians, or else explain Rome's inconsistency. Was she not as jealous of her rights then as now? History at least seems to say so. Moreover, Adrian IV. is known to have been a good priest and ranks high among the pontiffs both as a statesman and priest. It would then be unjust to accuse him of treachery to his sacred office and a betrayer of his people. Alexander III. is also too well known in history by his struggles with the German emperors for the papal rights to need vindication of weakness in the case of Henry. He did not hesitate a moment when Becket came as an exile to him, but promptly condemned all Henry's actions. It was fear of Alexander's censures that drove Henry to Ireland in 1171, and can we say he would hesitate to challenge Henry, unless convinced the grant had been made. In the face of all these facts only one conclusion seems possible: that Adrian granted the Bull upon the evidence presented.

---

A Case of Forgery.

ROBERT A. KASPER, '07.

The Johnsons and the Smiths had been neighbors for many years, and a feeling of friendliness had always prevailed between them. The mothers were fast friends from early childhood, attending the same parochial school and later the same convent. In those early days they often wondered what the future had in store for them. They spoke of many things in their youthful innocence and vowed never to be separated. As they looked back to it all now, the good times they had, the many pleasant hours spent together, they longed to live it all over again, to be free and drink in the joys of childhood once more. Not that they were unhappy now, for a feeling of perfect tranquillity characterized each household; but in the days of youth there are pleasures which one can not fully appreciate until they are past—pleasures which we would not enjoy as we grow to manhood or womanhood.

Frank Smith called on Alice Johnson and thus made the ties of friendship between the two families still stronger, and people often remarked how nice it would be if a match resulted. The mothers were strongly in favor of the alliance, and it seemed but a question of time until the engagement should be announced.

Frank was a manly fellow. There was something in his appearance, in the way he spoke, that marked him out as a gentleman. He was a kind-hearted lad who had a good word for everyone. At school
he was known as the "peacemaker," for the quarrels quietly settled by him. His friends were numerous, and his enemies,—well he had none of the latter, for it was impossible to dislike him. His large blue eyes bespoke simplicity and honesty, and his face and perfect angled jaws determination. In times when others would have given up he did not falter. He labored until the tide of defeat had been turned into victory. It was he who had scored the winning "touchdown" for Yale in the annual Yale and Harvard game when but a few moments remained to play. In the amateur golf championship he worked his way into the finals. His opponent was two up with two to play. Frank kept his nerve, and by sheer pluck won the next three holes, and also the coveted prize.

She loved him; yes, he knew she did. That he loved her there was no doubt. He found himself thinking of her constantly. He remembered how he longed for her letters when away at school, and how it worried him when she did not write. Then when his mother insulted Mrs. Johnson, he was forbidden the girl's house by his parents, and life seemed incomplete without her. Of course as he loved her he must settle the quarrel.

To make matters worse, Mr. Smith announced his intention of running for alderman on the Democratic side. Johnson represented the Republicans. The contest was bitter, and both men went into it as though it meant life or death. Frank Smith knew he must straighten out matters before either was nominated, for if it came to that he would have but little chance of marrying the girl. He must be peacemaker now as he had been in days gone by. In those days another's happiness hung in the balance, now his was at stake. He thought of many ways to repair the breach, each was in turn cast off as worthless. What should he do, was the question that bothered him. At last he hit upon a scheme. He walked into the telegraph office and sent two messages. When he arrived home some hours later he found his mother and Mrs. Johnson in the parlor. Each held a telegram bearing the simple words "I apologize," and when they saw his honest face and smile of content they understood and the quarrel was over.

Life's Way.

I fled alone one summer's day
Away from haunts of men,
Where I could see the brooklet play
And hear the twitting wren.
I longed to find some perfect thing
Full worthy of my love,
I found a flower beside a spring;
I thought it from above.
At last, this would my faith confirm,
All joys end not in pain,—
But 'mid the leaves I spied a worm,
Alas! my search was vain.

W. F. C.

Locke's Idea of Substance.*

MICHAEL J. SHEA, '04.

Having finished the first two points of our discussion, namely, (1) "the theory of Locke regarding substance and anything bearing on the theory, and (2) Locke's view of ideas and its relation to substance," we must continue with the next topic (3), "Locke's view of causality in the light of his doctrine of substance." That the discussion of this question is necessary is quite evident. The question that occurs immediately after examining Locke's doctrine of substance is: Why is it that certain ideas are always grouped together when perceived by the mind so as to induce man to believe that a substance corresponding with his perception is really existing without him? What is the bond, the necessary cause, which makes certain qualities conjoin as units; or is there any such cause? The last part of the question—is there any cause?—is answered by Locke's belief in the reality of substance. But let us take Locke's own words. In answer to this question of cause, he says (Bk. II., 23, § 6): "All the ideas we have of particular, distinct sorts of substances are nothing but several combinations of simple ideas co-existing, in such, though unknown, cause of their union as makes the whole subsist of itself." The use of the word 'cause' is of course in this case, synonymous with the word 'substance.' That which is the bond of union, the support of the co-existing qualities, is substance, and for Locke, as we have seen, it is unknown. So the "unknown cause" of the union of ideas

* Continued from Midsummer Number.
which causes in our perceiving minds the idea of substance, is substance; for when Locke speaks of "simple ideas co-existing in such, though unknown, cause of their union," he simply defines substance.

(b) We may notice here in passing a rather peculiar circle in which Locke's scepticism and dualism compels us to reason. The union of perceived qualities causes in us the idea of substance. Yet substance is the cause of this union of qualities. While we may regard this as an example of a posteriori reasoning, yet it savors strongly of a vicious circle. The separation of the world of reality from the world of ideas furnishes Locke two props which serve well to uphold inconsistencies. However, let us return to the question of causality.

(c) It is true, everyone will admit, that the conjoined ideas in our mind have at least a relative correspondence to their externally-existing facsimiles. Our knowledge is not absolute, nor, on the other hand, is it wholly nil, so we say we have a relative knowledge of the outside world; i.e., the world is not known as it really is but relatively through the senses. As Locke says (Bk IV., 3-21): "Of the existence of anything else (besides ourselves and God) we have no other but a sensitive knowledge which extends not beyond the objects present to our senses." Yet knowledge, whether great or little, can not be had of what is unknown. It is a contradiction in terms to say so. Our knowledge of outside existence is—since it comes through the senses,—sensitive; since it is not absolute, relative: yet even this conditioned knowledge is only of the known. This admitted, we will take the next step in our line of reasoning.

(d) A posteriori reasoning teaches us that we know a cause by its effects. To deny this is to destroy the validity of such reasoning. Then let us apply this fact. We know the qualities or ideas as united, we know "each compilation or collection of those several simple ideas of sensible qualities which we... find united in a thing called 'horse' or 'stone,'" and why then should the substance 'horse' or 'stone,' the cause of the union or "compilation of those several simple ideas of sensible qualities" be unknown to us? Even a relative knowledge of an effect throws some light on its cause sufficient to bring it out of the darkness of the unknown. It seems strange that if this cause or substance is unknown, that we should know there is such a cause or substance at all. That of which we can predicate anything we say we know to the extent of the predication. Locke of course evidently means that outside of the existence of substance we know nothing about it. But the very fact that he can predicate existence of substance takes it out of the realm of the unknown. This idea of the existence of substance Locke took from the existence of the united qualities which are held in union by substance. Why then did he not continue, and, by further predications, bring substance further into the world of knowledge?

(e) By unknown, as we just said, Locke seems to mean that, besides its existence, we know nothing of this cause of the union of qualities. Yet a cause must partake of or possess every characteristic found in its effect. If this is true, then substance, the "unknown cause" of known conjoined qualities, belies its name. It can not be the cause of a known effect and be itself unknown. There is but one more loophole left through which Locke may escape. To find out whether this loophole really exists we must discover Locke's view of causality. We will discover this by answering the following question:

Is substance the real cause of the union of qualities, or is it a cause according to the Associationist's view; i.e., is substance merely a concomitant idea associated with the qualities perceived to exist in union? Does Locke believe in a real, productive, efficient cause, or does he uphold Hume's doctrine of mere antecedence and consequence? If he believes in the latter—the doctrine of Association—Locke can logically hold that substance is unknown; but if he believes in real cause, then substance must partake of the characteristics of its qualities or effects and be therefrom knowable. Let us first take Locke's definition of cause in his own words. He says (Bk. II., 26-1): "That which produces any simple or complex idea we denote by the name 'cause,' and that which is produced, 'effect.' Thus finding that in that substance which we call 'wax,' fluidity, which is a simple idea.
that was not in it before, is constantly produced by the application of a certain degree of heat, we call the simple idea of heat in relation to fluidity in wax the cause of it and fluidity the effect. So also finding that the substance wood, which is a certain collection of simple ideas so called, by the application of fire is turned into another substance called 'ashes,' i.e., another complex idea, consisting of a collection of simple ideas, quite different from that complex idea which we call 'wood,' we consider fire, in relation to ashes, as cause, and the ashes as effect. So that whatever is considered by us to conduce or operate to the producing any particular or simple idea, or collection of simple ideas, whether substance or mode, which did not before exist, hath thereby in our minds the relation of a cause, and so is denominated by us."

This seems to contain the true idea of cause, especially the words "whatever is considered by us to conduce or operate to the producing any particular, simple idea, or collection of simple ideas, whether substance or mode, which did not before exist. It indicates that the effect is that which takes its existence from another, and that other from which existence is taken is the cause; for nothing else could be meant by saying that cause is that which produces. In the following paragraph in the "Essay," Locke divides causes into two classes.

"First, when the thing is wholly made new, so that no part thereof did ever exist before; as when a new particle of matter doth begin to exist, in rerum naturâ, which had before no being: and this we call 'creation.'

"Secondly, when a thing is made up of particles which did all of them before exist, but that very thing so constituted of pre-existing particles, which, considered all together, make up such a collection of simple ideas, had not any existence before as this man, this egg, rose or cherry, etc.; and this when referred to a substance produced in the ordinary course of nature by an internal principle, but set on work by and received from some external agent or cause, and working by insensible ways which we perceive not, we call 'generation.'

"When the cause is extrinsical and the effect produced by a sensible operation or juxtaposition of discernible parts, we call it 'making'; and such are all artificial things. When any simple idea is produced which was not in that subject before, we call it 'alteration.' Thus a man is generated, a picture made, and either of them altered when any new sensible quality or simple idea is produced in either of them, which was not there before; and the things thus made to exist, which were not there before, are effects; and those things which operated to the existence, causes. In which and all other cases we may observe, that the notion of cause and effect has its rise from ideas received from sensation or reflection; and that this relation, how comprehensive however, terminates at last in them. For to have the idea of cause and effect, it suffices to consider any simple idea or substance as beginning to exist by the operation of some other, without knowing the manner of that operation."

This quotation, while it affirms and emphasizes the idea of cause as a producing agent and effect as a produced, non-pre-existent being, yet places the source of this idea in sensation and reflection—the logical grounds of the Associationist doctrine.

3 We have noticed that Locke's definitions refer to efficient causes. To quote from Leibnitz (p. 237, §§1–2): "Philomeneus. 'Cause is that which produces a simple or incomplex idea; effect, that which is produced.

"Theophilus. 'I see, sir, that you often understand by idea the objective reality of the idea or the quality which it represents (This we noted p. 4). You define only efficient cause, as I have already remarked above.'

However, it serves the purpose just as well if Locke's idea of cause be of efficient ones, and substance be considered the efficient cause of the union of qualities.

4. Noah Porter, who treats Locke's theories carefully and at length, since, as he says, "they gave the occasion for the speculations of Hume and Mill," declares that Locke seems to advocate both theories which resolve the principle of causality into the observations of experience. The first of these theories which ascribes the principle of causality to our sense perceptions of
the phenomena of matter, is contained in the quotation last mentioned (Bk. II., 26–1). The second theory which ascribes the principle of causality to our conscious experience of the phenomena of the soul, is advocated in the following quotation:

"But yet, if we will consider it attentively, bodies, by our senses, do not afford us so clear and distinct an idea of active power as we have from reflection on the operations of our minds. For all power relating to action, and there being but two sorts of action whereof we have any idea, viz., thinking and motion, let us consider whence we have the clearest ideas of the powers which produce these actions. (1) Of thinking, body affords us no idea at all: it is only from reflection that we have that. (2) Neither have we from body any idea of the beginning of motion. A body at rest affords us no idea of any active power to move; and when it is set in motion itself that motion is rather a passion than an action in it. For when a ball obeys the stroke of a billiard stick, it is not any action of the ball, but bare passion; also when by impulse it sets another ball in motion that is in its way, it only communicates the motion it had received from another, and loses in itself so much as the other received; which gives us but a very obscure idea of an active power moving in body, whilst we observe it only to transfer but not produce any motion.... So that it seems to me, we have, from the observation of the operation of bodies by our senses, but a very imperfect, obscure idea of active power, since they afford us not any idea in themselves of the power to begin any action, either motion or thought. But if from the impulse bodies are observed to make upon one another, anyone thinks he has a clear idea of power, since they serve as well to my purpose, sensation being one of those ways whereby the mind comes by its ideas; only I thought it worth while to consider here by the way, whether the mind doth not receive its idea of active power clearer from reflection on its own operations than it doth from any external sensation."

So according to Porter, Locke seems to advocate each of two theories: (1) that which ascribes the theory of causality to our sense-perception of the phenomena of matter, and (2) that which ascribes it to our conscious experience of the phenomena of the soul.

In the "Human Intellect," Porter says: "Locke's view has been understood to be that by simple observation and experience of material or spiritual events, we know that they are connected as causes and effects, and that on the ground of experience thus given in sense and consciousness, we believe, conclude or infer that all events are so connected."

The criticism of this system is also given; but since we are only seeking to find out Locke's stand in regard to causality to assist us in examining his doctrine of substance, we will pass it over. We have now seen Locke's theory of causality and in what it consists. It only remains to note Hume's doctrine of Association, and by comparison find out in what respect it differs from Locke's. Of Hume Porter says: "Many attempts have been made to explain the relation of causality by some relation of time, which is not surprising, as the relations of time relate to all objects." Hume, in "An Inquiry Concerning the Human Understanding," (§ vii., p. 2) says: "We may define a cause to be an object followed by another, and where all objects, similar to the first, are followed by objects similar to the second; or, in other words, where if the first object had not been, the second had never existed. The appearance of a cause always conveys to the mind, by a customary transition, the idea of the effect. Of this we have experience." "A Treatise of Human Nature" (Bk. I. §xiv.): "A cause is an object precedent and contiguous to another, and so united with it that the idea of the one determines the mind to form the idea of the other, and the impression of the one to form a more lively idea of the other...." Porter states the theory as follows:

"The theory contained in these statements and definitions is briefly thus: a cause is a constantly precedent and an effect a constantly subsequent event. They are discovered to be such by the constant conjunction of the two. The necessity by which objects conjoined are connected as cause and effect arises from their being united in the mind's own experience, and the circumstance that the thought or observation of the one determines the mind..."
to a lively idea of the other. . . . Hume takes up Locke's positions in detail and considers them at length. He denies that in sense perception we can by sense be said to perceive the causation of material objects or phenomena. All that we perceive, he urges, is one material object or state followed by another, using precisely the same arguments against this view of Locke's which Locke uses against himself, when he would show that matter gives no clear idea of power."

The difference between Locke and Hume in regard to causality seems to be that Locke believes in causality as something more than mere antecedence and sequence. He believes in a real producing cause and a produced effect, but bases his idea of causality on sense perception and reflection. Hume's criticism of Locke is an evidence of Locke's belief in causality since Hume claimed, and rightly, that Locke's basis of belief in causality led logically to the Associationist's view.

Porter says further in discussing Locke's theory of innate ideas that Locke "did not guard himself against serious oversights. . . . He did not distinguish between our positive ideas of objects and acts in both matter and spirit—which make up the materials or facts of knowledge—and the relations between these materials, which, if possible, are more important than the facts they connect; nor did he conceive at all the difference between an idea as acquired by experience and as occasioned by experience. He did not discern that a relation which is developed in experience to conscious apprehension must be implied or assumed to make experience possible. He did not distinguish between innate ideas and innate dispositions or capacities to develop and assent to the truths which involve original ideas. To correct these oversights, Leibnitz subjoined his well-known reply to the adage 'nihil in intellectus quod non prius in sensu'—'nisi ipsum intellectus.'

"Locke asserts positively that all our ideas are obtained through two sources, Sensation and Reflection. . . . He was careful to add that except through these two sources we have no ideas whatever. What Locke intended by ideas admits here of a question similar to that which was noticed in connection with innate ideas. Did he mean positively to exclude from ideas those necessary relations by which the mind connects all the objects of matter and spirit which it observes or experiences? It is probable that in laying down these leading positions this distinction was not in his mind, and that for this reason he did not provide against uncertainty or ambiguity of interpretation."

"Hume applied the dictum of Locke in respect to the sources of knowledge in the analysis of the relation of causation. . . . This idea (i. e., of cause and effect) could not be gained from Sensation (nor by) Reflection on the conscious experience which we have of the exercise of power, in the production of effect by volition, experience giving us only the invariable succession, or constant conjunction of these internal ideas."

"How then he asks, does it happen that we connect objects as causes and effects, and what is the meaning of this combination? . . . To his own question, he replies: Objects which are observed to be always conjoined, we invariably associate in our minds. When we observe the one we can not avoid thinking of the other. The principle of association is that which explains, and it is the only mental law that explains the combination of objects and events as causes and effects."

(To be continued.)

Welcome Home.

(From Horace, Odes I., 36.)

'T it gives us joy to thank the gods to-day,
The gods who o'er Numidia watch and pray
A heifer's blood shall flow, while incense burns,
Let music sound, for safe our friend returns.

From farthest Spain he now returns to greet
His many friends, but to his Lamia sweet
Warm love he gives, for he is mindful still
Of how as boys they served one master's will.

The selfsame hour they donned the manly gown,
With Cretan chalk this happy day mark down.
Of cellared wine we all shall have our fill,
The Salian dance will let no feet be still.

Let not hard drinking Damalis put to rout
Friend Bassus in the Thracian drinking bout.
Let roses at the banquet fresh be seen,
The short-lived lily, the parsley evergreen.

On Damalis all turn their pining eyes,
But she sees only him, her latest prize;
With less restraint than clings the ivy vine
She will not leave the one her arms entwine. W. D.
—There is a branch of college training that seems to have lost, within the last decade, considerable popularity among students, the matter of instrumental music. Whatever the cause this lack of interest is due to, there is little doubt but that the student is the loser by it. There is hardly any training that makes so distinctly for refinement as training in music. Brawn of muscle, grace of body, strength of mind, the best of students go after; but even these earnest fellows are apt to look on cultivation of a taste for music as over-nice. This a false notion, for the best education makes room for the development of every faculty.

There never was a time when natural musical talent could be cultivated to better advantage and a taste and some degree of skill in music acquired with greater facility by the untalented than at the present time at Notre Dame. Professor Frank, who has assumed charge of the instrumental music department and is director of the band and orchestra, is a man of first rate ability in this line of work. Not only is he a musician of rare proficiency but a man of genial disposition and unbounded patience. It is the earnest wish of all that the band and orchestra be as good as possible this year, but this ideal can be realized only by steady interest and unflagging effort on the part of the students themselves. Already the organization of the band is well under way, and the prospect of a mandolin and guitar club is looked on with increasing enthusiasm by a number of students desirous of making the most of their opportunities here. Aside from the question of college pride in these organizations is the real profit that comes to the boy himself from getting the upper hand of a musical instrument. "Get on the band wagon," ought to be the word.

Prof. Frank will teach all instrumental music except piano and violin, according to the following schedule: from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. on Mondays and Thursdays; 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Tuesdays and Fridays.

—Another of the departments of the University to which special attention will this year be given is that of vocal culture. To meet the requirements of the students a most capable teacher has been secured—a man eminent as well as experienced in his profession. To recommend him in his present undertaking Mr. Milton B. Griffith has a splendid record.

He finished a normal course of training for voice teachers under Professor F. X. Ahrens, of New York; was for two years instructor in music at Indiana University; one year director of the music department of Tarkio College, of Missouri, and conductor of festivals there; was during two years vocal director in the Bradbury School of Music, Duluth, Minnesota, director of Duluth Apollo Club and the Matinée Musical Club; toured the country twice as tenor soloist with the Theodore Thomas Orchestra; was the organizer and director of the South Bend Choral Club for 1905; has sung in many churches throughout the West, and has private studios in Chicago and South Bend.

During the coming week the students of the University will have an opportunity of judging for themselves the character and ability of the new professor, for Mr. Griffith has kindly consented to give a public song recital in Washington Hall. This concert should not only serve to introduce Professor Griffith, but should also be instrumental in popularizing his course, which will consist of two classes, each of an hour's duration, every week. It is to be hoped then that the appearance of the gifted tenor amongst us will result in bringing vocal culture up to its true standard as a part of a university training, a hope which we have every confidence will be fully justified by Professor Griffith during the year upon which we are about to enter.
—In the resignation of Professor Francis J. Powers, who left during the week to accept a position on the teaching staff of Northwestern Medical College, in Chicago, Notre Dame loses one of her most representative sons among the younger members of the Faculty. Professor Powers’ many friends among the faculty and student-body wish him all success in his new work, though that is an assured fact.

—With this the first issue of the Scholastic comes the important question of an editorial staff for the ensuing year. It is customary just as soon as the paper is fairly started to look around for men who are able and willing to assist in making our paper a success. The honor is open to all who wish to prove their worth, and there is always room for the man of merit. A college paper, as is well known, is the outlet for whatever literary talent may be found among the student-body, and by the quality of the productions which are published in its columns the outside world judges of the proficiency and excellence attained by the students. It is for the purpose of raising the literary standard that a board of editors is selected; it is the old principle of “In union there is strength,” practically applied, since every individual member is, or at least should be, a help and support to his fellows. Furthermore, it is aimed to make the staff a representative one, and to this end the entire student body are eligible to compete, and the number of student-editors is unlimited. The columns of the paper are of course open at all times for contributors, but the benefits and advantages to be derived by those whose names appear at the head of the editorial page are too evident to require any extended explanation. Nor do we expect to find another Chatterton or another Keats to fill the places. All we require, and all we dare hope for, are students with a moderate amount of talent and an inordinate willingness to work. Get busy, each one of you, do your best in prose or in verse, and submit your productions to your professor in English. Who knows but he may discover in you one of those of whom the Scholastic stands so much in need?

—During the week we had the honor of entertaining at Notre Dame a very distinguished man in the person of the Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shields, of Washington, professor of biology and physiological psychology in the Catholic University of America. Dr. Shields is a recognized authority in his profession, a strong, original thinker, and a clever, entertaining lecturer. On Tuesday evening he gave a brief informal talk to the younger members of the faculty on the subject of pedagogy. In Washington Hall, Wednesday morning, he lectured before the student-body, taking as his theme “Study.” He repeated in part some of the things he had said the previous evening but with a different adaptation. In the course of his remarks the reverend doctor communicated some very helpful thoughts.

After a brief personal preface he showed us how materially the condition of knowledge to-day differs from that of twenty or thirty years ago; how we let things slip and take for granted what we do not understand, while twenty years back we would have insisted upon investigating and having things explained to us. Every man, the speaker contended, is the master of his own life, of his own destiny; and he must do things for himself if he would have them adaptable to him. He alone must pick out and develop each item of knowledge and each particle of muscular force, if he would have them harmonize and strengthen his already existent mind and body. To do this properly there is a need of concentration, of direction of energy, something to form a connecting link between ourselves and that which we seek to assimilate.

Dr. Shields then pointed out the great importance of knowing how to study, how to systematize, and the help a bracket diagram is in any subject or at any time; and above all how necessary it is for a man to develop his mind symmetrically and according to the laws of his nature. As a whole, the lecture was one of the most entertaining and instructive to which the students of recent years have had a chance to listen. It is to be hoped that the Rev. Dr. Shields may sometime in the near future have another opportunity to visit Notre Dame and again address the student body.
THE KNOWABILITY OF GOD. By Matthew A. Schumacher, C. S. C.

After carefully reading this thesis or dissertation I convinced myself of two things: the first, that its author had thoroughly investigated his subject, and the second that the question of God by Aquinas, far from being obsolete, is truly up to date and the most important of all in the twentieth as well as in the thirteenth century. For in our day perhaps more than before it is not simply the idea of God that is at stake, but above all His existence and nature. Most difficult indeed is the problem discussed through these pages, as it turns on the worth and value of human knowledge and the method to be followed in the discovery of the “Great Unknown.”

In a first chapter the theory of knowledge according to the Aristotelic system is very clearly explained, the actuality of the intellect affirmed, the relativitj- of knowledge exploded, and the idea of cause through analytic declared to be real and absolute. The second chapter, which contains the core of the thesis, is nothing but a forcible application of the principle of causality. It emphasizes the momentous fact that God can not be for man a matter of intuition, but is the result of a demonstration. For St. Thomas the so-called argument of St. Anselm is only a pious dream, and years before its birth the holy Doctor would have regarded Ontologism as a sublime but shallow fancy contrary to experience. On the other hand, the position assumed by Agnostics is altogether untenable, as it is not correct to say with Herbert Spencer that we can never reach the absolute. For even Plato rightly claimed that—through metaphysical induction—we arrive at the supreme Good, and Aristotle showed before the “Angel of the Schools” that, relying on positive facts we are able to rise from actual motion to a Prime Mover, from order and law to a First Ordainer and Lawgiver, from relative perfections to an infinitely Perfect Being; in short, from the contingent to the necessary—and that is God. Although no creature, still less man, knows Him “totaliter,” or comprehensively, as He alone knows Himself, still every man, and more so a philosopher, can succeed in knowing “something” about God’s nature and perfection through a process of argumentation called elimination or transcendency. Thus we obtain a satisfactory answer to the two questions set forth in this dissertation, viz., “An sit Deus?” and “Quid Deus sit?”

The author of this work deserves credit not only for the choice of the subject, but also for the able manner in which he presented its various aspects. In these pages we find harmoniously blended a deep knowledge of the scholastic philosophy with an extensive appreciation of modern and contemporary thinkers. Of course in a study of that kind it would be too much to expect beauty of language or elegance of style. Here and there we might criticize some uncouth constructions or even an inexact statement; but all in all, the impression made on the reader is excellent, and the Catholic student feels proud and happy that the light of Revelation enabled the Angelic Doctor to tell us about God infinitely more than the greatest geniuses of Greece or the most eminent scientists of our age ever dreamed of.

THE SENIOR LIEUTENANT’S WAGER, AND Other Stories.

While the railroad companies are beginning to realize that the dime-novel is an enemy they have been nursing in their parlor cars, and the world in general is decrying the “penny dreadful,” Catholic publishers are busy bringing out the best to take the place of the worst. “The Lieutenant’s Wager, and Other Stories” is an attractive collection of short stories for young and old by thirty of the best-known Catholic authors. Set in Catholic frames are pictures of quiet gardens blooming with faithful love, of dreary castles enclosing unforgiveness and despair, of incensed churches breathing comfort to repentant hearts, of cities crowded with suffering and want, of faithfulness to duty, of priestly strategy, of the supernatural, of denial, and self-denial. There is here a very city of delightful people whom to know is to love, a varied procession of characters whose trials and triumphs will be the consolation and support of generations of readers. The publishers are to be commended for their work, and the stories recommended to the Catholic public.
Athletic Notes.

Once again the gridiron hero holds the centre of the stage. From the present outlook we will have a team which will rival the teams of Notre Dame when McGlew and the mighty Salmon played behind the line. Last year we started out the season with very few old men, and Salmon was compelled to develop a comparatively new team. This year we have eight monogram men to start with and perhaps the best bunch of new material that ever came out at Notre Dame.

McGlew, the star end and quarter for the last four years, is our new Coach, and he is making wonderful changes from that which has gone before. Every device that can possibly aid in bettering our fast ball team has been secured: a new tackling dummy, a new bucking machine, new suits, shoes, headgear, etc. But best of all is the way he is working the men. Since September 15 men have been coming, and each day the squad increases. McNerny is the only old man that is not yet back, and when he arrives the squad will number nearly forty. For so early in the season the men are working fast and hard, and show almost mid-season form at present.

If hard work and patience from a coach have anything to do with making a football team we will surely have one. In a few days more a ball will be painted white, and certain nights in the week, and for a time every night, the men will have practice in the “Gym.” Lights are being put in and everything made ready for this innovation.

The training table was started on Wednesday, and the only men who had been here long enough to get in at least fair condition were taken on. The men to go on the first table were: Beacom, Sheehan, Donovan, Draper, Silver, Hill, Paupa, Remacker, Hutzel, Downs, McAvoy, Munson, Funk, Eggeman, Dwan and Calliercate.

Rooting has its share in winning any game, and well-organized rooting goes a long way in making a football team more than any team that calls for support. Songs, yells and anything which will tend to show good, true sportsmanship all goes to help. If the various halls would organize, elect a yell-master, learn yells and songs and then go in a body to the games, the result would surely reward their efforts. Good, clean rooting is essential at any game, but poor, unsportsmanlike screaming is even worse than absolute, funereal silence. Organize in the halls, elect a yell master, and do it right away. Everyone in the school has his share in making the team a winner. Do your share.

The old men who have reported are Beacom, Sheehan, Donovan, Healy, Funk, Silver, Draper, Waldorf and Bracken. Waldorf will not play football this year as his class work will not allow him to spare the time he must necessarily use in so doing. Last year was his first year, but he proved to be a valuable man and gave promise of developing into a star half-back.

Dwan and Silver are working at quarter, and Dwan gives promise of making a valuable second man for the position.

Thursday the new men were put through five hours of good hard work. In the morning the squad was divided into two teams which were then run through a vigorous signal practice. In the afternoon the ends and tackles were taken separately and taught how to block and hold.

The new men who have reported to McGlew for the first time are: Eggeman, Harben, Binz, Munson, Oberst, Schmitt, Curtis, Pryor, Rogers, Gilrich, King, Doyle, Duffy and Murray.

The men who are not yet on the training table will be put on just as soon as McGlew can handle them.

The first scrimmage was held last Wednesday afternoon. The squad was divided so that neither team had much advantage, and for twenty minutes the men received their first test in real football. The practice was held behind closed gates, and for a time
wil1 probably continue to be. The new men who showed up especially well in the first scrimmage were Hill at half-back, Paupa tackle, McAvoy end and Calliecrate half-back. Hill proved to be a good ground-gainer, while McAvoy and Calliecrate shone equally as well in defense, bringing their men down with low and sure tackles.

Hill, Rennacker, Calliecrate, Hutzel, Draper and McAvoy are showing well on the back field. Draper, O'Shea, McAvoy and Dwan are playing end and show all kinds of speed coupled with heady blocking and interference.

Munson and Eggeman give promise of developing into valuable linemen. Both men tip the scales at near 200.

Carroll Hall had its first practice Thursday, and from the number of men they had out they will again this year put a fast little team in the field.

Funk and Healy, last year's tackles, are coming into form and will soon be playing their usual steady game.

The following report emanating from our old rival, Purdue, gives us a good line on the way we will have to prepare ourselves if we hope to win back the championship from the "boiler-makers."

"Lafayette, Ind., Sept. 16.—The prospects of a winning football team at Purdue have been dimmed somewhat after a week of play by the continued absence of King, the giant guard, and Conville, the new man who was expected to fill a hole in the Varsity line. King, who was given a place on the all-Indiana team last year, is behind in his studies and will have to make them up before he can get back into the game. Conville went to Alma College, Mich., where he went to school a few years ago to obtain affidavits to the effect that he was a preparatory student and therefore eligible to play this year. He has not returned to school, although Coach Herrnstein still expects him.

"With a number of '04 regulars the scrubs have been able to hold the Varsity rushes fairly well this week, Captain Thomas and Zimmerman alone being able to make substantial gains. Coaches Herrnstein and Smith are shifting the linemen back of the forwards, for plunging plays and quarter-back and half-back runs are rarely seen on Stuart field. As yet the Varsity has developed no kicker, King having been relied upon to do the work.

"The Varsity eleven is about made up, and before the end of another week a good line can be drawn upon Purdue's real strength. With King and Conville back, the team will be composed wholly of veterans, with one or two men who have seen active service ready to fill in any position. Rush is playing a star game at guard, and will give Long and King a hard argument for their positions."

Personals.

—Dr. R. G. Monohan ('90) is now a prominent practicing physician in Butte, Montana.

—Chauncey W. Yockey (Law '02) is now engaged in a successful practise of his profession in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

—Mr. Dennis J. Hogan (A. B. '73, A. M. '75) was a guest at the University. Mr. Hogan is now prosperous situated in Geneva, Ill.

—John J. Cooney (Law '02) is doing exceedingly well and is the senior partner in the firm of Cooney and Lang, in Woodstock, Ill.

—Hon. Wm. B. Johnson (A. B. '68, A. M. '70) of Kansas City, Mo., recently paid a visit to the University for the purpose of placing his son Robert as a student at Notre Dame.

—Thomas J. Welch (Law '05) paid a short visit to his friends at the University during the week. Mr. Welch is on his way to Yale to continue the study of law, in which we wish him every success.

—Lawrence M. Antoine (E. E. '04) came out to the University a few days ago. Mr. Antoine ever since his graduation has been working for the Automatic Telephone Company, and he is now engaged in installing the company's service in South Bend.
Mr. Daniel L. Murphy (Law '05) was at the University during the week. Mr. Murphy has not yet entered upon the active practice of his profession, but intends to do so during the present year.

Hugh A. O'Donnell, a well-known student of a few years ago, is engaged in business in St. Paul, Minn., having been for some time employed as manager of the Randall Printing Co. of the above city.

Mr. Edward C. Smith (short electrical '01) of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, is now chief electrician for the Harrisburg Pipe and Pipe Bending Co. Mr. Smith's promotion in his profession has been very rapid, a circumstance which testifies eloquently to his ability and to his training as well.

Michael L. Fansler (Law student '04-'05) returned to Notre Dame for a few days, accompanied by his brother George, who is now continuing his studies at the University. Mr. Fansler reports that he is engaged in the law with his uncle in his home town, Logansport, Ind. His friends were delighted to hear of Mr. Fansler's success, which is, we feel assured, a well-merited one.

We are in receipt of a notice of the marriage of Angus D. McDonald to Miss Teny McDonald, the happy event having taken place in Oakland, California, the 31st of August. The bridegroom, Mr. McDonald, is well known here as a student and star athlete of a few years ago. The Scholastic unites with his friends in wishing himself and his bride all joy and happiness.

With pleasure we chronicle the marriage, on August the thirtieth, of John P. O'Hara (Ph. B. '02) to Miss Eleanor Carney of Portland, Oregon. Since his graduation in 1902, Mr. O'Hara has first been professor of history in Columbia University, and later editor of the Catholic Sentinel, published in Portland. His success has been as well defined as it has been rapid, and it is therefore in all sincerity that we congratulate him on his achievements and extend to him our felicitations and best wishes for happiness in his married life.

Medway Catholics attended with interest the first Mass of the Rev. James H. McGinnis in St. Joseph's Church (the Rev. Daniel J. Keleher, pastor) on Sunday. Father McGinnis is a graduate of this year's class from the American College in Rome, and was ordained to the priesthood on June 17, together with the Rev. James A. Supple, a Boston college graduate. He received the papal benediction himself and came home commissioned by the Holy Father to bestow it upon those attending his first Mass. Father McGinnis not only bestowed the papal blessing, but gave his own blessing to more than three hundred of the parishioners who flocked to the services to welcome the young priest.

Father McGinnis is ordained for the archdiocese of New York. He was prepared for the seminary at Notre Dame, Ind., in '00, and received the seminary training at St. Joseph's, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, the New York diocesan seminary (the Very Rev. Jas. F. Driscoll, S. S., D. D., president). At Dunwoodie, Father McGinnis won several scholarships and was sent by the late Archbishop Corrigan to Rome for the completion of his theological studies.

Father McGinnis will not report for duty until August 15, the Feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Local Items.

—The flag-pole has lately received a new coat of paint which greatly improves its appearance.

—Coach McGlew has had a new fence built around the football field, and everyone except players are expected to stay outside the barrier.

—Brother Leopold has at last adopted a trade mark. Every patron of the confectionery stand generally emerges after a friendly treat with a well-defined spot of lime on his coat, the result of inadvertent contact with the freshly whitewashed walls.

—A new brick building is going up at the west end of the old “gym.” The tailor-shop and shoe-shop will be moved from their present quarters and will hereafter be in the new building. This will allow the other industries to expand and take the rooms thus vacated.

—The scaffolding which was erected during the summer for the purpose of painting the colonnades and the base of the dome is now being taken down, revealing to the student for the first time the rich dark color which contrasts so well with the golden glory of the superstructure.

—All students, but more especially those who have recently entered the University, are earnestly advised to have their mail addressed to their halls, thus saving a goodly loss of time and labor on the part of the postmaster and his assistants, and an unnecessary inconvenience to themselves.

—Great has been the sorrow of the pilgrims to the novitiate apple orchard when they discovered the inferior quality and quantity of the fruit which in past years always proved so popular. There is only one consolation to be derived from the state of the crop, and that is the visits to the Infirmary will be materially less.

—The need for improvement has manifested itself in another direction. The quarters devoted to the development and entertainment of the “little princes” have been enlarged by the addition of a new room built against the east end of the old Minim “Gym.” The additional apparatus which will be found in the new structure will be a source of great pleasure to the little men when cold weather sets in and keeps them indoors.

—Many improvements have been made at Notre Dame since last June. The large barn which stood on the southeast promontory overlooking St. Mary’s Lake has been torn down and a new structure erected near the farmhouse on the south side of the St. Joe road. Men and teams are working on the old site, the ground is being leveled and rolled, and in a short time all signs of the old building will have disappeared to be in turn supplanted by a miniature park.

—Another thing that came to pass during the summer months is the renovation of the law recitation room. Great indeed was the delight of the embryonic Websters when a hurried peep into that room of pleasant memories revealed it standing forth resplendent in its coat of warm-tinted green. But there is also engendered in our minds a fear that the restful character of the color may perhaps conduct to “sleep, full of sweet dreams and quiet breathing,” a fear which is once allayed when we remember not only the absorbing interest of the subjects therein exploited, but also the fascinating way in which Col. Hoynes claims the undivided attention of his students.

—The hours at which the stationery office is open for the accommodation of the members of the different halls are:

For Brownson, Sorin, Corby, St. Joseph and Holy Cross Halls:

9:30 to 10:00 a.m., Thursdays excepted
9:00 to 9:30 a.m. Thursdays only.
3:00 to 3:30 p.m. Mondays, Tuesdays and Saturdays.

For Carroll Hall.
4:00 to 4:30 p.m., Mondays, Tuesdays, and Saturdays.
8:30 to 9:30 a.m., Thursdays.

Students of the different departments will please make note of the hours assigned to their respective halls and arrange to procure stationery, shop orders and other necessities at the proper times.

—Everyone at Notre Dame saw a sight which was surely worth the seeing when Martin O’Donnell, the “human squirrel,” climbed the steeple of the Church of the Sacred Heart a few days ago. The steeple had to be painted, and one of the foremost steeple-jacks in the country created a great sensation when he calmly climbed from the clock on the steeple up the narrow cornice board to the cross. Foot by foot he slowly worked his way upward until at last he reached the narrow platform and swung up over it. But best of all was when after having made such a perilous journey, he pulled a cigar from his pocket and lighted it with the same satisfaction one might suppose he be standing on the ground instead of 237 feet above it, and on a narrow platform. And now, daily he can be seen swinging around the tower painting away as though he really enjoyed his dangerous seat, while the watchers below sit in wonder and gaze at him.