

The Scholastic Year.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT NOTRE DAME.

Devoted to the Interests of the Students.

"LABOR OMNIA VINCIT."

Vol. II.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, IND., NOVEMBER 14, 1868.

No. 11.

Government.

An Essay, by Mr. T. O'Mahony of the St. Edward's Literary Society.

Government is a system of laws by which a nation or society is governed. Man has been created in the possession of wonderful powers and faculties; the great and noble characteristics of his soul being reason and free-will, from which fact it would appear that a regularly established form of government is unnecessary; since those wonderful faculties, reason, conscience and free-will ought to be a sufficient guide for man during life, but our own experience, as well as the history of ages gone by, proves conclusively and satisfactorily, that a form of government is absolutely necessary; society and nations cannot exist without it. Man does not always listen to the dictates of his conscience; man is not always governed by sound reason, but frequently by a sort of instinct or passion. Man does not invariably exercise his free-will properly, but frequently he exercises it, the noblest faculty of his soul, to the detriment, not of himself only, but of those by whom he is surrounded. Man's actions in life are not in every case the result of mature deliberation, but frequently of a momentary impulse, and hence the absolute necessity of a firmly established and vigorously executed system of laws for man's guidance through life. And furthermore, there is always a diversity of opinion and interest among men on every subject presented for their consideration, and hence the absolute necessity of some supreme authority, to the decisions of which men voluntarily submit. Therefore, notwithstanding those noble and distinguishing faculties which men possess, a system of laws, and a supreme authority to execute them, are necessary to the existence of society or nations; or, to express the same thing in other words, a form of

government is necessary. Having proved the necessity among men of government, I will now consider the powers and obligations of government and the different forms of government which have existed.

The will of the people is the supreme law of the land. And hence this will constitutes the power of government, and therefore the duty of government is the execution of the will of the people by whom it is maintained, and from this we conclude that the object of government, of whatever form, should be the happiness and prosperity of the people, because the people always will to be prosperous and happy, and it is the duty of government to execute the will of the people.

As long as government keeps this object, namely the happiness and prosperity of the people, in view, and promotes the interests of the people, so long is it consistently and with reason entitled to the allegiance and support of the people; but when the government deviates materially from this course, when it becomes detrimental to the interests of the people, then it does not execute the will of the people, and consequently it has lost its lawful power: and the people have then a right to reform this government or to establish that form of government which will advance their interests.

I will now speak of the forms of government that have existed.

There have existed many different forms of government since our first parents, Adam and Eve, were ejected, for their disobedience, from the garden of Paradise, but they have all possessed certain general distinctive features which enable us to make the following classification: The Patriarchal, the Monarchical, and the Democratic. The Patriarchal form of government existed in the earliest stages of society, when mankind were not very numerous, when

they had not attained a very high degree of perfection in the arts and sciences; but as mankind became numerous, as they advanced in the arts and sciences, they began to develop the natural resources of the country in which they lived; they became enterprising; they desired to extend the boundaries of their territory. These are some of the causes which led to the establishment of a Monarchical form of government, and the Monarchical form of government superseded the Patriarchal because it bears a marked resemblance to it and the people were anxious to preserve as far as possible their ancient institutions.

And when the people made still greater advancement in the arts and sciences; when they arrived nearer to the standard of perfection; in a word, when they became civilized and enlightened, we find the Republican form of government, which is a modification of the Democratical form, came into existence. The history of the world proves that the Republican form of government as it existed in ancient times, is the prelude to the destruction of the nation. Take for example, Rome, Sparta, Athens; they were once glorious Republics, Rome particularly was mistress of the world, her armies had subdued and conquered extensive territories; but in a few generations after the glory and prosperity of the ancient republics, their ruins only were to be seen to indicate the spot where they once had existed. The reason for this is plain, the people, under a republican form of government, become prosperous, with prosperity comes luxury, with luxury comes licentiousness, and the inevitable and necessary consequence of licentiousness is ruin and destruction.

The best form of government for a civilized and enlightened people, for a people capable of framing their own laws and governing themselves, is the elective Republic.

And the form of government best adapted to uncivilized people, people incapable of governing themselves, is the hereditary Monarchy: It is not necessary to enter into a philosophical discussion in order to prove that this is true, for the annals of the world prove it conclusively.

Gentlemen, a great deal more could be said on this subject, but I feel that I have already trespassed upon your time and patience; I will therefore come to a close by thanking you for the kind attention which you have given me, and assuring you that I appreciate highly the honor which you have conferred upon me in permitting me to address you this evening.

LECTURES ON HISTORY.

SECOND LECTURE.

The Roman Empire under the Pagan Emperors.

[CONTINUED.]

But to form a true estimate of the time of Augustus we must not forget the luxury of the people, the wretchedness of the lower orders, and the degraded condition of woman, herself a toy or a slave, and hardly respected as a mother, a sister, a wife, or a daughter,—sacred names on the lips of noble men.

Indeed mankind had grown so debased that they could hardly become worse: some great change must take place for the better, or society would be dissolved and the human race destroyed. Then it was, if ever, that a deliverer was needed, a Saviour, not only for the Roman people, but for the people of all the world, for the whole world was Roman, and even the Jews themselves needed a great Helper. Then it was the Saviour came, as if to give by this an additional proof of His divinity; for never can a helper come with more propriety than when he is most needed.

Little did Augustus think when he was laying deep the foundations of his empire, and establishing peace throughout the world, that he was preparing the way for the coming of a greater than any of the Romans, one who would use the grand structure of this empire for the spread of his own empire of true peace,—the peace of man with his maker and with his own conscience.

Thus Augustus

"Built better than he knew."

The empire united the whole world, giving to it one language, one law, one organization; and these became the means which God took to spread the Christian religion over the earth. This gave to the Church the great convenience of one language in every nation, as well as the means of reaching out, by its missionaries, from the center at Rome to every people in existence. It would thus seem as though the Romans had labored for 753 years, from the founding of the city to the birth of our Saviour, for the sole purpose of preparing the way for Christianity, so true is it that "Man proposes, but God disposes."

On the death of Augustus the empire fell into the hands of Tiberius, who seemed at first

disposed to follow in the footsteps of the first emperor. Soon, however, although in the fifty-fifth year of his age,—a time of life in which we should expect great moderation of conduct,—he showed himself a licentious tyrant, the first of the bad Emperors. His history shows us, if we needed any proof, that even mature age in an absolute and irresponsible ruler is no security to a people who are subject to his will. If the people of Rome had been satisfied with the empire under Augustus, Tiberius soon taught them what they might expect the moment power fell into the hands of a bad man.

The only events in Roman history for which the reign of Tiberius is remarkable, are the wars carried on by his son Drusus, and his nephew, the great Germanicus, so called from his success in his wars with the Germans. Both of these heroes, however, perished by violence, and, as many believe, with the secret knowledge of the unnatural emperor.

During the reign of this Emperor our Lord was crucified at Jerusalem, and the Apostles commenced the preaching of the Gospel.

Caligula, the unworthy son of the great Germanicus, was the second bad emperor. Like Tiberius, good at first, he soon became a barbarous tyrant, putting men to death for his mere amusement. It was he who said he wished the Roman people had but one head that he might cut it off at a blow. Besides his barbarity, he acted in many respects as an insane person, honoring his horse as his most intimate friend, and asking for himself divine honors. Caligula, like Tiberius, died by assassination.

On his death the people as though they had enough of Emperors, seemed desirous of re-establishing the republic. But the pretorians preferred an empire, as standing armies always do, and so Claudius a foolish old man, uncle of Caligula, was appointed emperor. The principal event of his weak reign was the invasion and partial conquest of Britain. He was poisoned by his own wife who caused her son Nero to be proclaimed emperor.

This monster, the third bad Emperor, like the first two, began very well, but soon showed himself the worst ruler that had yet ascended the throne. His wives and nearest friends were murdered by his own hand on the slightest provocation. To draw the attention of the people from his wickedness he instituted great shows for their amusement. To crown his infamy he set fire to the city, that he might observe the appearance of a real

burning city, and was so well pleased with the success of the experiment that he gave vent to his joy by playing on a musical instrument, while the people were endeavoring to save themselves and to put a stop to the flames.

He changed the manner of dying to which the bad Emperors had been accustomed, by putting himself to death.

Three Emperors followed in quick succession, the best of whom was Galba, governor of Spain, who was put to death by his successor Otho. The latter soon put himself to death and was succeeded by Vitellius, who is chiefly celebrated for his eating and drinking. His name is a synonym for glutton.

A conspiracy against him at last brought a better man to chief power, Vespasian, the general of the army of Asia, which was then engaged with the Jews. Leaving the command of the army to his son Titus he proceeded to Rome and was declared emperor. Titus conducted the siege of Jerusalem with great vigor, until the city was finally taken by storm, the city and temple destroyed, and the Jews driven out or sold into slavery in all parts of the earth.

The rest of the reign of Vespasian was peaceful, and worthy of the best days of Rome, as was also that of his son Titus, who succeeded him.

To Titus succeeded his brother Domitian another of the bad Emperors, and the last of the twelve Cæsars, as they are called, including Julius Cæsar as the first. No tyrant could be worse than was Domitian. Tiberius, Nero and Domitian formed a trio of the most cruel monsters that were ever suffered to afflict the human race.

With Nerva, the successor of Domitian, began the line of the five good Emperors, as they have been called,—Nerva, Trajan, Hadrian, Antonnius Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. Their united reigns covered a period of eighty-four years, certainly the most happy period of the Roman empire. Trajan, besides being one of the five good Emperors, was one of the greatest of all the Emperors. Under him the Roman empire attained its greatest extent. Never before had Roman power been so great. Marcus Aurelius deserves with Antonnius Pius special mention also as being the best of these Emperors, seeming to govern the empire as if they loved the people.

Three short reigns followed. Those of Commodus, a bad emperor, Pertinax, a good one, and Julianus, who bought the empire from the pretorians for a sum of money. How low had fallen the proud

old Roman people when their empire was purchased in the market as so much private property!

Septimus Severus, a Roman general, marched against this speculating Emperor and had him executed. Albinus general of the army of Britain and Niger general of the eastern army also contended for the empire, but were defeated by Septimus, who reigned alone and proved himself one of the great emperors.

Then succeeded three other monsters, Caracalla, Macrinus, and Elagabalus, whose very names are a disgrace to human nature.

After them came another Severus, Alexander, worthy to be ranked with the five good Emperors, as well as with the great ones.

After a few more contemptible reigns, came another good Emperor with Claudius II, who was followed by the still greater, Aurelian, put to death by a conspiracy. He was the conqueror of Zenobia, the celebrated Queen of Palmyra.

Afterwards came several emperors of little note, until finally the great Diocletian became supreme ruler.

With him began the formal division of the empire. Heretofore every Emperor considered himself capable of ruling the whole empire, but Diocletian appointed a colleague, Maximian, to rule in the west and he in the east. Afterwards Diocletian chose another helper in the east, Galerius, while Maximian chose Constantius Chlorus. These last, who were called Cæsars, soon succeeded to the imperial title, when Diocletian and Maximian retired to private life, the first example of an act afterwards made still more celebrated by the like retirement of Charles V of Spain and Germany, and by that of our own Washington.

Constantius Chlorus was succeeded by his son the great Constantine who soon after vanquished all his opponents, and reunited the whole Roman empire under his own sway.

With the name of Constantine we find ourselves at the beginning of a new era, the public recognition of the Christian religion by the government of the empire. Here then we must make a stand, and survey the progress of Christianity from its first entrance into the great pagan city, and its dwelling in the catacombs beneath the earth, until it burst upon the world in the full glory of its heavenly splendor.

Having learned something of the state of Roman society under Augustus and Tiberius, we may perhaps form an idea of the task which

the first preachers of the new law of love and purity proposed to themselves when they began the conversion of the proud sensual nobility and the enslaved and imbruted lower classes of imperial Rome. The law of love was offered to the most cruel and to the most oppressed people of the world; the law of purity and self-denial was offered to the most licentious and luxurious.

The Romans were then the most unbelieving and also the most intelligent people on earth; and it needed the most ardent belief to undertake their conversion and the most divine intelligence to accomplish it: the capital of the world, the destined seat of the supreme authority of the Church, the mightiest race of mankind, was to be converted, and the greatest of the Apostles only were fitted for the undertaking,—truly it needed the faith of the Prince of the Apostles, and the wisdom of the Apostle of the Gentiles. In the order of Providence the means were heré admirably suited to the end. Whether we consider the great difficulty of converting the Romans, on account of their sensuality, their unbelief, and their intellectual superiority, or the great importance of this conversion, on account of the influence of the race over the rest of mankind, the central position of the city, and the advantage of having one language throughout the globe, whether we look at the greatness of the task or the necessity, of its being done, in either case we cannot fail to see how suitable it was that the undertaking was confided to the greatest of the Apostles, to the ardent faith of Saint Peter and the extraordinary wisdom of Saint Paul. These being the founders of the Church of Rome, we may readily believe that the foundations were well laid, built deep in the catacombs upon the eternal rock.

But what a painful task was theirs! What ceaseless toil, what weariness, what sufferings! Well may we believe that their martyrdom did not consist only of the death which they suffered under Nero. Their lives were a constant martyrdom, not of the body merely, but of the mind, the heart, and the soul, sustained only by the never failing love of the Master whom they served.

THE passing years drink a portion of the light from our cheeks, as birds that drink at lakes leave their footprints on the margin.

WE follow the world in approving others, but we go before it in approving ourselves.

Revised Poems.

BY FANCIULLO.

No. I.—The Sister Lakes of Notre Dame.

I would sing of the scenes, where in youth's happy days
I drank at the fount of true pleasure;
Where virtue and peace were the guide of my ways
And *science* gave free of her treasure.

But first, gentle muse, lead me back to the side
Of the sweet Sister Lakes, dearly cherished,
On whose bright, lovely face sits the smile of a bride,
—Be it long ere their beauty has perished—

Tune thy harp golden-stringed to the sweet notes of love;
Make the woodlands and valleys resound;
Let thy numbers ascend to the bright stars above,
And all hearts to the measure rebound.

O, who would not sing of the beauty and grace
Of the Lakes of Saint Joseph and Mary?
Whose heart would not throb, when he looks on the face
Of their waters so limpid and airy?

Whose soul would not thrill with the purest delight,
When he sits on the bluff circling round him,
And a million bright jets of the sun's parting light,
Dance blithe on the waters before him?

When the birds, from the branch of some wide spreading tree,
Sing wildly their song to the morning;
And the flowers lift their heads and seem pregnant with glee
As they smile on the scene they're adorning?.

Then the heart free from care soon enchantedly swells,
And seems pillowed on furs of the otter;
As the silvery chime of the college church bells
Floats tremblingly over the water.

But who can describe all the charming delight
Of the student, released from his labor,
When he sits in the shade, while the sun sparkles bright,
And lists to the gay feathered songster!

When at evening, fatigued by the heats of the day,*
He dives neath the waters so cooling,
And chuckles with sport as he dashes the spray
In the face of some one "he'd be fooling!"

Or he sits in the shade of some tufted old oak,
While a "stout old havana" dispatching;
And betimes he looks round—(for he's stealing that smoke)
And he fears that the *prefect* is watching.

So the summer glides by, giving joys without end,
And dull winter is slowly advancing;
But the joys of all seasons the student befriend,
And each time seem his pleasure enhancing.

Now he runs to the lake, when his study is done,
Buckles on his good skates in a hurry,
And "outstrips the fierce blast" (which he thinks only fun)
As it sweeps o'er the ice in a flurry.

Then he capers around, like a colt from the stall,
O'er the icy-bound surface so glossy,
Till the bell calls him back to the old study hall
Where his books all await him *in posse*.

Thus the seasons glide round in our western retreat,
Mid pleasures and struggles for knowledge;
And the heart of the student will quicken its beat,
When, through life, he reverts to the COLLEGE.

* This was written during the dog days.

O my bright college days! how I weep for you now!
How I wish me a *boy* ten times over!
May your mem'ry so sweet through my soul ever flow;
May your influence round me still hover.

On Absurdity.

"Don't be absurd."—Mrs. Caudle.

"From the sublime to the ridiculous is but a step," says an ancient and very respectable proverb. The change perhaps of a single word—nay, even, of the intonation of a word—will turn tragedy into burlesque. And common-place actions—such as occur in the ordinary business of life—never seem to become absurd. Thoughts which are high, solemn, and of vital importance, are easily turned into ridicule, which cannot be attached to matters of simple indifference. Whence is this?

Is it that the heights of sublimity are dizzy eminences from which the soul easily falls into the abyss of absurdity? or is it that the origin of both tragedy and absurdity is a common one—namely, human passion, which is tragic when it materially affects human happiness, and absurd when it does not?

If it were not for the heavy misfortunes which fell to the lot of King Lear, he would be nothing more than a precious old fool for allowing his daughters to beguile him with their flattery; but we forget the folly of the man when we witness the woes of the outraged father. No passion is more tragic and at the same time more absurd than jealousy. If the *dénouement* of Othello had occurred before the murder of Desdemona, the position of the "hero" would be eminently ridiculous, particularly if Iago managed to keep out of his way.

In analysing the ridiculous, or that which excites laughter, we must carefully distinguish between the *humorous* and the *absurd*. To laugh at what is absurd, implies a certain amount of contempt for the object in which the absurdity resides,—to laugh at what is humorous does not. Absurdity is a weakness of the intellect, humor is a power of the mind. The greatest saints, as St. Francis of Sales and St. Philip Neri, have spoken and acted with excellent humor intentionally; while the greatest philosophers, as Sir Isaac Newton, have fallen unconsciously into the grossest absurdities. Two anecdotes will illustrate the difference:

A lady is said once to have consulted St. Philip

on the lawfulness of wearing *rouge*. The Saint replied that some were of opinion that it was lawful—others not. For his part, he should adopt a middle course, and allow her to wear *rouge* on one cheek only.

Sir Isaac Newton had a favorite cat; and in order that she might have easy access to his private library, he had a hole cut in the lower part of the door, sufficiently large for her admission. In the course of feline events, the cat gave birth to a kitten, and for the accommodation of the latter, the benevolent philosopher had a small hole cut in the library door beside the large one.

These well-known anecdotes show us that humor is a valuable gift of nature, intended by Divine Providence to be used for good purposes, while absurdity is a confusion of the ideas, to which even the wisest philosophers are liable. Most men are absurd in some respect—it is where their ruling passion most prevails.

The passions lead to absurdity, but the instincts of nature do not. A drowning man may be *unreasonable* in catching at a straw, but no one would call him *absurd*—no one but a fiend could laugh at him. And since the animals act from instinct rather than from passion, they are never absurd unless their instincts have been perverted by man's interference. A hen that has hatched ducklings is apt to be absurd, and so is a dancing bear. Of all animals in their natural state, and following their natural habits, monkeys alone appear to us absurd—and their absurdity is only apparent, inasmuch as they seem to be caricatures of humanity.

To attain the height of absurdity in any passion, intensity must be combined with trivial results. Or, mathematically speaking, a passion is absurd in *direct* proportion to its vehemence, and in *inverse* proportion to the crimes or misfortunes it leads to. Hence personal vanity is generally the most absurd of vices. Superstition is often absurd, but sometimes it is no joke. Fanaticism is too serious to be absurd. We laugh at the vagaries of drunkenness, but when we hear that a family is suffering want and penury, our sense of the ridiculous ceases.

Young friends, if you are benevolently anxious to contribute your share towards smoothing the rugged ways of life, and cheering the road by the ring of cheerful laughter, cultivate whatever sense of the humorous you may possess, as much as you will, but (if you can help it)—

Don't be absurd.

S.

COLLEGE BULLETIN.

Arrival of Students at N. Dame.

NOVEMBER 11th.

John E. Shannahan, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Nathaniel Shelton, South Bend, Ind.
James J. McDermott, Chicago, Ill.

NOVEMBER 12th.

J. Lloyd Miller, Dayton, Ohio.

Honorable Mention.

MORAL PHILOSOPHY.

W. P. McClain, J. Cunnea and J. O'Reilly

LOGIC.

H. B. Keeler.

FIRST RHETORIC.

T. O'Mahoney, J. H. Lecompte, W. P. Rhodes, A. B. White, J. McClain, H. Eisenman, H. Wrape and W. Waldo.

SECOND RHETORIC.

R. L. Akin, J. Curran, J. Garrity, J. Zahm, F. Crapser, J. Eisenman and J. P. Sewell.

FIRST GRAMMAR SR.

J. Mader, C. A. Wenger, J. Montgomery, E. D. Hagan, J. Harrison, J. Vocke, E. Fitzharris, L. Schneider, T. A. Kinsella, C. Sage, J. M. Duffy, T. Watson, J. Gavitt, W. Ryan, S. Ryan, J. Wilson, F. Nicholas, L. Towne, P. Rhodes, T. Lappin and H. Beakey.

SECOND GRAMMAR.

L. Dupler, E. Gambee, J. Garharstine, J. Murphy, J. Nash and C. Walter.

THIRD GRAMMAR.

C. Ilgenfritz, T. Heery, M. Carney, W. Lence, B. Vocke, O. Mosely, L. G. Dunnavan and H. Schnelker.

FIRST GRAMMAR JR.

P. Cochrane, V. Hackmann, M. Brannock, R. Broughton, L. Wilson, W. Clarke and B. J. Hefernan.

SECOND GRAMMAR.

A. Cabel, C. Duffy, E. Lafferty, Geo. Pearce, P. Tilan, E. O'Bryan and J. Crevoisier.

Letter-writing: L. Hayes, A. Cabel, N. Mitchell, H. Hayes, H. O'Neil, P. Tinan and E. O'Bryan.

son, E. Bland, R. Rettig, C. Foote, L. Ingersoll, E. Lindsay, L. English, A. Bryson, A. Carpenter, M. King, N. Sherburn, N. Thomson, A. Heckman, S. Gleason, L. Chouteau, K. Carpenter, W. Corby, A. Walker, T. Vanhorn, M. Ogle, and L. Corning.

Third Class Sr: Misses M. Tuberty, F. Butters, H. Niel, A. Boyles, J. Chesebro, N. Simms, H. Higgins, E. Ruger, M. Kirwan, M. Sherland, A. Fulwiler, A. Wiley, S. Beebe, R. Joslyn and J. Stevens.

First Preparatory Class: Misses A. Mast, A. Lyons, M. Foote, E. Cooney, M. Rumely, E. Darst, J. Lonergan, S. Coffee, E. Henry and C. Warner.

Second Preparatory Class: K. O'Toole, M. O'Toole, J. Davis, M. Minnick, E. Simms and K. Cline.

Third Preparatory Class: J. Denny, L. Blaizy, C. Hoerber, M. Clune, E. Ritter, A. Matthews and J. Davis.

FRENCH.

First Class: Misses A. Carmody, L. Tong, K. Livingston.

Second Class: A. Mulhall, C. Davenport, and M. Alexander.

Third Class: K. Carpenter, M. Sherland, J. Hynds, K. Cunnea, A. Bader, N. Leoni and K. Medill.

GERMAN.

First Class: E. Crouch, N. Simms.

Second Class: H. Higgins, S. O'Brien.

MUSICAL DEPARTMENT.

PIANO.

Fourth Class: Misses L. McNamara, M. Foote and B. Meyers.

Fifth Class: A. Metzger, B. Fensdorf, and S. Dunbar.

Sixth Class: K. Kline and E. Cooney.

Seventh Class: L. and M. McManaman.

Eighth Class: J. Walton.

GUITAR.

Second Class: Miss E. Simms.

VOCAL MUSIC.

Misses E. Longsdorf and C. Davenport.

DRAWING.

Misses E. Kirwan, J. Dobson, A. Carpenter, E. Bland, M. Bader, E. Carr and L. Lewis.

Table of Honor, Jr.

Misses J. Wilder, L. McKenney, M. Durand, M. Moon, Rose Carroll, M. Vaughn, B. Wilson and Anne Garrity.

Honorable Mention.

Second Preparatory Class: Miss H. Clarke.

Third Preparatory Class: Misses B. Meyers and M. Letourneau.

First Junior Class: Misses M. Moon, A. Byrne, B. Fensdorf, L. McNamara and M. O'Meara.

Second Junior Class: Misses R. Carroll, N. Strieby and B. Henry.

ADVENTURES OF A DRESSING GOWN.—A lady was anxious to make her husband a present on the occasion of his birth-day, and it happening to fall in winter, she thought a dressing gown would be a most useful acquisition to his domestic comfort. So she went and purchased a fine Persian pattern, one well wadded. Not remembering the exact height of her husband, she thought it best to purchase one rather too long than too short, to make sure of its usefulness.

The day was wet, the husband returned in the afternoon, and she presented him with the new article of comfort; and he fancied it indeed a great article of comfort after he had put off his wetgarments. But it was about ten inches too long.

"O! never mind," said the affectionate wife "I can easily shorten it to suit you."

They had a party in the evening, and were very merry; and every one admired the beautiful dressing gown. After they had gone to bed the wind and rain made such a noise that the wife couldn't sleep; her husband, however, snored musically. She arose without disturbing him, took the dressing gown, and commenced her work, cutting off about the length of ten inches to make it suit her husband's stature, and then went to bed again.

In the morning she was up early to make some arrangements with her housekeeper, as several friends were expected to dinner that day. Scarcely had the lady left the room, when her sister—a good-natured old lady who lived with them—stepped in on tip toe, in order not to disturb the sleeper took the dressing gown and hastened to her room, cut off about ten inches, as she knew it was too long the night before.

An hour after the gentleman awoke, and was now anxious to surprise his wife. Ringing for a servant, he was told to take the dressing-gown to a tailor and have it made shorter by ten inches. The good wife was detained longer than she expected, and scarcely had the dressing gown returned from the tailor's, when she came into the room. Her husband had just risen, and proposed now to surprise his wife and enjoy his comfort. But how surprised was his better-half to see her husband in a fine Persian shooting jacket instead of a comfortable dressing gown.