

Notre Dame Scholastic.

Devoted to the interests of the Students.

"LABOR OMNIA VINCIT."

VOLUME V.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, INDIANA, JUNE 8, 1872.

NUMBER 39.

Divine Providence and the Existence of Evil.

BY M. B. B.

Among the great problems whose solution has occupied the minds of thoughtful men from the earliest days of philosophical speculations, that of reconciling the existence of evil in the world with the sanctity, goodness and providence of God has ever held a prominent place. As happens in the case of all important questions, many and often conflicting theories have been invented to solve this problem, a review of which would occupy more space than would accord with the purpose of this essay. Hence we shall set aside all mere theories on this subject, and, taking a Christian view of the fundamental principles involved in the case, endeavor to show by the light of reason how the existence of evil may be reconciled with the highest Christian conception of God's infinite goodness and sanctity.

In the common acceptance of the term, there are three species of evil,—viz.: moral, social and physical. *Moral evil*, or sin, is that which is opposed to the law of God, and which withholds or diverts man from the attainment of his ultimate destiny; *social evil* is that which is opposed to the legitimate interests or good order of society; and *physical evil* is that which either interferes with the natural exercise of man's physical powers, or induces some deordination, real or apparent, in physical nature.

In a philosophical sense, however, there is but one species of evil, viz., *moral evil*. In regard to social evil, it may be well to remark that as society is one of the principal means by which man is to attain his ultimate destiny, whatever is opposed to the primary principles and object of society is likewise opposed to the divine will, and impedes the attainment of man's ultimate destiny, and is, therefore, a moral evil. Hence social evil, so far as it has any existence, resolves itself into moral evil. Physical evil, on the other hand, when viewed philosophically, is simply a misnomer; for pain and suffering, the loss of health, property or friends, death itself, and all besides that is included in the term physical evil, are rather inconveniences than anything else: and in so far as a patient endurance of these inconveniences may become the source of merit, and thus aid in the attainment of our ultimate destiny, they are good and not evil.

Moral evil, consequently, is the only real evil, and of this alone we purpose to speak in our present essay. To proceed systematically, our first inquiry should be whether or not moral evil really exists; and in order to answer this question satisfactorily it will be necessary to premise some remarks on the nature, modes and qualities of existence, and of the causes which produce existences.

To *exist* signifies not only to possess being, but also to have received that being from another. God does not *exist*, in the strict sense of the term, since He did not receive His being from another; God *IS*, necessarily. Man does *exist*, because he did receive his being from another; that is, from God.

Being, simply, therefore, does not suppose a prior cause, while existence does presuppose such a cause. This cause may be either primary or secondary, according as it produces an object directly and as a separate existence, or merely modifies one object in such a way as to render it in some respect another object different from the first. Thus God created a substance called marble; He also created man, with his distinctive form: of these two existences, separately, God is the primary and direct cause. Now the artist takes a piece of marble and so modifies it that it represents the human form, and this result of the artist's skill and labor we call a statue. Of this statue, considered as a piece of marble in which the human form is represented, God is the *primary* cause, since He created the marble, the model after which it was fashioned into a statue, and also gave the talent and strength by which the artist produced the distinct object in question; the artist is the secondary cause of the statue, considered in the light just mentioned. But the statue is the result of a combination of a particular form with a particular substance. God did not make that combination Himself, nor did He compel the artist to make it; hence, although He is the primary cause of the statue as a whole, He is not the cause of that by which the statue is rendered the particular object it is. The artist alone, by his free choice, and by the free exercise of the power and ability which God bestowed upon him as natural gifts, without, however, determining them to this or that particular exercise, is the primary and direct cause of that special combination of previously existing things by which that statue exists as a statue.

Again, a cause may be *efficient* or *virtual*, according as it produces an object by its own immediate act, or simply directs and influences some other agent to the production of a particular object, in such a way that that agent could not abstain from acting. In the foregoing illustration, God is the efficient cause of the marble and of the human model after which it has been fashioned into a statue; had He so influenced the artist that the latter could not abstain from forming the statue, then He would be the virtual cause of the statue; but having exerted no such irresistible influence, He is not even the virtual cause of the statue as a distinct object, although he is the efficient cause of all the elements which enter into its construction. The artist, on the other hand, is the efficient cause of the statue as a distinct object, although in no way the cause of any of its elementary parts. Hence, we see that an agent may be the cause of several objects separately, and yet not be the cause of the special object resulting from a combination of two or more of these.

Returning to the question of existence, we remark that an object may exist, (1) necessarily or contingently; (2) in the abstract, or in the concrete; (3) in possibility, or in reality; (4) absolutely, or conditionally. (1) An object exists *necessarily* when it exists by virtue of its own nature; that is, when it contains in itself the reason or principle of its own existence, and when it exists in such a manner that to suppose it not existing would involve a contradiction. This is *absolute necessity*,

and applies to God alone. In regard to existence proper, we say that an object exists necessarily when its existence is so involved in some other existence that to suppose it not existing would argue a substantial deformity or defect in the existence in which it is involved. This species of necessity we call *hypothetical*, because it exists only in the hypothesis or supposition that one object pre-exists which involves some other object.

An object exists *contingently* when it is the production of a cause which was free to produce it or not produce it at pleasure. Contingent existence is opposed to absolutely necessary existence when the producing cause was free from absolute necessity in producing it, or when, *considered in itself, and as a distinct object*, it might without any contradiction be supposed not to exist. In this sense, all things created, without exception, are contingent. Contingent existence is opposed to hypothetically necessary existence when the producing cause was free, not only from absolute necessity, but also from hypothetical necessity in producing it; or, in other words, when considered not only as a distinct object in itself, but also in its relations to other existing objects, it might, without any contradiction or impropriety, be supposed not to exist. In this sense many created things are contingent, while others are not. Hence, while all created things are contingent, as opposed to absolutely necessary, some are hypothetically necessary in as much as one act of the Creator involves another as its complement or inseparable concomitant. Thus God is absolutely necessary; creation as a whole is contingent, considered as opposed both to absolutely and hypothetically necessary. The existence of man as a rational and free being is also contingent in the same sense; but granting the existence of man as a rational and free being, the eternal correspondence of things requires the establishment of a law for man's moral government. The existence of such a law, although contingent, when viewed as a separate existence, is, nevertheless, hypothetically necessary—the necessity arising from the intelligence and freedom of man.

(2.) An object exists in the *abstract*, when it exists as a possibility which may become a part of some real existence, but not a real existence in itself. Thus, goodness, considered apart from all other things, has no existence in itself; nor can it have such existence, since it is a mere quality, and existence supposes substance; hence, goodness exists merely as a possible part or modification of some other object. An object exists in the *concrete*, when it exists as a complete and distinct thing, endowed with all the attributes which belong to the nature of such a thing. Thus the paper on which I am writing exists in the concrete, since it is distinct from all other objects and possesses all the essential qualities of paper.

(3.) An object exists in *possibility*, when there is no opposition between the attributes which unite to constitute such an object; or, in other words, when, though not existing at the present time, it may, without any contradiction, be supposed to exist hereafter. This supposes the existence of a cause

capable of producing the object in question. An object exists in *reality* when the requisite attributes are actually united so as to constitute a distinct object. Thus the table on which I am writing exists in *reality*; while a similar table composed of a single diamond is *possible*.

(4.) An object exists *absolutely*, when it exists independently of all other objects. God is the only absolute, because He alone is entirely independent of all other beings; yet there is a species of absolute existence which belongs also to contingent objects; viz.: their individual independence in regard to all other contingent things, although all are dependent on God not only for the beginning of existence, but also for its continuance. An object exists *conditionally* when its existence depends on some other object. Thus God is the absolute; all created things are conditional in regard to Him, since they all depend on the creative act for their existence; in regard to one another, however, and apart from their dependence on God, all men individually, and many other individual objects, have an absolute existence of their own; while, on the other hand, perfect health in a man depends upon a normal condition and action of all the physical and mental functions. Hence the existence of perfect health is conditional. Granting the normal condition and action of body and mind, perfect health exists; removing or disturbing these, it ceases to exist.

With the preceding explanation of causes and existences, we are prepared to examine intelligently, and we hope satisfactorily, the question of the existence and nature of evil. We have said that moral evil is that which is opposed to the law of God, etc. But the law of God, as imposed upon men, is nothing else than His supreme will, commanding that rational and free beings shall, in accordance with their nature and special destiny and within the limits of their finite capacity, act in a manner conformable to the perfections of God Himself, after whose image and likeness they were created. Consequently, whatever is opposed to the law or will of God, is also opposed to His divine perfections. Hence, evil in general, that is without special reference to man or any other class of beings, may be defined *that which is opposed or in contradiction to the perfections or attributes of God*.

If we now transport ourselves back to a period before any being, man or angel, had been created, we find the actual existence of evil simply impossible; for at such a supposed period no being existed except God Himself. But God is *essentially* good, and by His very nature incapable of acting in opposition to any of His own perfections or attributes. Hence, as evil can result only from an act, physical or intellectual, contrary to some one or more of the perfections of God, and as no being existed, prior to creation, capable of such an act, evil was then impossible.

However, as God had determined from all eternity to create other beings, who, in consequence of their finite nature, would be capable of acting in opposition to His perfections, we might probably say that evil existed even before the creation in a sort of abstract, hypothetical possibility. We say *abstract*, because evil being the contradictory of good, which is a positive quality, is nothing else than a mere negation or absence of positive quality, and is, therefore, incapable of actual existence as a distinct object. We say *hypothetical*, because evil, even as a negative character, was possible only in the hypothesis that a being in whom it could exist was to be created in the future. It is only in this sense that evil was even *possible* before the creation.

The moment finally arrived in which God had determined to bring creatures into actual existence, and He created the angels, giving them free will. From that moment, evil, which hitherto had been only hypothetically possible, became simply possi-

ble, since a being now actually existed which was capable of acting in opposition to the will of God. As yet, however, no evil actually existed; for the angels, as created by God, were in every respect good;—even that very free will, which rendered them capable of opposing the will of God, was in itself and in its object good; for it was bestowed in order that they, by voluntarily paying to their Creator the homage due Him, and by a voluntary submission to His will, might glorify Him, accomplish their own destiny, and thus increase their own happiness.

In the course of time, a portion of the angels did, by their free will, act in opposition to God—and evil, which was before only possible, then actually existed, so far as it is capable of existence. Here the question presents itself: In what sense is evil capable of existence? Evil can have actual existence only in some individual possessing intelligence and freedom; it can exist in that individual only after the manner of a *want* or a *defect*; it cannot exist as a *quality*, for a quality is something *positive* and implies an addition of something new to the individual or object to which it is attributed; but evil is *negative*, and denotes simply the absence of something which ought to be present, and at the same time supposes that this absence is occasioned or caused by the free and deliberate choice of the individual in whom it exists. Hence, as evil is nothing positive in itself, but merely the absence of positive existence, it can have no actual existence in itself or apart from some rational and free individual—not even by divine Omnipotence. Consequently, God could not create evil as a distinct thing. Neither could He create evil as it exists in the individual; for evil, by its very nature, supposes that that defect, or absence of positive quality, which constitutes the groundwork of evil, be occasioned or caused by the *free will* of the individual; but, if God were to create an individual with this or that defect, the presence of such a defect would in no way depend on the free will of the individual, and therefore would not be an evil, but simply an imperfection for which the individual would not and could not be held responsible. Hence, as God could not create evil as a distinct object in itself, nor as a characteristic of the individual, He is not and cannot be the cause of evil, at least not the *direct* or *efficient* cause.

But may not God be the *virtual* cause of evil? No; for to be the virtual cause, it would be necessary for Him to influence the free will of the individual agent in such a way that that individual could not abstain from acting in opposition to the Divine will and perfections. But in this supposition the individual free will would cease to be free will, since it would be deprived of the power of choice, which constitutes the very essence of freedom. Hence evil, in the supposed case, would be impossible, since it cannot possibly exist without the deliberate exercise of free will. Therefore God cannot be the virtual cause of evil, any more than a circle can be square, since the very act which would constitute Him such a cause would at the same time remove the very possibility of evil. Consequently, as God is not and cannot by any possibility be either the *direct*, *efficient*, or *virtual* cause of evil, He is not and cannot possibly be its cause in any sense.

Ah! some one thinks we have made a mistake, and suggests that God is the *primary* cause of evil, in as much as He created the individual in whom it exists, and the free will by which it exists. Yet, we have made no mistake. God, indeed, is the primary cause of the individual, who was once just but is now a sinner; as in the illustration already given, He was the primary cause of the statue, considered as a whole; but as in that case He was not in any way the cause of that special combination of form with substance by which the statue was rendered the distinct object it is, so in this case He is in no respect the cause of the

evil or sin by which the just individual has been transformed into a sinner. All that God caused in the case was good in the beginning, and continues to be good—namely, the individual, as an individual—the free will, or the faculty of choice; but the choice itself, which primarily and solely constitutes the sin or evil by which an individual, once just, is transformed into a sinner, depended entirely on that individual himself, and was not caused either directly or indirectly by God. Therefore, although God is the primary cause of the sinner, as an individual being, He is not and cannot be, in any respect, the cause of sin or evil.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Eccentric Characters.

The greatest men that history records have not been without their little weaknesses, somewhat flattering to humanity, because proving them to be simply men and not demigods. Thus Sir Walter Raleigh in his best days was a consummate dandy, and it is said appeared at court with six thousand dollars' worth of diamonds in his shoes, while his sword-hilt and baldric were studded with precious stones of great value. Bruyere, whose written lines were aglow with poetry and wit, was coarse, heavy and vulgarly stupid in society, and as a cotemporary declares, was in consequence the subject of many a practical joke. Next there occurs to us the great philosopher Descartes, who had a perfect passion for wigs, not unlike Sir Richard Steele, who would sometimes spend forty guineas on a black peruke. Corneille, the French Shakespeare, spoke in language so ungrammatical as to mortify his friends constantly, while his conversation was the acme of stupidity. What was said of Descartes might apply also to him, viz.: that he had received his intellectual wealth from nature in solid bars, not in current coin. Who ever thinks of Goldsmith without calling up that irrepressible peach-colored coat? It is as immortal as its master, and one never forgets the German flute that fed and lodged the itinerant in his wanderings over half of Europe. Yet the man who wrote *The Deserted Village*, *Citizen of the World*, etc., "couldn't talk," it was said, "any more than a parrot."

According to Johnson, Pope had such a high opinion of himself as to think he was one of the pivots of the system of the world; the little, deformed satirist was pride personified. Vanity builds its nest and hatches its brood in high places. Napoleon prided himself on the smallness of his hands and feet. Sir Walter Scott was prouder of being sheriff of Selkirkshire than of his reputation as the author of *Waverley*. Byron was vain to excess; vain of his genius, his rank, and vain even of his vices. What contrasts present themselves as the panorama of the mind unrolls the imprint of memory. Dryden, the illustrious poet, was yet all that he described himself to be, "slow in conversation, dull in humor, saturnine and reserved." The trite saying, that no man is a hero to his own valet, has abundant illustration. The Count de Grammont once surprised Cardinal Richelieu jumping with his servant to see which could leap the highest, and by joining in the ridiculous sport, and permitting the cardinal to beat him by a few inches, he gained his fixed friendship and great political preferment! Salvator Rosa was full of fun and frolic, often playing in impromptu comedies, and was more than once dected by his friends in the streets of Rome dressed as a mountebank. Mediocrity is ever voluble, and genius oftenest reticent. Addison's conversational deficiencies are well known, nor was the great master of English literature himself ignorant of the fact, as he used to declare that he had a good bank at home, but didn't carry small change with him.

The favorite recreation of Petavius, the learned Jesuit, was, after application to study and writing

for an hour, to twirl his chair steadily for five or ten minutes. That profound divine, Samuel Clark, after becoming weary over his books, would often place the chairs and tables in a row, and be discovered jumping over them consecutively back and forth. Cujas, the famous lawyer, studied lying upon the floor with his books about him. Odd enough most certainly are the fancies of genius. Spinoza, took a strange and absorbing delight in seeing spiders fight, returning to this strange amusement frequently during the day, while a singular contrast and yet partial resemblance was seen in Magliabecchi, the famous librarian of the Duke of Tuscany. He was passionately fond of spiders, fed and protected them, had his rooms filled with them, and would not permit them to be disturbed. He was a profound student, yet hourly returned to his strange pets, as a relaxation and amusement. Moses Mendelssohn, called the Jewish Socrates, passed hours together counting the tiles on a neighboring roof, "an occupation which he found very composing and quieting, mentally and physically." Cowper, while a prey to the deepest melancholy, a sort of monomania, indeed, wrote that famous burlesque, John Gilpin, and passed his leisure hours in making bird-cages and breeding rabbits.

Mina, the justly famous Swiss painter, always had a room full of cats, and one upon his shoulder while he was drawing. Even Dr. Johnson, the blunt old philosopher, petted his cat constantly, and kept him at night, when "he made it quite comfortable at the foot of the bed." On the contrary, it will be remembered that Henry III of France could not remain in the room with a cat. Sometimes the idiosyncrasies of great men are repulsive; for instance, Goethe, the noblest German of them all, had a fondness for snakes, and petted a tame adder, while at the same time he had a most unaccountable aversion to dogs, which was exhibited whenever he saw one. Erasmus, the profound scholar and philosopher, was terrified and would almost faint at the sight of fish. Thompson's greatest delight was to saunter in his garden and eat ripe peaches off the trellises, with his hands in his pockets, an invariable practice in the fruit season; and Gray said he should like to pass his life on a sofa reading French novels. The cynical but profound Rochefoucault sought inspiration in raw onions; and our own Choate, like Dr. Shaw, the naturalist, would drink ten cups of strong tea at a sitting. Thackeray felt so sensitive at the diminutive character of his nose, that he never forgot to present a full face to you when talking, and on all occasions, to avoid exposing his profile. Lamb stuttered so as to nearly tumble over his half uttered sentences, yet the pen of Elia glided like a fairy wand, as it recorded lines now so tenderly cherished.

Cromwell, who was said to "live upon stilts," sometimes came down, laid aside his Puritanic gravity and played at blind man's buff with his attendants, showing all the eagerness of earnest and frolicsome boyhood. Charles II of England romped in St. James' Park, surrounded by a troop of those diminutive spaniels which bear his name, also passing hours in feeding the ducks. Beethoven had a passion for paddling in cold water, and carried his fancy to such an extent that the floor of his room was flooded and the water would filter through to the lower stories. Sometimes he would at morning run barefooted through the dewy grass. Shelly was passionately fond of sailing paper boats in the park, and on one occasion finding himself there without paper, save a fifty pound note, he unhesitatingly gave it the proper shape and launched it on the water, running round the pond to receive his venture as it came to shore at the opposite bank. Some one has said there is no genius in which there is not an element of madness.—*Boston Globe.*

English Composite.

ED. SCHOLASTIC: I find I have driven Simon—Simple I cannot call him, because in a bad sense he is certainly not simple, but as I believe, possessed of culture; and Simple in a good sense I cannot call him so long as he defends so intricate a piece of machinery as the English language—I find I have driven Simon from "undefiled" English into what he calls "composite" English. Will the evasion save him?

In using the word "composite" he admits the whole argument. It is as much as to say that there is no such thing as the English language, properly speaking, because its defenders are compelled to defend it by calling attention to the already unpleasantly palpable fact that it is made of scraps, a defence which runs like the gossip of a quilting-party into a laudation of a patchwork upon which the threads of the seamstress and the sewing-machine are everywhere traceable, or, to change the metaphor, into a laudation of a Jacky Horner pie ingeniously stuffed with goodies—hardly a conglomerate, rather an agglomerate—a plum-pudding, a Joseph's coat of many colors. Now this does not show that the language is simple or noble, in the sense of simplicity or nobility in which we apply these terms to the marble or the lily, the rain-drop or the honey, the one of gold or of silver, or the tree of cedar or of maple—for these things, like the German language, come from the great heart of nature, from the liberal and undefiled hand of God, and are pure, and no one was ever heard to say that they were wanting in simplicity or nobility, or were composite—but it shows that the language is ignoble and complex, like a clay and iron image or a mixture of oil and water.

Undoubtedly the English language has merits as compared with a large number of languages, Asiatic, African, and even European; but our question is, "How does it stand as contrasted with the Latin and the German?"

The Latin is a noble language in that it is in its construction regular and methodical, in its general rules systematic, and in its pronunciation commanding and sonorous. In its nobility and simplicity, purity and strength go together. All these things are wanting to the English except in so far as they adhere to or inhere in the Latin and German words submitted to the process of agglomeration. It is true that in the ambition of the Roman orators and poets, especially in the decline of the Empire, it became a fashion (by no means a necessity) to bring into the Latin text an occasional word of Greek origin—but this no more proves the Latin a conglomerate, dependent or inferior language, than the practice current with the German *dilettanti* to lug into the German text French and English words, clothing them grotesquely enough in German letters—a practice, by the bye, severely censured by German scholars—argues against the independent character of the German tongue. The Latin language, like the Latin history, is one of grandeur and magnanimity—the German, like the character of the German people, is simple and honest.

"The English language is our mother-tongue," Simon insinuates. A condensed history of our connection with the mother country is found in a state-paper called the Declaration of Independence. Will Simon permit me to commend this document to his attentive perusal? I think he will find it a prophetic document which has not yet had all its fulfilment.

Simon's proposition to establish an American language is an admission of his own dislike for the English, at least by that name. He reminds one of those apists, the Ritualists, who hope to escape from the Church of England by establishing an American Church.

Simon's attack upon German literature does not

mend his argument; and his attack upon German civilization and German liberty are not to the purpose, only as showing the spirit of England. And let us see if we cannot find some analogy between the English language and English history. Consult works written by all sorts of people, Catholic, Protestant, English and American, and they show you that English history has been one scene of unprincipled aggression, that the rule of the political and religious history of England has been inordinate greed and violent wrong. The nations all apostrophize England in terms of hatred. America says to her, in the spirit of liberty: "Thou tyrant, thou art void of sense and reason, and deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity!" France, with her high sense of honor, addresses her: "Thou monster of perfidy, bound by no treaties, and using thine ill-gotten wealth to subsidize against me the hirelings of all Europe!" While Ireland raises her eloquent voice and says with heroic emphasis: "Thou thief, thou hast robbed me of all my earthly possessions, of everything except my heavenly faith, and that thou hast covered with revilings like those of the rabble who thronged the court of Pilate!" With such a political character it is proper that the character of its language should be just what it is—in its construction, etymology and pronunciation a bundle of irregularities, conventionalities and arbitrary caprices, a hypocritical language, regular in nothing except in irregularity, destitute of symmetry and wanting in system. As long as the Latin language is studied, it will say to the English, "There you are, bundled up in the pickings of my wardrobe!" As long as the German, it will say "There you are, wearing my jewelry!" The robber and the *partenu* are never respected while the witness remain to point with scorn at their arrogance and airs.

The German language is the personification of system, and is wholly independent. Being rich in itself, it borrows from none. The French, a poorer language, borrows discreetly, and gives its stealings a French dress. Johnny Bull, poorer still, but more rapacious and less nice, steals from all and glories in his shame. In his uncontradictable way he struts about and boasts, as only an Englishman can, "See how gay I am in borrowed plumage! See how rich I am in other people's money! See how fine my table looks, albeit the plate bears the escutcheons of my honest neighbors! See how many nice things I have at 'ome, altho' Mrs. Bull keeps them all higgledy-piggledy, you know!"

J. A. WILSTACH.

Alley Ball.

Now-a-days, when base-ball is "all the go," it is pleasing and changes the monotony of the scene to have the pleasure of witnessing one of these hand-ball contests. The game we are about to chronicle was played between the Junior Three, and the Amalgamated University Hand-Ball Trio, and resulted in favor of the latter by a score of 20 to 21. The game was played on the Senior alley, and attracted the Students of both Departments to come and view the display of skill. It is only just to say that both sides played a good game, and as we are not very well acquainted with the technicalities of the game, we will content ourselves by giving the names of the sides, and opposite the player's name the total number of tallies his side made on his hands:

A. U. H. B. Trio.		Junior Three.	
Staley, (l.s.)....	10	Hogan, (r.s.)....	3
Walsh, (c).....	9	Dum, (c).....	6
Darmody, (r.s.)..	2	Reilly (l.s.).....	11
Total.....	21	Total.....	20

Mr. T. Dundon gave general satisfaction as Umpire. *SANADACHUENRA.*

NOTRE DAME SCHOLASTIC.

Published every Week during Term

Time, at

NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY.

All communications should be sent to Editors SCHOLASTIC, Notre Dame, Indiana.

TERMS:

One year..... \$2 00

Single copies (10c) of the publication can be obtained at the Students' Office.

THE semi-annual reports of the various societies should be in for next week.

THE Minim Exhibition will take place on the Tuesday of Examination week. *Joseph in Egypt* is their play.

THE THESPIANS will play *The Conspiracy* and *A Sudden Arrival*, at the Annual Commencement. The parts have been assigned, and the members are busily engaged in preparing for the Exhibition.

REV. E. B. KILROY, the orator of the Alumni Association, has written that he will be present on the 26th; and Prof. P. Broder, the poet, alternate, of the Association, will also be present. We heartily rejoice in anticipation of the rejoicing we shall have when we give a friendly hand-shake to our old friends.

WE hope that there will be a large attendance at the Thespian reunion on the 25th of June. It is impossible for those in charge to send invitations to all the old members, as the present addresses of many are unknown. Those who may not receive special invitations should attend, as they would receive this invitation were it not for the above reason.

It seems a great pother has been raised in the College by the obituary of the owl. When we write owl we mean owl; and when we refer to the "Philodemic Owl" we write Philodemic in full, and put a capital O, according to the rules for Punctuation and Use of Capitals. We hope this will set all minds at ease concerning the owl whose demise was recorded in last week's SCHOLASTIC.

AMONG those lately ordained priests in New York city, we notice the names of two former students of the University—Walter Elliott and Adrian Aloysius Rosecrans. They were ordained by Right Rev. Bishop Rosecrans, of Columbus, Ohio. Walter Elliott was a student here a great number of years ago. He served for three years in the 4th Ohio Volunteers. Mr. Rosecrans is a son of Gen. Rosecrans, and a nephew of the Right Rev. Bishop of Columbus. We wish them God-speed in their holy career, and congratulate the Paulist Fathers on this addition to their community of two worthy young men.

THE sixth number of the *Philomathean Standard* comes out on time, for which all praise is due to the intelligent, active and go-a-head editors who have certainly many other important matters on hand, as the Examination looms up in not very far remote distance. We hope, and we have our reasons to presume that our hopes are well founded, that they will all do as well in Examination as they have done and now do in their editorial capacity.

THE present number consists of thirty-six pages. Athletic sports—which means base-ball—takes up a reasonably large portion of the paper; and as the editors—representatives of the Juniors—took in good part the defeat of the Star of the West when that unanimous base-ball club lost the first

game of the season, some time ago, so now they triumph with becoming modesty over their recent victory, which resulted in their maintaining the belt and continuing to be the champions of Notre Dame. This is the particular peculiarity we much admire in the Juniors. If they are beaten—which seldom happens—they give all honor to those who are so valiant and lucky as to be victorious over them, because they are conscious of their own innate powers; if they are victorious, instead of crowing on every fence around the premises, like a bully Shanghai rooster, they wear their laurel wreath of victory with becoming dignity and modesty, and would scorn to insult a defeated yet respected rival.

Besides the above there are many good articles, which we cannot notice at length; among which are the articles: "Mind your own Business," by "Ajax," which we recognize as written by one of our most intelligent Juniors; "Necessity of Public Virtue in a Government," by "Jalapa," a young Junior of serious bent of mind; "Rise, Progress and Downfall of Carthage," a good article, by the Historical Editor; "Amusements," by "Cab," a sensible and well-timed essay on that important subject; "A Day in and about Williamsburg and New York," by "Jucunditas," who seems to know all about the subject. An account of the Exhibition at St. Mary's on the 31st ult. takes up several pages. Our special friend, the Doctor, renders the paper doubly interesting by his notes of passing events in the College.

We are glad to see an improvement in what we may call the typographical get-up of the paper. "One word more," and it is that we heartily sympathize with the Philomatheans, and wish them the success in the future that they have already achieved in the past.

OSCAR BAKER is clerking in New Orleans.

H. P. MORANCY is in business in Memphis.

FRANK SHEPARD is building railroads in Texas.

A large number of visitors are expected for the Exhibition.

WARREN KAIN manages a book concern in New Orleans.

THE Written Examination will take the place of the Competitions.

PROF. VAN DE VELDE's violoncello playing is pronounced excellent.

PROF. BAASEN took the largest fish out of St. Joseph's Lake this year.

NAT. CUNNINGHAM aspires to some military position and is now in Chicago.

WE have seen some very fine specimens of penmanship from Bro. Camillus' class.

WE look for a large number of Thespians at the approaching reunion of the old members.

PROF. T. E. HOWARD will give next week his second lecture on the English Language.

REV. FATHER O'BRIEN, of St. Michael's Church, St. Louis, Missouri, was at Notre Dame this week.

A NEW Cantata from Handel's Oratorio of Judas Maccabeus is being rehearsed for the Exhibition.

THE Boat Club has organized for the race of the 25th, which promises to be well contested. A new boat for the staff is spoken of.

THE boats will not be lent in future for fishing purposes. Non-members of the club should bear in mind that they may use the boats for a consideration of \$5, which every member of the club paid down.

WE hear that James O'Reilly, LL.B., is doing splendidly in the law business, in Reading, Pa. A few words from him are always welcome.

WE understand that the Commercial Diplomas are very fine this year—as to size and material. We hope that many students will deserve them.

THE Drawing Class, which is quite numerous, will make a good display of its work during the Examination time. Bro. Albert is pushing it ahead.

A MUSICAL CONCERT is to take place during the Examination Days. We expect that our pianists, violinists, flutists, etc., and our vocalists, will be well prepared.

PROF. C. A. B. VON WELLER will soon be engaged painting some new scenery for Washington Hall. The musical talent of the Professor will also be put in requisition at Exhibition time.

THE finest vegetable gardens in Indiana are those of Notre Dame and St. Mary's. The former, with its twenty acres, makes a grand display of all the luxuries of the season, and is well worth visiting. Bro. Martin, with his associate gardeners, deserves much credit for the present state of this beautiful garden.

ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, Galveston, is in a very prosperous condition under the direction of Bro. Boniface, S.S.C., assisted by Bro. Charles and others. Its halls are well filled with students, and it is safe to think that 300 students will attend classes there next year. An experienced Professor of Book-keeping is much needed there at present. One of our old graduates might well fill that want, and get a good salary for it. We need not say that one of our graduates of the Commercial Course would have the preference over others for the position.

INSPIRE of the warm weather, which threatens us at last, a remarkable attention to study continues to prevail among all the students, with but few exceptions. The time approaches which will decide for many their good or bad success. It happens very often that students imagine that their obtaining premiums or diplomas is left entirely to the good or bad will of the Faculty, while in reality it depends entirely upon their merit or demerit. If a student deserves what he claims, he will obtain it; if he does not deserve it, well, evidently he ought not expect it. Why then should some one be criminated and charged with partiality to this one or that one, and accused of injustice, for voting against giving the honors of graduation to such as may not deserve them?

Musical Soiree.

A musical soiree was held in the grand parlor, Thursday, 30th, ult. Those who were present were highly pleased by the performance of our musicians. Prof. Van de Velde, on the violoncello, accompanied by D. J. Wile on the piano, delighted the audience with choice music. The Junior Orchestra, composed of some fourteen instruments, under Bro. Leopold's management, played the Overture of Dame Blanche, and a march. The proficiency of the Junior Orchestra is quite remarkable, and reflects greatly to the credit of Bro. Leopold, who has proved beyond doubt that much can be accomplished in music with young students. It is to him that we owe our present orchestral strength and efficiency. At the same soiree Mr. C. Berdel gave us in his happiest style of declamation "Boinardo del Carpo."

THE programme of the soiree was not exhausted when the late hour called the listeners to a good night's rest.

WE remarked the presence of Mrs. Quan of Chicago, Mr. and Miss Quinlan of Cleveland, and many amateurs.

10/11
1939
O'Hara Buick
has a Roadmaster
NOTRE DAME SCHOLASTIC.

Presentation of a Carriage to Very Rev. W. Corby, June 7, 1872.

Yesterday the students of the University of Notre Dame gave a magnificent proof of their generosity, and at the same time of their affection and respect for the kind-hearted President of the University by the presentation to him of a splendid four-seated carriage, worth four hundred and fifty (\$450) dollars. The carriage is of the Studebaker manufacture, and is in every respect worthy the wide-spread reputation of that enterprising firm.

This magnificent present was delivered to the worthy recipient by three committees from the three Departments of the University, and in presence of the Faculty and the full assembly of the students.

The committees consisted of the following young gentlemen: From the Senior Department, Messrs. T. F. O'Mahony, P. J. O'Connell, J. D. McCormick, T. L. Watson, H. B. Walker; from the Junior Department, Messrs. C. Dodge, M. M. Foote, J. McHugh, L. McOsler, L. Hibben; from the Minim Department, Messrs. Stevie McMahon, C. Walsh, T. Nelson.

When all had taken their places, in order and silence, in front of the main building, Mr. J. E. Cavanagh drove around from the rear of the building, and the Very Rev. President was invited out on the front portico—he in the mean time wondering what this unusual demonstration could mean, so well had “the boys” kept their secret. On his appearance in front, Mr. T. F. O'Mahony, as spokesman of the committee from the Senior Department, came forward and read the following presentation address:

Very Rev. and Dear Father: The history of the human family shows that there exists in man an irresistible propensity to give visible and tangible form to the emotions of his soul. It is not enough for him to know and to feel that there are invisible existences; he is ever seeking for something by which to represent them in the material world around him. The spiritual affections which are produced by the secret influences of love and friendship are not sufficient, 'twould seem, to satisfy the human heart, and we find, accordingly, that man has always sought to give them the appearance of reality, or, in the words of Shakespeare, to give them “a local habitation” in sensible objects. Hence the veneration which has existed among men from the beginning for the portraits and gifts of loved ones; and those dear objects, small and inadequate though they be in themselves, are inestimable in the eyes of the recipient, who knows that they are animated by the loving spirit of the giver.

It is, Very Rev. and Dear Father, to indulge this propensity which is so natural and so pleasing to the heart of man, that we, your children of Notre Dame, have invited you forth on this lovely morning of the Feast of the Sacred Heart, to present to you this beautiful carriage as a small but sincere token of our affectionate gratitude.

We have all found in you a kind Father during our happy sojourn at this home of wedded Science and Religion, over which you preside; and now that the time is near at hand when many of us will be called hence to the busy scenes of active life, we desire to leave behind us something which will serve in future years to remind you, in the midst of your holy labors and sanctifying cares, of the boys of '71-2, who are now assembled around you. Accept then, Very Rev. and dear Father, this small gift, which with humble affection we offer you this morning as a sincere though inadequate testimony of the warm sentiments of love and gratitude with which your endearing qualities have inspired our hearts, to such an extent that we can hardly refrain from giving expression to our emotion in the words of the holy disciple: “Lord, it is good for us to be here!” And may Almighty God grant you a long and happy life to enjoy it.

And now, dear Father, we are through;
Our pleasant task is done
Of showing to you ere we leave
How many hearts you've won
Among your children
OF THE SENIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. O'Mahony was followed by Mr. M. M. Foote, who on behalf of his Junior constituents read the following address:

Very Rev. and Dear Father: Although the words just spoken by our Senior brothers are exactly the sentiments that fill the heart of every Junior now standing before you, we think it fitting and appropriate that we should on this occasion give vent to our feelings, and express as nearly as possible the love and affection we all hold for you.

Dear Father, this gift is ill-able to express that love and affection; and indeed we fear it would be impossible for us to obtain one that we could call a fit representative. Neither do we, in presenting this, aim at any compensation for your love towards us; for we deem it wholly inadequate to the gratitude that is due you for your kindness,—yes, Father, for your exceedingly great kindness,—for certainly we have reason to love you. When we think of the kind and gentle care you have taken of us, your patient endurance of all the troubles we have caused you, the proud look of approbation you have given us when we have done well, the many pleasant hours we have spent through your kindness, we cannot wonder at the great love for you that is entertained by all the students. Therefore, we not do not consider this gift an equivalent, but more as a reminder of our love. It is needless, Father, to say that we hope the carriage will please you, and that you may take many pleasant rides in it, and we do hope, dear Father, that during those hours of enjoyment you will sometimes remember the love for you that is cherished in the hearts of the Juniors of 1871 and 1872.

The Minims next came forward in the person of Master Stevie McMahon, and thus expressed their concurrence in the presentation:

Very Rev. Father Corby: Your dear little Minims are last, though we hope and know we are not least in your estimation.

We now come forward to offer you our heartfelt congratulations, and to wish you many a pleasant ride in your new buggy. We know we cannot speak so boldly and use such high-sounding expressions as the other Departments, to tell you how happy we feel today; but these are not always the best.

The Minims' hearts are with you; what more could you desire?

We will not detain you longer. We know too well that you are anxiously waiting to give us an extra recreation day. But now, before we close this short address, allow us, dear Father, to wish you a happy, happy career in this vale of tears; but, what is more, true and eternal happiness in the world to come.

Very Rev. Father, this is the sincere wish of your dear little MINIMS.

At the conclusion of the addresses, which need no comment here, Very Rev. Father Corby spoke substantially as follows:

My dear young friends, the overwhelming surprise which you have caused me this morning, leaves me scarcely able to speak; the magnificence of the gift which you bestow as a testimonial of your affectionate good will, and of your satisfaction with the government under which you have lived for some time, fills me with pleasure, while the extent of your generosity makes me feel my own littleness. You have been surrounded by a Faculty, zealous and noble, whose efforts have always been to inspire you with good and generous thoughts, and this morning you have given a striking proof, and in a most unexpected manner, that their efforts have met with hearty co-operation on your part. I feel that I cannot express the feelings with which I am animated at this moment, and beg leave to bring my address to a close, thanking you with all my heart for your generous gift, and especially for the affection which it betokens. Classes will be resumed to-morrow morning.

As the Very Rev. Father thus closed his address, the Band, which had taken position in a convenient place, struck up a lively tune, during the execution of which Very Rev. Father Corby, with a member from each of the Committees, entered the new carriage, and the sprightly team, as if inspired with the spirit of the occasion, bounded away amid the strains of martial music and the repeated cheers of over four hundred hearty youth, at such

a pace that it required all the skill of Mr. Cavanagh to prevent accident. Thus closed the presentation ceremony, after which the day was spent in amusements varied to suit the tastes of all.

Long may the gentle, kind-hearted President of Notre Dame live to enjoy the affection and esteem of Notre Dame's numerous students, and many be the pleasant rides he shall take in his new and splendid carriage. B.

Tables of Honor.

SENIOR DEPARTMENT.

May 31—V. Bacca, M. Bastorache, M. Carr, R. Curran, T. Graham, J. McGlynn, T. Phillips, M. Sheil, T. Watson, H. Walker.

JUNIOR DEPARTMENT.

May 31—J. McNally, R. Hutchings, M. Foote, E. Gribbling, R. Kelly, S. Dum, G. Kurt, H. Long, E. Edwards, C. Ely. D. A. C., Sec.

MINIM DEPARTMENT.

May 18—C. Faxon, A. Morton, F. Huck, J. O'Meara, C. Green, C. Stonehill.

June 1—H. Faxon, P. Gall, G. Voelker, T. Nelson, S. McMahon, W. Hitchcock.

Honorable Mentions.

CLASSICAL COURSE.

Fourth Year—T. Ireland, M. Keeley, M. Mahoney, J. McHugh.

Third Year—M. Foote, D. Hogan.

Second Year—P. T. White.

First Year—F. P. Leffingwell, W. Clarke, C. Dodge, J. Walsh, L. Hayes.

SCIENTIFIC COURSE.

Fourth Year—N. S. Mitchell, T. O'Mahony.

Third Year—T. Dundon, P. O'Connell, J. D. McCormick, T. H. Graham.

Second Year—R. J. Curran.

First Year—T. J. Murphy, C. M. Proctor, J. M. Rourke.

COMMERCIAL COURSE.

Second Year—P. Cochrane, J. McFarland, J. Staley, H. Schnelker, O. Wing, J. Carr, C. Berdel, F. McOsler, E. Newton, B. Roberts, T. Phillips, J. Rumely, J. Wernert, J. Zimmer, J. Bowen, J. Darmody, J. E. Hogan, J. Noonan, J. Spillard, C. Hutchings, E. Barry, H. Dehner, J. Smarr, L. Godfroy, F. Phelan, H. Walldorf, T. Watson, G. Madden, P. O'Mahony, M. Sheil.

First Year—V. Bacca, D. Gahan, T. Finnegan, E. Ascher, H. Beckman, G. Duffy, J. Devine, J. Hoffman, F. Hamilton, W. Quinlan.

No mention in the Preparatory Course this week, for want of reports.

PENMANSHIP.

J. Wernert, J. Smarr, O. Wing, M. Sheil, J. McFarland, H. Dehner, D. G. Burnham, H. Saylor, J. Darmody, J. Crumney, H. Walldorf, E. Newton, P. Logue, L. Godfroy, T. Finnegan, L. Hayes, D. Gahan, J. Staley, J. Zimmer, J. Ireland, H. Walker, T. Watson, T. Murphy, P. O'Mahony, E. O'llwill, G. Riopelle, S. Dum, P. Reilly, L. McOsler, F. McOsler, L. Hibben, F. McDonald, J. McGinnis, W. Fletcher, W. Kelly, T. Hopkins, A. Dick-erhoff, V. McKinnon, J. Campbell, H. Schaller, E. Ascher, E. Dougherty, J. Dunn, O. Waterman, B. Hughes, E. Edwards, W. Ball, J. McMahon, E. Kaiser, G. Duffy, F. Phelan, B. Vogt, J. Shanks, J. Caren, C. Campeau, F. Smyth, J. Burnside, W. Morgan, W. Murphy, J. Stubbs, J. Kauffman, E. Shea, J. Pumphrey, J. Wuest, J. Porter, H. Hunt, W. Kinzie, L. Busch.

An Eastern editor makes a pathetic appeal to his readers, saying:

“If there is anything you know that is worth knowing, that we ought to know, and you know we don't know, please let us know it.”

VICTORY!

THE JUNIORS CHAMPIONS!

Star of the West vs. University Nine.

The University Nine Defeated by a Score of 21 to 13.

The fourth game for the Base-ball Championship of the University was played on the grounds of the University Nine on Wednesday, June 5th. The Juniors had won two games out of three that had taken place, and inasmuch as they have won this game they have won the majority of the agreed number of games, and consequently hold the Championship. The day was "just about right" for playing ball, and every one was on the *qui vive*. Promptly at two o'clock, the umpire, John F. McHugh, Esq., President of the Excelsior Base-ball Club, (who umpired the game most satisfactorily to all,) called "play," and in a moment everything was in readiness and moving with the precision of clock-work. The Juniors for the first time during the series lost the choice, and were sent to the bat by the Seniors.

An interested crowd of spectators were in constant attendance, and manifested much interest in the game. Among them we noticed Very Rev. Father Corby, Rev. Fathers Lemonnier, Condon, O'Rourke, Maher, Vagnier; Professors Baasen, Stace, Clarke, Cunnea, Van de Velde, Edwards and many Brothers of the Order; the Prefects of the respective yards, Brothers Camillus, James and Albert of the Juniors, and Alban, Marcellinus and Irenæus of the Seniors, and Bro. Emmanuel of the Minims. Every good play made during the game was much applauded by all; and in that respect, we are happy to say, no partiality towards either side was manifested. We herewith give the game as it occurred by innings. Time called, two o'clock P.M. University Nine in the field.

FIRST INNINGS.

Juniors—S. Dum batted a fly a little over the short-stop's head; was put out running to second by throw from catcher; McOsker went to first on called balls; to second on passed ball; Berdel to first on called balls; Dodge out on fly to pitcher; Berdel out on first before he could run back; McOsker left on second. No runs. Time, six minutes.

Seniors—Staley struck out; Dillon went to first on a hit to left field; Thomas flew out to Hogan; Darmody to first on hit to left field; Dillon to second on that hit; same to third, and Darmody to second on passed ball; Dillon came home on a wild throw of S. Dum; Darmody out on third. One run not earned. Time, four minutes. Score, 1 to 0 in favor of the Seniors.

SECOND INNINGS.

Juniors—Dodge flew out on a foul to catcher; W. Dum flew out to centre; Hutchings to first on a hit to left field; Hogan went to first on a muffed fly by centre fielder; Hutchings got second on same; Roberts flew out to second; Hogan left on first; Hutchings on second. No runs. Time, five minutes.

Seniors—Davis went to first on a grounder; stole second; Walsh went to first on called balls; Gambee out on first; Davis ran to third, and Walsh to second; Smarr foul out to catcher; Schnelker out on a fly to short-stop; Davis left on third; Walsh on second. No runs. Time, five minutes. Score, 1 to 0 in favor of the Seniors.

THIRD INNINGS.

Juniors—Reilly got first on a fly muffed by second baseman; S. Dum got first on a good hit to centre field; Reilly out on third; S. Dum home on a wild throw; McOsker to third on same; Berdel out on fly to left field; McOsker home; Dodge knocked a liner to short-stop, who held it well. Side out. Time, five minutes. Two runs—none earned.

Seniors—Staley out on first; Dillon out on a foul well caught by S. Dum; Thomas out on foul bound to catcher. No runs. Time, three and a half minutes. Score, 3 to 1 in favor of the Juniors.

FOURTH INNINGS.

Juniors—W. Dum hit lightly to third and reached first on a wild throw by Thomas; made third before ball got back; home on passed ball; Hutchings flew out to pitcher; D. Hogan to first on long hit to centre field; made second on passed ball; Roberts made a light bat to third and reached first on Thomas' wild throw; Hogan to third on same; Hogan came home, and Roberts to third on passed ball; Roberts home; Reilly out on first; he hit a hot "liner" to short-stop, who stopped it well; S. Dum made first on a hit to left; out on second. Three runs; none earned. Time, six minutes.

Seniors—Darmody got first on a long hit to centre; stole second before the ball is back; Davis to first on a grounder to left, which passed Reilly on third; Darmody home; Walsh to first and Davis to second on called balls; Gambee out on first; Davis to third; Walsh to second; Smarr to first on a long hit to left; Davis home; Walsh to third; Schnelker to first on good hit to left; Walsh home; Staley to first; Schnelker to second; Smarr to third on called balls; Smarr out on home; Schnelker and Staley home by Thomas' hit to centre who gained first; Darmody flew out to second. Dillon left on second, Thomas on first. Time, ten minutes. Five runs; none earned. Score, 6 to 5 in favor of the Seniors.

FIFTH INNINGS.

Juniors—McOsker to first on called balls; Berdel to first, McOsker to second on a grounder; Dodge out on fly to right field; Berdel out in trying to run back; W. Dum reached his first on a fly muffed by the left fielder; stole second; McOsker home on fly muffed; Hutchings out on first. One run; not earned. Time, six minutes.

Seniors—Davis hit to Roberts in the right field, who muffed it, and centre fielder (Hutchings) caught it as it bounded from his hands; player out; Walsh to first on good hit to left field; went all around and home on a wild throw by Dodge; Gambee to first on a light grounder; to second on passed ball; stole third; Smarr foul bound out to S. Dum; Gambee home and Schnelker to first on a hit to left field; Staley flew out to third baseman; Schnelker left on first. Two runs, not earned. Time, seven minutes. Score, 8 to 6 in favor of the Seniors.

SIXTH INNINGS.

Juniors—Hogan to first on a fine "daisy" to centre field; stole second; Roberts out on first; Reilly to first on called balls; Sam. Dum to first on hit to centre field; Hogan home; Reilly to second; McOsker to first on hit to left; Berdel out on first; Reilly home; McOsker to second; S. Dum to third on passed ball; S. Dum home; McOsker to third on passed ball; Dodge out on first; McOsker left on third. Three runs, not earned. Time, nine minutes.

Seniors—Dillon and Thomas both flew out to W. Dum, s.s.; Darmody flew out to centre field. No runs. Time, three minutes. Score, 9 to 8 in favor of the Juniors.

SEVENTH INNINGS.

Juniors—W. Dum and Hutchings out on first; Hogan to first on fly muffed by second baseman; out on second. No runs. Time, five and a half minutes.

Seniors—Davis to first on called balls; to second on same; Walsh to first on same; Davis home; Walsh home; Gambee to second on a first base hit to centre; Smarr foul fly out to catcher; Schnelker to first on light tap of the ball; Gambee home and Staley to first on a hit to left field; Dillon to first, Staley to second and Schnelker to third on Dillon's hit; Schnelker home; Staley out on home; Dillon left on second. Four runs, not earned.

Time, thirteen minutes. Score, 13 to 9 in favor of the Seniors.

EIGHTH INNINGS.

Juniors—Roberts to first on called balls; Reilly to first on a passed grounder to second baseman; Roberts to second base on same; S. Dum batted a grounder, passing third baseman, bringing Roberts, Reilly and himself home; ball lost in the field; McOsker to first on called balls; he to second and Berdel to first on same; Dodge to first, Berdel to second and McOsker to third on Dodge's light hit to short-stop; lost by fumbling with the ball; McOsker home; Berdel out on third; Hutchings to first on a little tap; D. Hogan out on fly to pitcher; Dodge and W. Dum home, and Roberts to first on wild throw by Darmody; Hutchings home on passed ball; Roberts home; Reilly to first; run out between first and second bases. Eight runs—none earned. Time, twenty-four minutes.

Seniors—Dillon to second on first base hit; Thomas out on first; Dillon home and Darmody to second on bat; Darmody out on third; Davis to first; Walsh, three strikes, out; Davis left on second. One run—not earned. Time, five minutes. Score, 17 to 13, in favor of the Juniors.

NINTH INNINGS.

Juniors—S. Dum out on first; McOsker to first on called balls; out on second; Berdel to first on a knock to second and by a wild throw; Dodge to first; Berdel to third; home on passed ball; Dodge to third on same; Dodge home; W. Dum to first on hit to left field; Hutchings reaches second on first base hit; W. Dum reaches third on same; Dum home and Hutchings to third on a passed ball; Hutchings home and Hogan to first on a base hit; out on second, while trying to steal it. Four runs—none earned. Time, twelve minutes.

Seniors—Gambee scratched first by Berdel's muffed; out on second; Smarr struck out; Schnelker flew out to pitcher. No runs—all earned. Time, three minutes.

Score, 21 to 13, in favor of the Juniors.

At the conclusion the comrades of the Junior nine set up a series of terrific yells, which "made the welkin ring." So concluded the championship contest of 1872. We append the

SCORE.

STAR OF WEST	O	R	I	B	F	O	A	UNIV. NINE	O	R	I	B	F	O	A
S. Dum, c.....	3	3	4	11	2			Staley, p.....	4	1	1	3	1		
McOsker, p.....	1	3	1	1	1			Dillon, c.....	2	2	3	1	4		
Berdel, 1st b.....	5	1	0	4	0			Thomas, 3d b.....	5	0	0	2	3		
Dodge, 2d b.....	5	2	0	1	2			Darmody, 2d b.....	4	1	2	6	2		
W. Dum, s. s.....	2	3	1	3	4			Davis, c. f.....	1	2	1	1	0		
Hutchings, c. f.....	3	2	2	2	0			Walsh, l. f.....	1	3	1	1	0		
Hogan, l. f.....	3	2	3	2	0			Gambee, 1st b.....	3	2	1	11	1		
Roberts, r. f.....	2	3	0	0	0			Smarr, s. s.....	5	0	1	1	5		
Reilly, 3d b.....	3	2	0	3	1			Schnelker, r. f.....	2	2	1	1	1		
Total,	27	21	11	27	10			Total,	27	13	11	27	17		

INNINGS.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
S. W.....	0	0	2	3	1	3	0	8	4-21.
U. N.....	1	0	0	5	2	0	4	1	0-13.

Umpire—Mr. J. McHugh, of the Excelsior Base-Ball Club.

Scorers—Mr. F. P. Hamilton for the University Nine; Messrs. F. Arantz and E. Hughes for Sta of the West Nine.

Time of Game—One hour and fifty-five minutes.

First Base by Errors—Star of the West, twenty-two times; University Nine, ten times.

Runs Earned—Star of the West, none; University Nine, none.

Struck out—Staley, Thomas, Walsh, Smarr and Schnelker.

SUMMARY.

Game No. 1—S. W....	11	U. N.....	17
Game No. 2—S. W....	14	U. N.....	7
Game No. 3—S. W....	23	U. N.....	11
Game No. 4—S. W....	21	U. N.....	13
Total.....	69	Total.....	48

What a commentary on the "great coalition!"
BASE-BALLIST.

Whitewash.

BY N. H.

Whitewash is the word to-day,
In this lovely month of May;
Somebody's singing like a thrush
Whilst handling his whitewash brush.
Who might this noisy fellow be?
If you wish to know, go, see;
You'll find him at the Seniors' yard
Whitewashing fences quick and hard;
He makes the old things look quite new—
Upon my word, just take a view
Of the old fences, all around
Upon the spacious College ground!
It is indeed a brilliant show,
Everything as white as snow.
Whitewasher, you can justly boast
That you deserve to have a toast;
What shall it be? Oh, take the hint,—
Hurrah! for Brother Hyacinth!—
Just watch him brushing up and down
Like some great artist of renown!
But some will say: "What's whitewash for?
We think it is a humbug; or
A loss of time, which is quite wrong."
But listen to my "muse and song":
First, it purifies the air—
A good thing always, everywhere—
Preserves the fences from decay,
Makes Notre Dame look nice and gay.
Now, who can blame my whitewash brush,
Or tell me: "With your singing hush?"
But this is all I have to say
On this, the seventeenth of May.

Self-Praise.

Though we may think a great deal of ourselves, as indeed we should, this does not justify us in trying to make others have this good opinion of us, by praising ourselves and becoming egotistic in their sight; but though we may think that by so doing we raise in the minds of others the same idea of ourselves as that which our own entertains, our good sense, if allowed to come to our aid, will tell us that such is not the case. When we praise others, people admire our generosity and magnanimity, and we are raised in their estimation; but when we give this praise to ourselves, it is taken as showing a weakness on our part, an absence of that largeness of heart and nobleness of soul which it should be our most earnest endeavor to cultivate.

We look upon the egotist as a jealous, selfish, bigoted person, and one, too, who "has not much to boast of," for such is generally the case with them; they have a little, and wish to magnify it into much; to do this they are continually talking about *ego*, *me*, *my*, etc. They will sit and talk for hours about the great deeds they have performed, what they did when they were at such an age, and the like. Do they think that talk like this is anything but edifying? And if you wish a poor opinion to be formed of you, you have but to indulge in it before strangers and those who are not well acquainted with you. But we must not think that there is only one way in which we can show our egotism; it has been truly said "that a person shows his character in a thousand little things," and we believe it; we may show egotism in our acts, dress, walk, and expression, as indeed many do.

This egotism, or tendency to self-praise, is especially to be found among the young, who have not as yet learned, quite to their sorrow, the utter foolishness of it, and the contempt that others bear them. This contempt they try to explain by saying that others are jealous of their talents and acquirements, whereas the true solution is that they are held in contempt because their egotism has rendered them a bore to every one with whom they have come in contact. They are indeed

called a *bore* upon society; no one cares to associate with them. Nor is this egotism confined to the world without, but enters into our very schools, where, above all places, we should not look to find it; for the student, seeing as he does the weakness of society, should be expected to avoid them to a great extent, and especially *one* which is so palpable and disgusting; but alas! such is far from being the case. Owing to some cause or another, but more often owing to none, a student takes it into his head that he is *smart*, immediately he becomes witty; but *wit*, and especially *his*, must not be lost; so when holding a conversation with his fellow-students he must get off his *puns* and *jokes*, and the conversation would not be complete did he not "here and there" enliven it with a "smart story" elucidating the point under discussion. This, though perhaps the most disgusting class of "smart boys,"—who, however, know *it*, and *wish* to give their knowledge to others,—is by no means the only one. There is another class who have come to the knowledge of their smartness through some unknown circumstance, and immediately grow, stand a head and neck above their associates; they become important, and will not deign to notice a common student; but when they are thrown into a position to speak to a superior, the "grace, to say nothing of the "soft-soap" and "bombast" used is astonishing, and we might add disgusting. They become the "laughing-stock" of others, who love to draw them out and have them show their self-sufficiency and make "lamb's tails of themselves." Thus far we have been speaking of egotism venting itself in self-praise either in word or act.

It does not follow that because you belong to a society or a *club* which may accidentally come out ahead that you should praise yourselves, and attempt perhaps under a fictitious name to raise higher your fame in the opinion of others—for these things are, among the "knowing," taken for about what they are worth. Thus, for example, if one base-ball club actually "scratch" victory over another, those who know both well *know* also the *worth* of a report larding the victors, and it often happens that they furnish a contradiction of what they say. Thus in No. 36 of the SCHOLASTIC a reporter remarks that a certain club "was outplayed at every point of the game," while the score which he appends indicates that the nine he thus decrys made 9 first-base bats while the victors made but 7; that the vanquished by their good fielding *assisted* one another to put 14 out, while the victors assisted but for 3; that the vanquished made "first" 8 times on the victors' errors, while the victors made it but 7 times on the errors of their opponents. Again, we notice another reporter, who is also writing on this same subject, *omitting* certain portions of the score because it smacks *hard* against his side. We might go farther and adduce other examples,—but these, common as they are, and falling under the eye of every student, will amply suffice.

The rule with us when we are called upon to write or speak should be to tell the truth "*pro* and *con*," and "to give praise to whom it belongs," and not omit to do justice to those whom we have by a "scratch" vanquished. Do we gain friends by self-praise? Not a bit of it—but, on the contrary, are liable to disgust those we already have.

Self-praise, to make the best of it, is quite unpleasing to every one, save the giver; so it is as a rule better, when we are called upon to report for a paper, to give to each one his due, and not attempt to despoil him of it by misrepresentation and omission. Though this subject, in point of fact, deserves much more to be said upon it, still, fearing we are intruding too much upon the space allotted the able writers of the SCHOLASTIC, we will content ourselves at present with what we have said.

J. W.

SAINT MARY'S ACADEMY.

ST. MARY'S ACADEMY, }
June 4, 1872.

During the last week many interesting events occurred. The most important was the celebration, on the 30th ult., of the feast of Corpus Christi. At the High Mass the following pupils were admitted to their First Communion: Misses A. Woods, M. Lasson, M. Sylvester, L. McKinnon, G. Kelly, H. O'Meara, I. Quan, T. Cronin.

These happy privileged girls received during the day, from their teachers and companions, most affectionate demonstrations of esteem and congratulation. "Oh, how happy they are!" "What a heavenly spectacle!" these and similar exclamations were heard on all sides as the happy group, robed in white and crowned with flowers, emerged from the chapel after the touching ceremonies were over, to receive the congratulations of parents, friends and schoolmates.

All the pupils were permitted to assist at the solemn Vespers and grand procession at Notre Dame. The day was full of holy joy. Sunshine, birds and flowers, combined with all that pious hearts could devise, united in a grand ovation in honor of the solemn mystery so gratefully celebrated.

On Friday, the 31st ult., the feast of St. Angela was celebrated as usual with great *clat*. This is the patronal feast of our beloved Mother Superior, whose devotedness to the true happiness of youth has made her name synonymous with all that is benevolent and kind.

In the morning, the pupils being assembled in the study-hall, a committee invited Mother Superior to meet them there. She was saluted with a welcoming chorus, and addresses from the Senior and Junior Departments, read by Misses Katie Haymond and Julia Kearney. Recreation was then the order of the day. A grand banquet at noon, set off with strawberries, ice-cream, etc., formed the tangible part of the enjoyments of the feast.

At half-past six in the evening the invited guests and pupils assembled in the exhibition hall to participate in the entertainment that had been prepared expressly for the occasion. As the programme was given in the SCHOLASTIC of June 1st, we will not repeat it. The Seniors' addresses were replete with affectionate, beautiful sentiments, couched in graceful, poetic language. Those of the Juniors and Minims were in plain prose, but very strong in expressions of gratitude and devotedness to their beloved Mother Angela. Miss M. Quan represented the Juniors. The one on behalf of the Minims, spoken by little Rose Wile, was so very superlative that it elicited a burst of applause.

The French play was pronounced excellent, and the musical Pic-nic, by the Vocal Class, was a success. Some very fine vocal and instrumental solos were given. The Juniors' play of "The Seasons" was pronounced *seasonable*. The whole affair gave much satisfaction and certain proof that there is at St. Mary's the right materials for literary, musical and dramatic entertainments, and appreciative taste for the highest social enjoyments.

Respectfully, STYLUS.

TABLE OF HONOR—SR. DEP'T.

June 2—Misses K. Haymond, L. Duffield, I. Reynolds, L. West, J. Millis, R. Spier, I. Wilder, M. Prince, R. Devoto, M. Letourneau, B. Reynolds, C. Woods.

HONORABLY MENTIONED.

Graduating Class—Misses M. Kirwan, M. Shirland, M. Dillon, M. Tuberty, L. Marshall, A. Clarke, A. Borup, J. Forbes, G. Hurst, H. Tinsley, K. McMahon.

First Senior—Misses K. Zell, A. Mast, M. Cook-

rane, M. Lange, A. Shea, A. Todd, M. Lassen, K. Brown, B. Crowley.

Second Senior—Misses E. Plamondon, V. Ball, A. Piatt, J. Coffey, D. Green, A. Woods, I. Logan, M. Donahue.

Third Senior—Misses A. Lloyd, I. Edwards, M. Leonard, J. Walker, A. Robson, M. Wicker, L. Ritchie, E. Dickerhoff, S. Addis, M. Brown, J. Walton.

First Preparatory—Misses A. Emonds, H. McMahon, A. St. Clair, A. Hambleton, N. Sullivan, J. Walsh, C. Crevling, B. Gaffney, F. Moore, M. Kelly, N. Duggan, E. Greenleaf, M. Layfield, N. Ball, G. Kellogg, A. Calvert, E. DeBoyce.

Second Preparatory—Misses M. Mooney, H. McLaughlin, A. Conahan, F. Taylor, J. Luce, L. Eutzler, E. Brandenburg, E. Wade, B. Wade, M. Roberts, A. Hunt, B. Johnson, K. Casey, A. Monroe, M. Addis, E. Crawford, E. Howell, N. Bower.

Third Preparatory—Misses K. Miller, L. Pfeiffer, E. Drake, B. Schmidt, C. Germain, L. Buehler, J. Valdez, R. Manzanara, N. Vigil, K. Greenleaf, M. McNellis, L. Pease, L. Harris.

HONORABLY MENTIONED.

Second Senior—Misses M. Kearney, L. Niel, N. Gross, A. Clark.

Third Senior—Misses M. Quan, E. Richardson.

First Preparatory—Misses M. Walker, M. Cummings, A. Byrne.

Second Preparatory—Misses M. Quill, J. Duffield, M. Faxon, E. Parker, M. Hepp.

Junior Preparatory—Misses A. Lynch, G. Kelly, F. Lloyd, A. Gollhardt, E. Horgan, L. Harrison, A. Walsh, L. McKinnon, F. Munn, B. Quan, A. Burney, M. Reynolds.

First Junior—Misses K. Follmer, A. Rose, T. Thompson, M. Walsh, A. Noel, M. Sylvester, N. O'Meara, T. Cronin, M. Carlin, M. DeLong, E. Lappin, D. Allen.

Base-Ball.

With us Americans this has become the great source of out-door amusement and exercise. Each year beholds it advancing in perfection, and adapting itself more and more to the nature and demands of the American youth. Even now it seems almost perfectly adapted to them; for the game of base-ball is, at the present day, above all others a lively, intellectual, scientific game. So also with American youth. The German can study his sixteen or eighteen hours per day—the American does well if he studies ten or twelve and preserves his health. This is owing to the constitution and temperament of the two,—and yet at the end of a year if either be in advance of the other it will be the latter.

Base-ball is a lively game, as is sufficiently demonstrated by the crowd it will attract, and the quickness with which the ball must be handled to effect an "out." The ball is batted hotly—the short-stop runs and stops it; he has no time to lose, but must throw it to "first" as quick as possible; all this time the crowd is silent, as are the players, and feel anxious as to the result; the baseman holds it; "Out!" cries the umpire,—then long and loud are the cheers of the spectators. This is something that is witnessed in every game which is in any way closely contested or deserving the name of a match game. Such feeling on the part of outsiders, and even the players, could never be excited except by a game which was in itself lively and interesting, and that this is a lively game does not admit of a doubt. The fact is, the game is full of life. As to its intellectual character there can be but little doubt, for there is more than one point in the game, and any person who would become expert at it and play well his position, must watch the "points of the game" and use headwork. When he goes to the bat he first considers where he must "drive" the ball in order

to get it out of the reach of those who wish to put him out; he sees an open place, and then has to use his judgment how he will stand at the base and time his stroke so as to send it where he wishes; then, again, he must exercise judgment in running bases; but though much acumen is required on the part of the batting nine, it is especially in the field that we see it displayed more abundantly; for when the ball is thrown or batted to one, he at a glance must see where it belongs. When one goes to the bat the "fielders," as well as the players in the "diamond," post themselves as they judge will prove most effective towards getting him out; and then there is the excitement that the player must learn to overcome, and the judgment and accuracy required to be exercised by the umpire and the pitcher.

The science of the game consists in knowing the rules and points of the game, and when and where to use them to the best advantage.

Especially is science brought to bear when the "dead ball" is used. It is characteristic of the American to be fond of novelty and change, and this probably is the reason why cricket does not prosper in this country; base-ball better meets all requirements, and is largely indulged in by young Americans. It is in fact the out-door game of the country; and is, as some one has said, the "most perfect of all out-door games," and especially adapted to the healthy development of the body.

The game of base-ball is vigorous; yet not violent, and though the mere observer may think it so, and even to the player while viewing the game and seeing those balls, hard as they are, batted "red hot" to a baseman or some one else of the "in-fielders," and again picked up and thrown not easily to a baseman, it looks violent,—but the "practiced" find no difficulty in stopping and catching them; they even take delight in doing so. Put up a soft ball—a "puddin'-bag," as they would call it,—and if they consent to play at all they find neither "fun" nor life in the game, and can exercise but little skill in it.

There are, it is true, many injuries received in playing ball, but these are received rather in "pig-tail," fungo, and the like, than in the game itself; most injuries are occasioned through carelessness on the part of the players; in fine, since we have been at Notre Dame we have never seen any one severely injured in a match-game of base-ball, though scarcely a recreation day rolls by, during the warm and pleasant weather, without one; it is in the so-called "practice games," with the second, third or fourth nines, or in "pig-tail," that these injuries happen, and yet we are recommended by *some one* (I disremember whom) to play in this way.

Here we are naturally led to speak of physical exercise, as it is in the game of base-ball that most boys nowadays take exercise, despite what the

"Laudator temporis acti,
Se puero, castigator censorque minorum"

may say about it. Let us inquire into the necessity and end of exercise, and see how far our national game meets the demands required and gives us this exercise in a proper manner. Exercise is important and necessary for the health of the body at every stage of life, but is especially so to the young, who are growing and becoming gradually developed. Exercise is absolutely required to bring about a healthy and proportional development of the human body, and a corresponding vigor and strength of mind, preparing it to undergo the severe training necessary to render the individual a good and useful member of society.

One of the highest aims, then, of physical exercise is that strength may be given the body, and a healthy tone to the mind. Exercise is required to strengthen the muscles of the body, to render it healthy and sound, make it capable of enduring fatigues, labor, and undergoing the changes of

weather and climate without being materially affected by them. The very framework of our bodies—our bones—receive from physical exercise a strength which they would not otherwise gain. The necessity of exercise has long been established beyond a doubt; the question to be solved is, "What is the best mode of taking exercise?" To this, each one has his own answer. It may and it may not agree with that of his fellows. Everybody has his favorite game: and exercise, like most other things, calls upon us to use our judgment in its selection; it must be in keeping with our strength and the time we have to devote to it, as well as the circumstances with which we are surrounded.

We now recur to our subject proper, and see if the game of base-ball is calculated to bring about this required development of the body and limbs. After a moment's pause and reflection, we find that the four acts of throwing, striking, catching and running are the characteristics of the game as an exercise, one or more of which enter into all exercises outside of the gymnasium. In these four acts we find every limb and muscle of the human frame brought into activity; these, together with jumping, which also has a right to be called a characteristic of the game of base-ball, are the fundamental principles, so to say, of all open-air exercises. Base-ball, then, has the "material" to make a well-developed and healthy person. Does it not do this? It does; to prove which we have but to refer to the players themselves. We have yet to see a base-ballist in poor health, or one who has lost his health from playing base-ball. Look for proof at the First Nine of the Star of the West Base-Ball Club,—where will you find nine healthier and constitutionally stronger young gentlemen? Or, if you like, look at any of the other nines—or at all of them—and we ask where can you see healthy and well-developed bodies if they are not in those nines? In conclusion we have only to say that much more has been said against this game than its imperfections call for, and those remarks decrying it as an exercise are made by persons who may have the *theory* of the game but have not the practice, and therefore know nothing about it.

LUSON.

A COUNTRY editor has become so hollow from depending upon the printing business alone for bread, that he proposes to sell himself for stove-pipe at three cents a foot.

L. S. & M. S. RAILWAY.

SUMMER ARRANGEMENT.

TRAINS now leave South Bend as follows:

GOING EAST.			
Leave South Bend	10 35 a. m.	Arrive at Buffalo	3 30 a. m.
" "	12 25 p. m.	" "	4 08 a. m.
" "	9 18 p. m.	" "	2 00 p. m.
" "	12 40 a. m.	" "	5 30 p. m.
" "	8 50 p. m.	" "	6 50 p. m.

GOING WEST.			
Leave South Bend	5 00 p. m.	Arrive at Chicago	8 20 p. m.
" "	3 15 a. m.	" "	6 50 a. m.
" "	4 35 a. m.	" "	7 20 a. m.
" "	5 35 p. m.	" "	10 40 p. m.
" "	6 35 a. m.	" "	10 30 a. m.

Making connection with all trains West and North.

For full details, see the Company's posters and time tables at the depot and other public places.

Trains are run by Cleveland time, which is 15 minutes faster than South Bend time.

J. H. DEVEREUX, General Manager, Cleveland, Ohio.
CHARLES PAINE, General Superintendent, Cleveland.
C. P. LELAND, Auditor, Cleveland, Ohio.
JNO. DESMOND, Sup't Western Division, Chicago, Ill.
J. W. CABY, General Ticket Agent, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. MORSE, General Passenger Agent, Chicago, Illinois.
M. R. BROWN, Ticket Agent, South Bend.
A. J. WHITE, Freight Agent, South Bend.

NEW ALBANY CROSSING.

To Lafayette and Louisville.

Going North—Express passenger, 6.09 p. m.; 8.58 a. m.; 5.29 a. m. Freight, 6.30 a. m.; 8.06 p. m.
Going South—Express passenger, 8.58 a. m.; 10.46 a. m.; 9.25 p. m. Freight, 1.00 a. m.; 4.48 a. m.

H. N. CANIFF, Agent.