

THE VIATORIAN.

PAC ET SPERA.

VOL. XVI.

MAY, 1899.

NO. 8

HER FLOWERS.

A rosy lad with sparkling eyes
Gathers a bunch of flowers fair,
Then quickly to his playmate hies
And crowns her shining, golden hair.
"Now you my Queen of May shall be,
And I your champion," quoth he.
Then flushed with pure and childish joy,
The maiden kissed the rosy boy.

"Here are some flowers," the bridegroom said,
A manly grace upon his brow.
"But fairer flower this morn I wed,
And Oh! the fragrance of thy vow,
Mine own forever more," quoth he,
"Ay! thine for all eternity,"
Returned the blushing happy bride,
And kissed him with a true-love's pride.

"My own true wife," an old man cries,
And lays a wreath upon a bier.
The tears are falling from his eyes
And naught his aged heart can cheer.
"She was my flower, my joy, my pride,
But now she's gone," the old man cried.
And bending low his whitened head,
He kissed the forehead of his dead.

J. H. N.

CIVIL PENALTIES IN THE PAST COMPARED WITH THOSE
OF THE PRESENT.

Among the numerous charges brought against the Catholic Church, by modern writers and speakers, there is none which appeals so strongly to popular prejudice, or that excites such bitter enmity as that of being the persecutor of innocent men, guilty of no crime but that of following their own conscience. The executions for religious offenses, the burnings and the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition for the crime of heresy and like incidents of past history, afford a splendid opportunity for any one who is anxious to produce an effect, and who is not over-scrupulous as to the means employed for his purpose. Such facts admit of a most vivid description which is often so startling and realistic that the incautious reader or listener becomes fully persuaded that there never was an institution so diabolical and cruel as the Catholic Church, nor any body of men so savage and bloodthirsty as her bishops and priests have been in past ages. But fortunately those who have made careful researches into the chronicles of the past and who have judged the events of past history on their own merits and not by the light of the manners and customs of our time, have enabled us to judge how far these accusations are well founded, and how unfair it is to judge the past by the present. In everyday life we know how the words or the utterances of a public man are liable to be misunderstood and misinterpreted, especially if certain passages should be separated from the context. If such things occur daily in our midst, how much more grievous will those misrepresentations and misinterpretations be, when anyone attempts to judge the nature and the gravity of a law, or a custom, which prevailed several centuries ago, without any regard to the social conditions of those times.

If the average citizen of today who has not read anything of history outside of that of our own times, were told that six or seven centuries ago princes and nobles dwelt in houses without chimneys or glass windows and that instead of carpets and mats they used either straw or rushes; that they never smoked cigars, never drank tea or coffee, never read a newspaper, or used a pocket handkerchief, wore hair shirts instead of linen—he would doubtless say that they were very barbarous and uncivilized people. Yet if he were sufficiently acquainted with the conditions of those times he would not be so severe in his condemna-

tion of them, inasmuch as modern luxuries were entirely unknown in those days. Applying this principle to the penalties inflicted for religious and other offences in times past, we shall be able to form a more correct estimate of them.

At the present time no one would think of punishing a heretic with death, and such a thing dare not even be suggested; yet it was not so regarded in ancient times. In the old law the offices of the spiritual and civil ruler were united in the same person or council, and the law, often of great severity, extended alike to civil and religious offenses, and both were punished with the same penalties. If in our day one man takes the life of another he is punished with death, not because he violates the law of God, but because he violates the civil law. But if two persons commit crimes the most abominable against the sixth commandment, the civil law takes no notice of it, so long as each is a free and willing partner in the offense. But under the old dispensation such crimes were punished with death. Stoning to death was the punishment for adultery. The death penalty was then inflicted for other offenses against the decalogue as well as for murder as it is in our days. Offenses which are now overlooked by the civil law were then punished with death. To break the Sabbath day, to utter a blasphemy, to bear false witness, were among the crimes deemed worthy of death. Persons were executed for neglecting the ceremony of circumcision, for doing work on the atonement day (Lev. xxiii : 29), for anointing a stranger with oil, for eating leavened bread during the pass-over, for making holy ointment, and even ordinary perfume, if intended for private use; and even for touching sacred things illegally. Such persons, according to the nature of the offense, were either hanged or burned, or slain with a sword or spear, or strangled, drowned, or crushed by great weights, or torn asunder. On other occasions the unfortunate culprit was beaten to death, pounded in a mortar, or precipitated from the pinnacle of the temple or some other height. Thus the law took cognizance not only of civil but also of religious offenses and visited violations of the law of God with greater severity than the violations of the civil law.

With this precedent before them can we wonder that the early Christians should also enact punishment for religious offenses. For they would naturally look to the chosen people of God as most worth of imitation. Indeed this practice, so foreign to our modern notions, was common, not only among Jews

and early Christians, but even among professors of false religions and pagans themselves. In pagan Greece the state punished every neglect of the worship of the gods. In America and in other countries today a man may not only live but even aspire to places of honor, and be considered a respectable member of society, like Bob Ingersoll, while openly denying the existence of God; but in pagan Greece such things were not tolerated in regard to their false deities. Protagoras was banished and his works publicly burned, because he doubted the existence of the gods; he was what we call an agnostic, of whom there are plenty in this country at the present day. Socrates, again, was condemned to drink hemlock because he repudiated the gods of the state and attempted to introduce new ones.

In ancient Rome, also, the pagan religion was a state religion. The kings in their time were at once kings and judges and high priests. They in their own person performed the sacrifices offered in the name of the state; they superintended all religious ceremonies. Transgressors of religious rules and ordinances were punished, and by a sort of excommunication excluded alike from all religious and political fellowship. Thus the right of punishing religious offenses by civil penalties seems to have been a principle fully recognized and accepted. This is a principle which should be clearly kept in view in dealing with the question of religious persecution. For, if it be once granted that a man may be justly punished for a purely religious offense, it will be easy to show that the Church applied that principle—a principle which she did not invent, but found in full force—with leniency and moderation. The only fault that can reasonably be found with her is not that she punished violaters of her commands with too much severity, but that she punished them at all. Once the principle is allowed—and it was in bygone days universally admitted and practiced, just as was the use of torture. No one, therefore, can reasonably accuse the Church of undue severity in carrying out this principle. The fact is, whether rightly or wrongly, the principle has been abandoned once and forever, probably. Laws are now established on a different basis. Formerly governments punished whatever was wrong, or, at least, what they considered to be wrong. Now they take no notice of crimes which they acknowledge to be great in themselves, so long as they are not such as to interfere with the welfare and liberty of others. Such is the teaching of many of the most serious thinkers of modern times—like Herbert

Spencer, Stuart Mill, Kant, and others, who have claimed full liberty for every man to do just what he pleases and to break every one of the ten commandments so long as no one else suffers by it. Now, to take the customs and laws prevailing in the nineteenth century and to make use of them to interpret the laws of the tenth century, is ridiculous and unfair. Yet this is what is commonly done in dealing with religious persecutions of past ages. In this age we think a man must have liberty to commit any excess he pleases so long as he does not interfere with others. But during long periods of the world's history it was considered the duty of the legislator to punish immoral acts because they were immoral and offensive to the Deity, irrespective of their effects upon society. It is useless to compare penalties inflicted for religious crimes in past ages with penalties inflicted in these days for civil crimes, for the whole spirit and tone of society has undergone a complete change. No doubt great severity was shown and men and women were subjected to the heaviest punishments for religious faults; but this was because the whole penal code, in its application to every department of human misconduct was barbarous in the extreme. If a spiritual fault was to be punished at all, no one can complain because it was punished with the severity which was common in those days. It came under the ordinary practice of the time; severity was the rule, hence it affected religious offenses as well as others. The use of physical force as a means of instilling faith was formerly in vogue, and so was the torture as a means of extorting confessions from political offenders; and so, too, was branding with a red-hot iron the foreheads of laborers and of slaves, even on the Southern plantations, captured after leaving their rightful masters. If one of these practices may return, so may all. But they can not. They are dead and past, and as extinct as is the dodo, and no power can resuscitate or galvanize them into life again. A. L. O'SULLIVAN, '99.

"To use books rightly, is to go to them for help; to appeal to them when our own knowledge and power of thought fails; to be led by them into wider sight, purer conception, than our own, and receive from them the united sentence of the judges and councils of all time, against our solitary and unstable opinion."—*Ruskin*.

CO-EDUCATION.

No student of social questions disregards the efforts that have been made in recent times to level the differences which nature seems to have placed between men and women; to set women on a footing of equality with men; to afford her the same political rights, the same educational facilities, the same professional opportunities and honors which men enjoy. From this modern tendency has arisen what is known as co-education.

Large institutions have grown up in which both sexes are trained in the sciences and in the liberal and fine arts, and in many countries—though not in all—the plan of co-education begins in the common schools. Now what are we to think of this new product of our century? What judgment are we to enact upon an institution for which very many excellent men and women have the highest regard? Shall we approve it unconditionally? Shall we condemn it outright? No! There is need of proceeding cautiously, prudently, especially with institutions that are bearing their first fruits. Even when a great heresy appears the church is slow to condemn, or when a great system of philosophy comes from the mind of a genius, she is slow to approve. But then, when she speaks, she knows whereof she speaks, and her judgment commands the respect of mankind. Co-education is but a recent growth, yet it has been of speedy development and has already borne fruit. If it is wise to judge a tree by its fruits and men by their actions, it is likewise fair to judge institutions by their effects upon individuals and upon society. If we ask ourselves, therefore, what have been the effects of co-education upon the character of men and women, upon times and upon society, we shall be able to say whether all that is claimed in behalf of co-education is to be granted; we shall see what its real advantages are and in what it is reprehensible.

It may be as well to start by mentioning the advantages which this system claims: 1st. It is claimed by the advocates of co-education that the system will tend to elevate young men, both mentally and morally and will especially make them more refined and gentle in their manners, to polish off the rough edges, as it were, by constant contact with the finer qualities of the gentler sex. No doubt it is true that a young man will be more polite and exacting in his manner under this system and will be most particular about his dress—always appearing at

his best in the class-room; he will have his trousers properly creased; his hair evenly divided, and his tie done up in the latest style,—no fault can be found with his toilet, but the chances are he has spent more time upon it than upon his books. We will grant that those who have particular reasons will be always polite and respectful in the class-room, but taken altogether young men do not treat their girl classmates with proper respect, as any one who has attended a mixed school can testify. And why? Perhaps because “familiarity breeds contempt.” This constant mingling with, and competing against classmates of the opposite sex, noting their weaknesses and defects, causes in most cases, an ill-bred familiarity to spring up between them and makes the men less,—rather than more respectful towards the young women. And, by degrees, they begin to treat them as inferiors, or at best, as they would treat one another, and no better, and the respect that one boy has for another, when applied to a girl is nearly as bad as no respect at all.

Again may we ask, what advantages does woman derive from this close association?

It is said that what man most admires in women are those qualities and virtues which he himself does not possess. Now, if women lose these qualities, which men so much admire, by constantly associating with and imitating the man; competing with them in their studies, following the same professions, indulging in manly sports, and even falling into their vices, it naturally follows that men will lose that admiration and regard for them. A man may laugh at and even encourage a young girl who smokes cigarettes and goes off bicycling with him, and perhaps joining him in a social glass of wine at some wayside inn, but when he arrives at that period of life when frivolities and thoughtlessness have no more attractions, and he feels himself drawn to make a choice which is not one of mere impulse or passion, but which is to last for life, he invariably seeks for that shining ornament, which always makes the true woman—modesty.

Leaving for a moment his social aspect of the question, let us see how this system affects young women physically and morally. Does it improve them mentally? No, on the contrary they lose rather than gain by this system. In the first place it is impossible to adjust in the same institutions the physiological needs of each sex; the strain of competition falls unequally, especially upon young girls, who at this time of their lives are

physically unable to study so continuously as men. And taken morally, it is well known that this is the period when the association of the sexes is attended with most dangers, and woman being more exposed to criticism, will lose rather than gain the finer graces of social life. Listen to what James Cooper Sinclair says in the *North American Review*: "Some colleges have dormitories or boarding houses for the girls, but the more general custom, particularly in the larger institutions, is for them to select their boarding places quite independently. It is a rare thing for the parent to ask anyone to assume the least control over the girl. She would resent it, and it is not considered necessary. She is as independent as her brother, free to make what friends she likes, to keep what hours she likes. Her coming and going concerns no one but herself."

There is, no doubt, something particularly American in this independence, this liberty, this almost manly self-reliance of young ladies. It is certainly not French nor English even. This liberty, as all other liberty, would be all right were it not attended with dangers that make it an unwise liberty. These dangers cannot be ignored or underrated. It is a well known and generally admitted principle of social ethics that where men are gathered together the elements of evil as well as those of good are accumulated, and as human nature is more prone to err than to do right, it follows that in great assemblages of human individuals the inclination to evil are not only multiplied but intensified by the power of example, and will triumph over inclinations to good unless restrained by wise direction and strict discipline. Hence the rigorous regulations of armies and navies. Unfortunately for the system of co-education, we cannot claim for it that powerful safeguard against immorality—namely, discipline. Even the common, or public schools, though it deals with a younger class of pupils of both sexes, is objectionable on the score of discipline.

Now is it different in larger schools of co-education? Has not experience demonstrated that even the regulations fixed by the well meaning directors of such institutions, to keep within bounds the restless passions of these immense accumulations of closely associated young men and women, have proved feeble barriers of sand? Have we not heard of the too numerous and sad cases connected with two well known universities? And have not the various other great centers of co-education furnished our times with more than their share of public scandal?

A thing ceases to be an accident or an exception when it becomes the rule. Such an education, therefore, must be declared most dangerous to the individual and to society, for whatever corrupts the individual corrupts society, of which he is a member. Destroy that chivalrous respect for woman, and society soon will become a scene of disgusting free love between skirted men and pantalooned women.

Now, it certainly will be of interest to note what is the sentiment and practice of the Catholic Church in the matter of co-education. The church is an old institution, one that has had the experience of centuries in dealing with men, and which is certainly well informed on matters of education. The Church, in her public utterances, has not unconditionally condemned co-education; yet, practically, she has not approved it in any of her schools of higher education, and even in her primary schools, where the means are not to be had for carrying on two separate schools, one for boys and one for girls, it is customary to keep the sexes separated as much as possible,—having separate class-rooms for the boys and girls, and placing their recreation rooms and play grounds on opposite sides of the buildings. And as a religious teaching organization, she is not in harmony with mixed schools. In the oldest churches, even in the Catacombs, the sexes were separated for divine services and catechetical instruction, and to this day it is customary in many places to reserve one side of the church for women and the other for men.

On account of this opposition to co-education, the Church has been accused of being negligent about the education of young women, but this is not true: the Church has always been most zealous for the education of all her children, women as well as men. We need look no further than our own country for a proof of this. Look at the hundreds of institutions scattered over the land. There is hardly a state that does not contain at least half a dozen Catholic institutions for the higher education of young ladies, and the colleges and academies are all taught by sisterhoods and orders of women specially trained for this purpose. This custom of committing the education of women to women, has always been the rule and practice of the Church: the young ladies attend their own schools, and the men obtain their education at colleges and universities specially intended for them. Hence there has existed in the Church from the earliest ages, communities of women and men who make it their special work to impart to young girls and ladies, and to boys

and young men, the education that was necessary to fit them for the duties of life and the adornment of society.

We may therefore conclude from what has been said, that co-education is far from being an unmixed good; that it has been a costly experiment; that it robs young men of chivalry and young women of modesty; that it destroys more than it builds; that it is fraught with most serious dangers to the citizen and to the state; that it is at variance with the practice of the church, which passes for a very respectable authority in matters of education and morals. These various considerations are, it seems to me, sufficient to cause a parent to think twice before he decides to send his daughter or his son,—but especially his daughter,—to a co-educational institution. And if all those interested are set a-thinking seriously upon these and like considerations, the pros and cons of co-education, it will not be very long before co-education is abandoned as vain and unprofitable and there will be effected a return to the older, perhaps, but safer system of separate schools and universities for men and women.

A. B. CASEY, '01.

HUBERT.

Ever since the days of the Grecian sage, Socrates, "know thyself," has been received by all men as one of the wisest, most profound and all-embracing precepts ever enunciated. Assuming, then, that self-knowledge is the first, most necessary, and profitable kind of knowledge a man can acquire, it follows as a necessary consequence that he is the best and wisest teacher who enables us most surely, most easily, and most accurately to get a profound view of our inner self.

Judged by this criterion, what a powerful educational influence does not Shakespeare exercise. There is no phase of human character, which he has not clearly unfolded; no condition of life, which his mighty pen has not depicted in the unfading colors which genius alone can mix; no passion, which moulds the character of individuals and frequently determines the fate of nations, that has escaped the notice of his searching eye. His dramas are a mirror in which each one may see himself reflected if he only has the discernment and honesty to recognize his likeness.

The truth of these reflections can best be shown by a study of some one of Shakespeare's creations. For this purpose we will select his character sketch of Hubert in "King John."

At first sight it might seem that Hubert is a very unimportant character; hardly worthy of more than a passing notice, and yet I dare say he represents a larger class than any other single character in Shakespeare. He is neither very bad nor heroically good, but rather a weak man, whose standard of action depends largely on the circumstances in which he is placed and the influences that are brought to bear upon him. He would much rather do what is right and just than what is wrong, but when difficulties which try men's souls, surround him, he lacks the moral stamina to follow the bent of his inclinations and to obey the stern and uncompromising commands of duty.

This is, it seems to me, an accurate description of the condition, if not of the majority of men, at least of a very large number. In every rank of life we find men who have not the courage of their convictions; men whose intentions are, in the main, good, and whose feelings prompt them to follow the path of virtue and honor, but they dare not brave the frown of the powerful or manfully face the sneer of the crowd.

We feel our souls burn with indignation when Hubert * * *

To be endeared to a king
Makes no conscience to destroy a prince,

and basely answers the covert request of King John, to murder little Arthur,

He shall not live.

But can most of us lay the "flattering unction" on our heads that in similar circumstances we would not have acted an equally dishonorable part? We who fall so frequently under temptations a thousand times less trying.

Men of Hubert's calibre always look around for expedients when danger confronts them in the fulfillment of duty, and so we find Hubert trying to steer a middle course between the commission of a foul crime on the one hand and obeying the dictates of conscience on the other. He is afraid to tell King John he will not do the bloody deed and yet he cannot bring himself to such a degree of villany. He therefore resolves to put out young Arthur's eyes. Thus it is that he can tell King John, later on, with perfect truth—when he is well assured the intelligence will be acceptable—

Within this bosom never entered yet
 The dreadful motion of a murderous thought
 And you have slandered nature in my form;
 Which, howsoever rude exteriorly
 Is yet the cover of a fairer mind
 Than to be the butcher of an innocent child.

But even after he has been deterred from his cruel purpose by the eloquent pleadings of the young prince, he dares not tell the truth and thereby brings the kingdom to the verge of civil war. It is only when he has absolute certainty that the knowledge will gain for him the good graces of John that he finally tells him "young Arthur is alive." It is too late, however, to avert all the evil consequences of his criminal dalliance with vicious suggestions. Prince Arthur's unexpected death is naturally attributed to the contrivance of Hubert and he thus brings shame and disgrace upon himself and places King John, whom he desired to serve, in a very bad light before his disaffected nobles.

This is the logical and inevitable outcome of evil doing. We not only injure ourselves but also those for whose sake we degrade ourselves. This also explains the secret scorn with which men regard their too ready tools and the fierce hatred they feel for them when their undertakings prove unsuccessful and fail of their intended end.

Thus does Shakespeare teach us to know ourselves, by placing before our eyes, characters in whom he embodies all our faults, shortcomings, and vices. We do not always like to acknowledge that the portrait is a good one and easily deceive ourselves into believing that we would have had more courage if placed in a similar position. Nothing is easier than to censure the vices of others, especially when they are such as we ourselves have not committed, even though we have fallen into others of a similar kind and equally disgraceful. But he who is honestly desirous of getting a clear and accurate knowledge of himself as he appears to others cannot fail to find some character in Shakespeare who is a faithful representation of himself at least in the broad outlines. He thus forces us, in a manner, to see ourselves as we really are, stripped of all the glittering and deceptive tinsel in which our own vanity has decked us.

Hubert is not a great character, but I know of few others that are more thoroughly useful or the study of which can serve a more practical end. By his masterly analysis of this character, Shakespeare has fully demonstrated the truth of his own beautiful saying, "Corruption wins not more than honesty."

W. J. SOMOS, '99.

THE VIATORIAN.

Published monthly for the students by the Pantagraph Printing and Stationery Co. Bloomington, Ill.

Edited by the students of St. Viator's College, Bourbonnais Grove, Ill. All correspondence must be addressed: THE VIATORIAN, Bourbonnais, Ill.

Entered at the Bloomington Postoffice as second class matter.

Subscription price, one dollar per year, payable in advance.

BOARD OF EDITORS.

P. W. HANSL,
D. J. HAYDN,

J. I. GRANGER,
P. J. GERAGHTY,

P. F. DANIHER,
M. J. MORRISSEY.

EDITORIAL.

If there is one day more gladdening to the student's heart than another, it is Commencement. It means a change, home, and a great many other things, no better, perhaps not so good for him, as those he has, but new ones just the same. That day of days is rapidly approaching—it comes June 19—and a great deal will be crowded into the short interval between now and then. With the thought of parting, each going his different way, and all verging into the many paths of life that for each group lead from a common center, but never meet again. With the beauties of a season that throws its halo around every sincere friendship, and with opportunities of closer intimacy, it is not wonderful that pupils grow into a closer friendship in those bright days of a declining school year, and find that all the after memories of school time date from the charming life led during the last days of one's last school year.

Of all the inconveniences the future may seem to present, none is less to be feared than that of competition. The fact that many have the start of us, and that the professions are being filled up with great rapidity, is and ought to be in no way discouraging. There is room for all; in fact, there is a greater need for the right sort of men today than ever before.

He who brings talent, virtue, learning into a profession, comes as one rich among starving multitudes, as a light amidst darkness, is the one for whom many wait. Those who fear that themselves or those dear to them are to have no place when the time comes to fill one, make a tacit confession of inability to fill a position, were it offered at once. The trouble today is that young men have no idea of the responsibility they assume when they enter professional life—hence the hurry and the insuffi-

ciency of their preparation. Worse than this, public opinion does not condemn what must be taken as a gross abuse, and the result is that men with few of the necessary qualifications, and above all a great lack of sympathy for humanity, are pouring a steady stream into all the professions.

Humanitarianism is a religion defective in its object, and must be very changeable in its progress. Its foundation is neither broad nor secure enough on which to rest the best hopes of intelligent beings. Still, when we contrast it with the worship of mammon, at whose altars a great number of professional men worship, we need not be surprised that the property, life, and sometimes his spiritual needs, are all too sadly neglected. Crowds count for nothing when intellect, knowledge, and a genuine sympathy with the needs and weaknesses of men, are put in contrast. Men soon know their friend, him in whom they may trust with full assurance of his help. Him they seek out, by him they are benefited, and their lasting gratitude amply rewards his efforts. The man that has a high purpose in view, that will not take money when conscience protests, that finds more pleasure in doing good than in growing rich, has the qualifications that fit him for professional life, that make him successful, that bring him fame, and no man shall see him want.

BISHOP M'GAVICK.

The splendid functions incident to the consecration of the Rt. Rev. Bishop McGavick were beautifully supplemented in the reception and banquet tendered him by the alumni of St. Viateur's College at the Grand Pacific Hotel on Wednesday.

The grand hostelry never looked prettier. The corridor and parlors of the reception floor were literal bowers, while from one of the recesses a select orchestra discoursed sweet music. The guests began to arrive shortly before 8 o'clock, and when the Bishop took his stand in the elegant east parlor, surrounded by the members of the reception committee, the sight was unique. The sombre garb of ecclesiastics was softened by the appearance of gentlemen in evening dress, and as the guests were presented in turn, men of prominence in professional and mercantile callings were noticed. It was a distinguished gathering. Sons of St. Viateur's College had assembled from near and far to greet

their brother, and certainly the grand old institution of learning at Kankakee was honored in such a brilliant showing.

When the presentations were completed, the gentlemen marched to the large banquet hall of the hotel. Grace was said by Bishop McGavick, and then 127 guests sat down to dinner. The tables were laden with good things, the *menu* proving that nothing had been spared to make the spread worthy of St. Viateur's and her honored son. Places of distinction on either side of the Bishop were occupied by the Very Rev. Fr. Marsile, C.S.V., and the Rev. Fr. Beaudoin, C.S.V. The pleasantest sentiment prevailed throughout the evening. It was a gay recalling of happy college days, and a resuming of old friendships. In a word, bishop, priests, lawyers, physicians—all for the time were light-hearted, happy boys of St. Viateur's. When coffee had been served, the meeting was called to attention by James Maher, Esq., the toastmaster of the evening. In a few well chosen words Mr. Maher formally welcomed Bishop McGavick in behalf of the alumni, saying:

"It is an hour of proud triumph for St. Viateur's, that in which one of her sons takes rank with the hierarchy of the Church; and now, East and West and North and South, we are assembled here tonight to give voice to the promptings of our hearts."

Telegrams of greeting were then read from Archbishop Feehan, Archbishop Kain, Bishops Spalding, Burke and many other prominent personages. The first toast, "Our Holy Father, Leo XIII.," was followed by the addresses of Father Lesage, who spoke to the toast, "Our Archbishop." It was a becoming tribute to the great metropolitan of the Archdiocese of Chicago, and every allusion to the venerable prelate was received with enthusiastic applause. Father C. P. Foster made the address on "Our First Bishop." In words elegant and with enunciation clear and sweet, the speaker dwelt on the life and record of the guest of the evening. The effort was splendid in every sense, worthy of the occasion and proof of the exceptional ability of the speaker. Father Foster's address was followed by Bishop McGavick's response. When the Bishop arose, the pent-up feelings burst forth, and for several minutes the enthusiasm was unbounded. Every guest was on his feet, and cheer upon cheer was given as only old college men can applaud. Throughout it all the youthful Bishop smiled and bowed his acknowledgments, and when quiet had finally been

restored he began to speak. He said he was proud of the college, proud of the faculty, proud of the students, proud of his "sheepskin." In his labors of the past years, the remembrance of *alma mater* had been a solace and strength to him; and now he was proud to lay the honors that had come to him at the feet of that same *alma mater*. He was glad to meet again the companions of his college days, to renew old friendships, to hear the old songs and to see the old faces. In the course of his meeting with men trained in the great universities, if there was question of the different seats of learning, he was always proud to declare that he held degrees from St. Viateur's College. Concluding, he thanked the faculty and alumni for the mark of esteem implied in the reception.

Loud cheers greeted the genial president of St. Viateur's—the Very Rev. Fr. Marsile—as he rose to respond to the toast "*Alma Mater*." It was the tribute of the "boys" to a loved father, and the whole-souled, kindly rector seemed to take them all to his heart as he spoke of his joy and honor in seeing one of his own elevated to the Episcopate. From all parts of the country, and from all callings—young men and old, priests and laymen—all were his "boys" again tonight; all shared with him the triumph of the hour, and all wished the new Bishop a long life in the leadership to which he has been called.

The Rev. F. J. O'Reilly was the next speaker. His subject, "Patriotism," was handled in a masterly way. It was one of the gem addresses of the evening. Father O'Reilly is a clear reasoner and a polished elocutionist. "Our Future" was dwelt upon by the Rev. Thomas Kehoe, and the Rev. Thomas Shannon was most happy in his toast, "Our Alumni from Afar." Mr. James G. Condon created much merriment by the bright and witty manner in which he spoke to the toast, "College Men and Professions." Interspersed with these orations a quartette of voices from St. Viateur's gave some beautiful selections, while the Rev. Father Dore was in almost constant demand for musical and elocutionary numbers. After the regular program, calls were made on the Rev. Dr. Rivard, C.S.V., the venerable Fr. Beaudoin, C.S.V., Father P. Conway, and others—all of whom responded in a most cheerful vein. College songs, informal talks, etc., were indulged in until the wee sma' hours. The reception had been a complete success. Largely instrumental in the perfect arrangement of details were the committee, and in particular the Rev. P. Conway, who spared no trouble to make the affair what it proved to be—a source of intense satisfaction to all concerned.

Thursday morning found the bishop, in company with Father Marsile, en route to Kankakee. The train bearing the distinguished party pulled into the station on schedule time, and the visitors were given a perfect ovation. Representative citizens on horseback and in carriages awaited them and escorted them to the borders of Bourbonnais Grove. Here the reception assumed a magnificent shape. Gorgeous arches, festooned with Episcopal and Papal colors, bore messages of welcome. The students of the college, in military uniform and headed by the college band, made a fine showing. Much attention was attracted by the picked squad of the college, who on this occasion for the first time appeared in their bright Zouave suits. This company formed the guard of honor to the bishop. Bunting streamed from the windows, and flags floated from the church, the college, the town hall, and the principal residences. The weather was ideal, and vast throngs had assembled to greet for the first time the auxiliary bishop of Chicago. After vesting in Episcopal robes, Bishop McGavick was led in procession through the beautiful grounds of the college to the parish church, where after delivering an earnest exhortation to the congregation, he administered confirmation to several hundred children. This ceremony was followed by Benediction of the Most Blessed Sacrament, and then the guests were conducted to the reception halls of the dear old college. Dinner was served in the college library, where covers had been laid for about seventy-five. It was a refreshingly informal banquet, a family reunion—and none appeared to be more at home than the guest of honor. An incident that brought great joy to all present, and that had not been announced, occurred during the dinner. The bishop—evidently filled with delight—stated that he took great pleasure in conveying to the Rev. Father Legris, the learned and well-beloved professor of moral theology, a distinction bestowed by Laval University, the degree of Doctor of Divinity. To none was this feature of the exercises so great a surprise as to Fr. Legris. When the bishop had bestowed the ring, cap, and diploma, the applause was deafening. Recovering from the surprise, the newly made doctor spoke in his own happy vein for several minutes. Needless to say, congratulations poured in on him from all sides.

Immediately after dinner the principal reception of the day was in order. The entertainment hall of the college had been most tastefully decorated. Numberless electric lights shed a

soft light through the palms and ferns, and a dais was placed in the center of the stage, from which the Bishop witnessed the exercises of the students. As the party entered the hall, the college band, under the leadership of Dr. Legris, played "Hail to the Chief." This was followed by a charming address from the minims, who one by one presented cut flowers to the Bishop. It was a pretty bit of acting. Drills by the famous little Columbian guards and the crack company of the seniors were followed with the closest attention. A novel feature of the entertainment was given in the form of a cantata, sung by the choir with orchestral accompaniment. Mr. J. H. Nawn then delivered the address on the part of the students, assuring the Bishop that this day would live in the history of St. Viateur's.

The Bishop, deeply affected, responded, thanking the faculty and students for the loyal greeting they had extended to him. He told them that he was proud to lay his honors at the feet of his *alma mater*, for here he had learned all that had helped him to labor successfully. The very walls were dear to him. The professors had ever been wise guides to him, and to them he owed the formation that had enabled him to cope with difficulties and valiantly bear on in the pursuit of that work to which within these walls he had consecrated his life and energies. For all this he thanked the president and faculty most tenderly, and then bestowed his blessing on those present.

After the exercises in the college hall, the Bishop was escorted to the convent of Notre Dame, where he was welcomed by the Sisters and pupils. The large music hall was tastefully decorated, and here a most enjoyable programme was carried out. Bands of little girls sang and presented flowers, while the older pupils read an address of welcome. The Bishop again spoke in heartfelt appreciation of the elaborate exercises that had been given in his honor, remarking that the day just closing would remain one of the happiest days of his life.

St. Viateur's College has just reason to be proud of her greeting. It was a graceful, splendid expression of the intense happiness of professors and students. Gladness was in the atmosphere, and happiest of the happy was the genial president, the Very Rev. F. Marsile. The day marks an epoch in the history of St. Viateur's College.

Bishop McGavick and party returned to Chicago in the evening.

The following are the names of those present at the banquet given in Chicago:

Rev. P. Beaudoin, C.S.V., Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. H. Boeckleman, Elkhart, Ind.; Rev. J. Bohlman, Sag Bridge, Ill. Rev. A. L. Bergeron, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Z. P. Berard, St. Anne, Ill.; Rev. F. J. Barry, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. E. J. Bourget, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. J. Bergeron, Chicago, Ill.; Arthur Byron, Kankakee, Ill.; James Burns, Kankakee, Ill.; Matthew Berry, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. R. Bellerose, C.S.V., St. Mary's, Ill.; Frank Butler, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. P. C. Conway, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. James Cusack, Brookville, Ky.; Rev. F. Caraher, Chicago, Ill.; James G. Condon, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. H. Cannon, Gibson City, Ill.; D. M. Carroll, Chicago, Ill.; Joseph Cremin, Chicago, Ill.; Thomas Cahill, Chicago, Ill.; Daniel Cahill, Chicago, Ill.; Wm. Clune, Indianapolis, Ind.; John Coyle, Peru, Ind.; P. W. Clifford, Valparaiso, Ind.; Rev. J. J. Cregan, C.S.V., Chicago, Ill.; Rev. P. Ducharme, C.S.V., Montreal, Canada; Rev. J. P. Dore, West Chicago, Ill.; Rev. W. H. Donovan, Ramona, S. D.; Rev. M. Dermody, Flandreau, S. D.; Rev. H. P. Durkin, Peoria, Ill.; Rev. James Dunnion, Marengo, Iowa; William Doody, Chicago; Rev. C. P. Foster, Joliet, Ill.; Rev. E. J. Fox, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. J. Gosselin, Ashland, Ky.; Rev. A. Granger, Kankakee, Ill.; Rev. E. M. Griffin, Chicago; A. L. Granger, Kankakee, Ill.; Rev. Charles Goulet, Ellenburg, N. Y.; Charles Golden, Minonk, Ill.; Thomas Gibbons, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. L. Grandchamp, Duluth, Minn.; Rev. J. M. Hagan, La Grange, Ill.; Rev. I. A. Hines, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. T. M. Hughes, Chicago, Ill.; P. W. Hans, Chicago, Ill.; T. F. Hoban, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. J. Jennings, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Edward Jordan, Chicago; Rev. Thomas Kehoe, Ludlow, Ky.; Rev. W. L. Kearney, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Joseph Kelly, Moline, Ill.; Rev. John Kelley, Gilman, Ill.; Rev. F. Kirsch, McHenry, Ill.; Rev. E. J. Kramer, Chicago, Ill.; Charles Knisley, Chicago, Ill.; Louis Kreuder, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. M. B. Krug, Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. G. N. Legris, Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. J. Lesage, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. A. B. Leising, West Brooklyn, Ill.; H. J. Legris, Kankakee, Ill.; F. E. Legris, Bourbonnais, Ill.; T. A. Legris, Bourbonnais, Ill.; Bert Letourneau, Kankakee, Ill.; Dr. A. Lesage, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. P. Lesage, Joliet, Ill.; Rev. J. V. Lamarre, Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. M. J. Marsile, C.S.V., Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. T. J. McDevitt, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. J. McCann, Oregon, Ill.; Rev. T. J. McKinney, Merna, Ill.; Rev. J. J.

Morrissey, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. W. Murtaugh, Sheffield, Ill.; Jas. Maher, Chicago, Ill.; Vincent Morrison, Ft. Madison, Iowa; Henry Matter, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. A. Mainville, Hoopeston, Ill.; J. H. Nawn, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. D. O'Dwyer, Chebanse, Ill.; Rev. Frank O'Reilly, Peoria, Ill.; Bernard O'Connor, Indianapolis, Ind.; Michael O'Toole, Chicago, Ill.; Francis J. O'Connor, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. F. N. Perry, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. J. P. Parker, Galva, Ill.; Felix Provost, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Sheldon Peck, Chicago, Ill.; William Quinlisk, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. E. L. Rivard, C.S.V., Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. H. E. Read, Chicago, Ill.; F. J. Richard, Bourbonnais, Ill.; Joseph P. Rafferty, Chicago; Moses Ray, Chicago; Rev. J. F. Ryan, C.S.V., Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. R. Sadlier, Battle Creek, Mich.; Rev. James Shannon, Peoria, Ill.; Rev. L. A. Senecal, C.V.S., Bourbonnais, Ill.; Rev. Paul Simms, Louisville, Ky.; Rev. J. P. Suerth, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. E. J. Therien, Aurora, Ill.; Rev. William Walsh, Wilmington, Ill.; Rev. James Walsh, Chicago, Ill.

EXCHANGES.

We noticed, in several of our exchanges, earnest pleas for the adoption of an exchange column by all college and high school journals, and eloquent descriptions of the great advantages to be derived from such a column. Yet the exchange column in many of these journals consists of a few wornout jokes for which every paper that comes to their table seems to have been laid under contribution.

The editors of these journals seem to be under the impression that an exchange column is made by printing the word *Exchanges* in large capitals at the head of a column and trusting to the scissors to do the rest.

"The End of a Romance," in the *Mount Saint Joseph Collegian*, is a very peculiar story. The author must have been interrupted while writing it, for there exists no connection at all between its various parts. We advise him to write his next story more carefully—at least the plot.

In the *University of Ottawa Review* for April, is the first installment of an interesting criticism of Aubrey De Vere's "Foray of Queen Marie." The author exhibits excellent understanding of English literature in general, and particularly of his subject. The criticism covers a great many pages; but a great deal of it

might very aptly be omitted. This is the only fault we have to find with the paper. The critic wanders from his subject too much. The introduction is a long dissertation upon narrative poetry. After the author does take up his subject, he pauses again, and in a few paragraphs, tells us for what kind of readers the article was written, viz.: for students. After this we are regaled with a three-page essay, "metre." By this time we have forgotten the subject. However the author finally recalls it to our attention, and the rest is very good.

The *Centre College Cento* treats us to an entertaining article upon "German Student Duelling." During the course of the paper the writer expresses a thought which has, no doubt, often occurred to many of us, Americans, in the following words: "To most Americans it (duelling) is an abhorrent and senseless survival of more ancient days, *and it appears strange that it is allowed to continue by such a radically rationalistic nation as the Germans are.*"

In the *Dial* for April there is a criticism of the works of Mrs. Augustus Craven, a writer who is sadly neglected by the American reading public. The article is well written.

BASE BALL.

With the advent of warm weather and pleasant days, came the base ball enthusiasts. Every college boy is a base ball "crank." So almost before the snow was off the ground, the college league teams were organized. Great rivalry now exists among the contestants, (it is wonderful what an effort is being made to win the strawberry festival.)

Below is a summary of the games that have been played, and the standing of each of the clubs up to date:

Captains.	Teams.	Won.	Lost.	Per Cent.
Rooney.....	Rivals.....	5.....	1.....	.833
Caron.....	Cyclones.....	4.....	2.....	.667
Riley.....	Lilacs.....	3.....	3.....	.500
Patterson.....	Tallyho's	3.....	3.....	.500
Hanlon.....	Stars	0.....	6.....	.000

VIATORIANA.

—
ACT I.

First P. (excitedly): "What! not in class? Then he must be asleep in his room. Go seek him there, some of you, and I will follow later."

ACT II.

SCENE I: Messenger (to P—— of P——): "A—— is missing from the class room."

P—— of P——: "Let us seek him in his chamber. * * *

* The door is bolted. The wily villian thinks to foil us. Ha! I have it. The transom."

Chorus (to tune of Walter Rooney): "The transom, the transom, the transom's the thing."

SCENE II: (Stage arrangement same as before, except that when the curtain rises the P—— of P—— is vainly attempting to extricate himself from the transom, having been caught by a nail). First P—— (arriving upon the scene): "What means this disturbance? What! Is the young rascal openly resisting authority? Then must we employ force. Ho here! an axe!

(The mother of the rebel, visiting her son, appears, and learning the nature of the trouble, immediately proceeds to faint.)

At this juncture, when all is excitement, the long sought lad calmly comes up the stairs with his books under his arm, and diligently striving to solve a deep problem of bookkeeping in his brain. As the hero appears upon the scene the faces of the P—— assume a perplexed look, the mother faints again into the arms of her son, and the gallery applauds vociferously.

Moral—Always turn the knob of a door twice before concluding that it is locked.

Steele-Wedeles Co.
WHOLESALE GROCERS

— Tea and Coffee Importers.

Address mail orders to

JOHN J. LUCAS, Institute Salesman,
Chicago, Ill.

Every student who intends to go into business should read

Business.

Monthly \$1.00 a year. The Office Paper.

To read **Business** for a year is a liberal commercial education in itself. Write for sample copy, mentioning this paper.

Publication Offices, 13 Astor Place, New York.