

Airs

Hairs—pleasing
try one—sit in
best materials.

Couches at \$8

See the
garance, and
and see the.

ere

Go-Cart—and
es and super-
ur showroom
h interesting

Cart
ished in \$17.50
Upholstered
and has mat-
leather cloth
steel, four
tire wheels,
stener, foot
to match
\$17.50

about \$25.00
ished in a
olstered in
loth, with
ather cloth,
Gear all
dies, auto-
le, four 12-
hells, foot
\$25.00

\$40.00
hed dark
Has side
in English
at teacher
British
artillery
wheels,
rusteners,
ed finish
\$40.00

THINGS
HING
MER



An Hour with the Editor



ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS

Charles I. was a strange compound of strength and weakness. He was cultured, kind and lived an irreproachable life; on the other hand he was deceitful, unscrupulous and treacherous. He was a Protestant, but his wife, Maria Henrietta, of France, was an ardent Roman Catholic. His father had educated him in the doctrines of absolutism, and he came to the throne when the relations between the Crown and Parliament were greatly strained. He was well liked by the people, although those who knew him best had become to question his sincerity and to suspect that he would seek to extend the prerogative even further than his father had. His wife, who brought with her from France extreme notions of the power of kings, encouraged him to assert himself as the sole ruler of Great Britain, and his closest adviser, Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, was an avowed advocate of absolutism. In judging of Charles it is necessary to remember that the Stuarts had ruled Scotland without parliaments, and that his father had throughout his reign in England ignored them as far as possible. While we may condemn him for the methods by which he attempted to attain his ends, we ought not to fail to recognize that he might conscientiously hold his opinions of his rights as King. Many sincere men entertained the same views, and indeed it was not yet established that Parliament had a right to a voice in the administration of the kingdom. Its legislative rights had been admitted, but many of the best minds in the kingdom denied its claim to a voice in the manner in which the affairs of the nation were carried on. Even the great parliamentary leaders did not at first aspire to any share in the administration of affairs. They demanded for parliament the power to make the laws, to impose taxation, to determine matters relating to religion and to discuss freely all matters of state, but they did not claim the right to say how the laws should be administered, or the revenues should be expended. The doctrine that the ministers of the Crown were responsible to parliament had fallen into abeyance. But Charles was determined to govern without any restraint. To him the principle that the redress of grievances should precede the granting of Supply was intolerable, for that presupposed the right of the people to question the validity of his conduct and that of his ministers, a doctrine that he would not concede.

Puritanism, which, as we saw in a previous article, had its origin in a little group of people who had fled during the reign of Mary to Geneva, had at this time become dominant in England, and in Scotland Presbyterianism was firmly established. However English Puritanism and Scottish Presbyterianism may have differed in respect to forms of worship and matters of creed, they were alike in their adherence to the principle of popular supremacy. This was the direct outcome of the teachings of Calvin, the fundamental principle of whose doctrine was the assertion of the sovereignty of God, from which it followed that under Him all men must of necessity be equal. Stripped of all details, the contest which arose between Charles and Parliament almost immediately upon his accession was over popular sovereignty. It was complicated by questions of an ecclesiastical character; it was intensified by fears that Roman Catholicism was about to be restored; it was embittered by a strife between Presbyterianism and Episcopacy; it was rendered more violent by religious fanaticism; but at the bottom it was strife as to whether the King or the people should rule Britain. It is with this aspect of the case only that we shall concern ourselves.

Charles came to the throne in 1625. At that time there was war with Spain. Parliament was quite willing that it should be prosecuted vigorously, for Spain was regarded as the arch-enemy of the Protestant religion; but it insisted that the struggle should be confined to the sea, whereas the King was desirous of carrying on operations on land as well. This early in the reign caused friction, but the first evidence given by Parliament of its intention to assert its power was in its first meeting, which was in the first year of the reign, when Montague, court chaplain, who had preached the doctrine of the Real Presence and the divine right of kings, was summoned before the Bar and committed to prison. Charles showed no resentment, but he became indignant when his request for a large grant of money was met by one of one hundred and forty thousand pounds, whereas his plans called for at least a million. He was yet more indignant when Parliament declined to grant him the ordinary revenues of the Crown for life, limiting the grant to a year only, on the ground that the incidence of taxation required revision. Charles at once refused the grant and ordered the House of Commons to adjourn. They reassembled shortly after, but in the meantime Charles had released Montague from prison and endeavored to collect taxes without legal sanction. The temper of the Assembly was shown in the exclamation of Sir Thomas Phillips, when he said: "England is the last monarchy that retains her liberties. Let them perish now." But the resolution of the King was not moved, and acting on the advice of Buckingham, he dissolved the House. The attitude of Charles may be defined in his own words. "Remember," he said, "that Parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting and dissolving, and therefore, as I find the fruits of them to be good or evil, they are to continue to be or not to be." The reply of Parliament to this was to order the impeachment of Buckingham.

It will be timely here to speak of the parliamentary leaders, for the British people owe so much to them that it is of importance that

their characters should be well understood. If, as some claim, we are on the eve of a constitutional crisis, it is well that we should learn as well as we can who were the men who precipitated the tremendous events which culminated in the overthrow of the monarchy. First among them must be named Sir John Eliot. He was a man of high social standing, his family being one of the most ancient in the kingdom. He had performed distinguished public services, particularly in the suppression of piracy in the Channel. He was highly educated, refined, dignified and devout. His eloquence was of a high order; he was, indeed, the first to introduce impassioned appeals into the discussions of Parliament. His mind was active and clear; his temper was ardent and resolute. He believed in Parliament. To him that body represented the collective wisdom of the nation, and he insisted that the safety of the kingdom depended upon the responsibility of ministers to the representatives of the people.

Another leader of the Commons at this time was Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards Earl of Strafford. On his entry into public life he was a champion of popular government, and was among the foremost advocates of the Petition of Right. He was a man of rare talents and powerful eloquence, less fiery and passionate than Eliot, but yet able to sway his fellow-members with ease. We find him declaring in Parliament: "We must vindicate our ancient liberties; we must reinforce the laws made by our ancestors. We must set such a stamp upon them as no licentious spirit shall dare hereafter to invade." Later he became effective agent of Charles in extending his absolutism. He differed from his fellow-leaders in that he sought at all times his own ends. His object was power, and he looked upon the King simply as a medium through whom he should exercise the power to which he attained. From being a champion of the rights of the people, he became their most determined opponent. Perhaps no man contributed more to the downfall of the King than he. His ability as an administrator was great, but his methods were unscrupulous. His career in Ireland was productive of evils, which bear fruit even today. He inaugurated a policy to which he gave the name of "thorough," and which may be thus defined: The King was to be absolute and the English monarchy was to be placed upon the same footing as Richelieu had placed the monarchy in France; the estates and liberty of every person in the realm were to be at the disposal of the Crown; the courts were to be deprived of independent authority and to be simply instruments for the exercise of the royal will; the most merciless punishments were to be imposed on any one who ventured to question what the King might do. To this policy, which went much further than he himself had ever intended to go, Charles gave a ready assent, and thus precipitated the conflict with Parliament.

NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The Iberian Peninsula, as Spain and Portugal are sometimes called, presents one of the most interesting examples of racial characteristics to be found anywhere. The difference between the inhabitants of Spain and Portugal is very marked, and their attitude towards each other is very unfriendly. Speaking generally, the Spaniards are a much more refined race than the Portuguese. The patriotism and energy of the latter are intense, but they are difficult of control, and in their habits are not on a par with the people of Europe generally. The explanation of these differences will appear from the review of the history of the Peninsula. The primary cause may be found in the fact that the Portuguese represent more strongly than the Spaniards the original stock with which the Peninsula was peopled. This ancient race was driven before successive invaders until they took refuge on the Atlantic coast, just as the Celtic population of the British Isles was driven before the Teutonic invaders.

The earliest known inhabitants of the Peninsula are called Iberians. Representatives of them are supposed to survive in the Basques. This remarkable people occupy the southwestern part of France and the northern part of Spain, on both sides of the Pyrenees and adjoining the Bay of Biscay, to which they give their name. They are a fine, sturdy race, make excellent soldiers and sailors, and retain their ancient language and customs with little change from what they were centuries ago. Some historians claim that there were Greek settlements in the Peninsula before the historical period, and there seems to be no doubt that the Phoenicians founded colonies in the country more than three thousand years ago. Carthage in northern Africa was a Phoenician city originally, although it attained its independence, and the Carthaginians occupied parts of Spain. It is claimed, with we do not know what degree of authority, that the Trojans, Greeks, sought refuge in their city by the Peninsula. There seems, however, to be no reason for supposing that any of the people, who may have come from the eastern shores of the Mediterranean, found the Peninsula unoccupied, and ethnologists have assumed the existence of an aboriginal people to whom they have given the name Iberi. The assumption is well supported by facts. It seems established that there was a Celtic invasion of the Peninsula. This took place in prehistoric times, and we find before the Christian Era that the combination of the Celtic and Iberian blood had produced a race of people in central Spain that was exceptionally vigorous and warlike. In those days fighting was the chief test of human superiority, and both the infantry and cavalry of the

Celtiberi, as the Romans called them, were of the highest type. We probably find in this race the origin of the Spanish people of today, and it was perhaps the stronger admixture of Celtic blood with the Iberian at this time that originated the distinction between the Spaniards and Portuguese.

The Roman invasion infused a new element into the population, but there is not much reason to suppose that its influence extended to Portugal. The amalgamation between the new invaders and the Celtiberi seems to have been complete, and the result was the development of a new type of people, the descriptions of whom by the Latin writers disclose many of the most distinctive characteristics of the Spanish of the present day. The type was so strongly fixed, as far as form and features are concerned, that the accounts of the beautiful girls, who went from Spain to Rome, would apply to the Spanish women of later centuries around whom romance has woven so much that is pleasing. About the fifth century the great advance of the Teutonic tribes across Central Europe occurred. The Vandals led the van, so came the Goths and one branch of the race, the Visigoths, settled in Spain, and to some extent in Portugal. They contributed to a very large extent in the determination of the characteristics of the people, but as was the case with previous invaders their influence was less in the west than in the east and centre, so that the Portuguese became more than ever a people apart from their neighbors. In 712 began the great Saracenic invasion. The Moorish occupants of the Peninsula added another element to the already mixed race. Some of the "kingdoms" into which Spain was divided, kept their racial stock fairly pure, notably Aragon and Castile. The infusion of Moorish blood into Portugal was quite marked. Subsequently the Moors were driven out of the country, but not until they had left their impression upon the character of the people over a wide area.

Thus we find that contributing to the production of the two nationalities, which inhabit the Peninsula, we have an ancient race known as the Iberi, supposed to be aboriginal, possibly a Trojan and Greek element, certainly some of the Phoenician stock and of its modification the Carthaginian, Romans, Vandals, Celts, Moors and later to a smaller degree Franks. The Trojans, Phoenicians, and Carthaginians represented what is called the Turanian stock from which the Chinese and the Japanese are said to have sprung; the Moors are of the Semitic stock; the Celts, Vandals, Cistergoths and Franks are of Aryan stock, otherwise known as the Indo-European. The Iberi and the Romans cannot be ascribed with certainty to any of this last stocks. We do not suppose that there is any country in Europe in which so many various races have combined to produce types of people that are so well defined as the Spaniards and Portuguese are. It is interesting to note in this connection that these two peoples, after their racial character had become fully developed, came to America, where they have intermarried with the native Indian tribes, and the result is the Spanish half-breed of Central and South America and the Portuguese half-breed of Brazil.

It will be seen when the development of the people of other nationalities comes to be considered that the variations of characteristics are possibly not so difficult to explain as they seem to be at first sight. The case of the Iberian Peninsula is peculiarly well fitted to illustrate how these have been brought about. As has been shown above, there is no great difficulty in accounting for the difference between Spaniards and Portuguese, although there are no natural lines of demarcation between the two countries. The historical facts also explain why there are wide differences between the people inhabiting the several provinces of Spain. It ought to be added to what has been said above that the physical nature of localities also to a considerable extent modify the types of their inhabitants.

A SPECULATION

Instances have frequently occurred where, through injury or illness, persons have lost their memory to a greater or less degree. In some instances they have forgotten who they are, while retaining their other faculties in their normal condition. Usually there seems to be a transition stage between the full possession of his faculties and the beginning of the new conditions, for which the victim has no explanation to offer after he has recovered his memory. He will say, for example, I remember leaving home at such and such a time, and the next thing I recall is that I was in such and such a place, which may be hundreds of miles distant from his home, and the time may be many days later. As these extraordinary lapses of memory are possible, it is conceivable that an adult man might lose his memory entirely. Let it be supposed that a normally healthy and intelligent man is cast away naked on an uninhabited island, and for some cause or another has absolutely lost all memory. He is simply a human organism with its physical functions in full operation and a mind capable of thought but an absolute blank so far as knowledge is concerned. What would be the chance of such a man living, and what sort of a person would he become? Here is an open field for speculation. It may be assumed that he would on gaining consciousness become aware of physical sensations, that is he would become hungry and thirsty, and his first effort would be to supply these wants. Would he know enough to eat,

to appease his hunger and drink to assuage his thirst? In other words, are these essential acts so instinctive that they would be performed without education? Judging from the actions of infants, they are instinctive, and would be performed without previous knowledge. His first great danger would be in respect to the choice of food. The lower animals have an instinct that is almost unerring in respect to food; but it seems doubtful if the human animal has it. As the number of natural products that are poisonous is much less than that of those that are nutritious, the chances are that our naked animal would manage to sustain his life. Sleep would of course come automatically. It may be taken for granted that the man would in a very short time settle down into a sort of routine in which eating and sleeping would form the principal parts. It is to be assumed also, as we are supposing him to be a man of intelligence, that he would give some attention to the question of shelter, and that he would not long remain naked, if materials were available out of which he could make clothing, for in the last analysis clothes are merely a form of shelter. Being without memory, our hero would not know that there were any human beings in the world, or that there was any other thing in all the world beyond his island and the surrounding sea; but being intelligent, he would naturally begin to speculate upon how he came to be where he was, and it seems inevitable that he would reach the conclusion that he must have had a previous existence. Thus far we may go with a feeling of certainty that we cannot be very much astray; but when we endeavor to determine what he would think that previous existence was like, that is what the conditions of the life were, we are at a loss to find a boundless ocean of speculation.

But the interesting question in such a connection is whether or not the man would develop a moral consciousness. To put the matter in another way, could he do anything wrong? We cannot answer this question without proceeding at once to the next stage in the inquiry. We will have to determine what is the abstract test of right and wrong. Some will say that the test is whether or not an act is in accordance with the Divine Law as it has been revealed to men. But there are very many parts of the world

"Where there ain't no Ten Commandments"

nor anything resembling them, and of course to our solitary man on the island, without memory of anything that had happened or he had learned previous to his entry upon this stage of his existence, there would be no code for the regulation of his conduct, no fixed principles derived from education. If another person should come to the island, a new element would at once enter into his existence, and the possibility that he might benefit or injure that individual would create the possibility of his doing right or wrong, and the operation of Law would at once begin, that is of human law. But it is conceivable that to such a person in solitude two courses of action would lie open. He might brutalize himself mentally and physically, or he might develop along lines of gentleness and nobility. He might either sink to the level of the brutes that surrounded him, or he might rise to a height immeasurably above them. Which he would be the more likely to do would depend in some measure upon his inherited instincts, but no matter why he did it, we may justly say that if he sank downward he would be doing wrong, and that if he progressed upward he would be doing right. From this it seems to follow that there is a distinction between right and wrong which has no relation to the effect of our actions upon others.

In what has been above suggested there is the basis upon which an imaginative and logical mind might erect an exceedingly interesting work of fiction. What would be the views of the solitary man, with only the memory of what had taken place after he had awakened to find himself alone, when he first met other men, and when he came in contact with modern society? Would he evolve a species of theology? Would he be actuated by any other feeling than selfishness? Possibly if one should follow out this line of thought logically the inevitable conclusion would be that in selfishness is the source of all evil and that love is of necessity the fulfilling of all law.

Some Famous Dramatists and Their Master-Pieces

(N. de Dintend Legun)

SOME GREAT DRAMATISTS AND THEIR MASTERPIECES

Aeschylus
Before the time of this mightiest of Greek tragic poets, the drama was in more or less of an embryonic state. It had begun, as early as we can ascertain with the dithyrambic chorus sung at the festivals of Dionysus, and Thespis has the credit of introducing the first actor who related the story of the god. The word "drama" means action, and Aeschylus by starting the innovation of having two or more actors may be said to have originated drama, in as much as heretofore, there had been practically no action, but merely a monologue. Perhaps it would be as well before proceeding further to come to some understanding of what the Dionysian feasts were. Dionysus, in Greek mythology, is the god of the vine, so that his feasts were in reality Bacchanalian festivals. He was one of the

many sons of Zeus, and his mother was a daughter of King Cadmus of Thebes. Semele, the mother was killed by lightning, but at her request to Zeus her infant was saved by the rapid growth of the vines which suddenly flourished round him as a protection. Zeus took up the child and enclosed him in his own thigh, keeping him there until Dionysus had reached maturity. So that the lad was twice born, and the dithyrambus celebrated this double-birth. He was educated by the nymphs of Nysa.

Aeschylus lived in stirring times. He was of noble birth and born in Athens 525 B. C. One of his earliest experiences was the witnessing of the assassination of the tyrant Hipparchus in the public streets of his native town. While he was still a lad he took a keen interest in the establishment of democratic rule which was brought about in Athens through the efforts of the renowned Cleisthenes. During the wars with Persia it is probable that the poet took considerable part in the fighting. He was then at the zenith of his manhood and we have evidence of his taking part at Marathon and Salamis. He was infused with the very spirit and sentiment of war, and intensely patriotic, all the noble traditions of his country stirred his intellect and inspired his genius. He had studied in that early Athenian school whose masters were Miltiades, Aristides and Themistocles, so that he is a fitting example of the most advanced intellectual thought of the day.

His plays, besides the innovations he introduced into them, are remarkable for the depth and power of their poetry. He is said to have been the author of ninety-two, but only seven complete plays have come down to us. They are preserved in manuscript in the Laurentian Library at Florence, Italy, which manuscript was probably compiled some fourteen hundred years after the poet's death. The master-piece among his extant plays is the trilogy of the "Oresteia."

In their chronological order the dramas are as follows:

1st, the "Persians." This is an historical tragedy and represents the victory of the Greeks over Xerxes in the Bay of Salamis. In the opening of the play the chorus, composed of Persian elders are bemoaning in song the fact that no word has come to them of the soldiers absent in Greece, and they fear that defeat may have overtaken them. Atossa, Xerxes' aged mother appears before the elders and relates an evil dream she has had and also expresses her dire forebodings. She is soon followed by a messenger who announces the terrible defeat of the Persians at Salamis. The old queen leaves the stage weeping and lamenting. The chorus sings a gloomy dirge. The ghost of the once great Darius appears from the underworld and warns the Persians to desist from further attacks upon the Greeks. After he has vanished, Xerxes and the sorrowing remnant of his army return and join with the chorus in voicing their sorrow.

2nd, the "Suppliants." This is a simple play of mythological derivation.

3rd, the "Seven Against Thebes." This drama deals with the legend of the house of Darius or the doomed race.

4th, "Prometheus." In this play the characters are all divinities and the scene of action a desolate waste on Scythia. We are all, doubtless, more or less acquainted with the story, as Dionysus portrays it here, of the sin of Prometheus against Zeus, and of Prometheus' gift to the human race of fire, and of his teaching to them of the arts and handicrafts so that they may withstand the anger of the great god, who wishes to destroy them. It is a long and powerful drama, full of magnificent scenes and stirring poetry. In "Prometheus Unbound," between which and the first play ages are supposed to have elapsed we have the reconciliation of Prometheus, the friend of mankind, with Zeus, king of heaven.

The three remaining plays are a trilogy and relate the gloomy myth of the house of Atrius. This is another with which most of us are partially familiar in its new setting in the opera "Elektra." The modern version differs not a little from the old tale, but we will not go into details. In the first play "Agamemnon" the great king is murdered by his faithless wife upon his return from the Trojan war. In the second, the "Choephoroi," the guilty woman is in turn killed by her son the avenging Orestes, and in the last the "Eumenides" the conscience-smitten young man confesses his crime and seeks punishment, but is pronounced guiltless by the citizens of Athens.

A Fragment from "Prometheus."

O holy Ether, and swift-winged winds,
And River-wells, and laughter innumerable
Of yon sea-waves! Earth, mother of us all
And all-viewing cyclic sun, I cry on you,
Behold me a god, what I endure from gods.
Behold, with those on throne,
How wasted by this woe,
I wrestle down the myriad years of time.
Behold how fast around me
Has flung the chain he forged, has shamed
and bound me.
Woe, woe, today's woe and the coming morrows!
I cover with one groan. And where is found
me
A limit to these sorrows?

"With \$100,000," said a young man of expensive ideas, "I could make a fortune on the stock exchange."

"Yes," rejoined a friend, "but whose fortune would you make?"