

Every Day

Simple reason that our prices shall be sold, and those prices

and Carpets

ings and carpets—newest pat-
ty—the best display facilities
the situation in this depart-
ents offered here to seekers of
t to influence anyone who is
question. We have rugs and
variety for every room in a
regular sizes, but many of the
stock. We are positively rug



Beautiful China and Wares

you are planning wedding
—and many forethought
are even putting away
gifts this early—or en-
your own collection of
ices of china and art objects,
opportunities afforded here
et unusual at this time.

new things challenge ad-
by beauty and style
ewilder in variety and

previous season has shown
tempting things—irresistible
You must see them with-
y.

silks

at can be of great service
ing at 10c, 15c or there-
not necessary for you to
utensils. Instead, come

Mail Orders

and 1 table cloth—packed

84 inches, and 1 dozen
Priced at... \$5.00
86 inches, and 1 dozen
Priced at... \$11.50

POSTER RUGS
most attractive styles.

..... \$4.50
..... \$14.00
..... \$27.50

WASHINGTON RUGS
for bedroom use

..... \$3.00
..... \$5.00

are beyond competition,
ordinary" to you, all

Use the
Ladies' Rest
Room

AN Hour with the Editor

ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS

The beginning of party government in England was under conditions which, in these days, would not be tolerated, especially in the matter of bribery. This was open, notorious and flagrant, although the sums paid in certain cases were absurdly small. It seems rather absurd to read that a noble lord valued his vote at £10 2s. It also seems astonishing to find that regular accounts of such expenditures were kept, and that in fact an office was opened where business of this kind was transacted. In the days of the Tudors and the Stuarts, if a member of Parliament was not amenable to the wishes of the powers that were, it was an easy matter to lock him up in the Tower until he saw the error of his ways, or the measure to which he took exception had been passed; but the Revolution abolished this practice, and under the leadership of Wharton, who was probably selected for the cabinet for no other reason than that he absolutely lacked anything that resembled a conscience, bribery of members became so common as to be looked upon as a matter of course.

We saw in the last preceding article that the Commons endeavored to exclude from that body all office-holders under the Crown, and that the Lords objected to it, except with the proviso that, while an acceptance of office vacated a seat, the office-holder might be re-elected. The King vetoed this; but both Houses determined that it should become the law of the land, and finally, after a second passage, the King gave his assent. Herein, we find the origin of the practice, now in vogue, wherever the British system of government is in force, of members seeking re-election after being appointed to a cabinet office. When the United States, nearly a century later, adopted their Constitution, they followed the plan, which the English Parliament had rejected during the reign of William and Mary, with the result that they do not enjoy ministerial responsibility. None of the histories available give the name of the statesman who first suggested the adoption of this system in England. Possibly he was one who "builted far wiser than he knew." Ministerial responsibility was further ensured by the passing of a resolution requiring all public business to be transacted by the Privy Council, and that the King should be incapable of performing any executive act without the sanction of his ministers. Thus the British Constitution, as we call it today, was fully established, and it was strengthened by the enactment of a law providing that judges should be removed only on an address from parliament to the Crown, and the abolition of the censorship of the press. Having accomplished these things, Parliament proceeded to reduce the strength of the standing army, and determine the accession to the throne.

William and Mary had no children, the latter having died in 1694, and although William survived her eight years, he did not marry. It became necessary, therefore, to provide for the succession. James II. had died, and although the King of France had formally recognized his son as King of England, the English people themselves were resolute that he should not ascend the throne. They were determined on maintaining the Crown on the head of Protestants only.

Mary, it will be remembered, was daughter of James II. She had a sister, Anne, who was married to Prince George of Denmark, a Protestant, and she was herself a Protestant. She was therefore, in point of heirship, next in succession, and her religious views were, of course, acceptable to Parliament. But at the time of the death of William she was childless. She had had seventeen children, all of whom had died in infancy, except the Duke of Gloucester, who died during the reign of William and Mary. It was therefore necessary to provide for the succession after the death of Anne, or in the event of her predeceasing William. By the ordinary rules of law, the right of succession after Anne was vested in the descendants of the Duchess of Savoy, granddaughter of Charles I., but they were Roman Catholics, and hence could not be considered. The descendants of Charles I. and Charles II. being therefore barred from the throne, it was necessary for Parliament to go one step farther back, if the Crown was to be kept in the kingly line. James I. had a daughter, Elizabeth, who had married the Elector Palatine. She had had twelve children, all of whom died except one, Sophia, who married the Elector of Hanover. She was the nearest Protestant in right of descent to the throne, and the choice of Parliament fell upon her. In the first year of the reign of William and Mary it had been enacted that any person who should profess the Roman Catholic religion should be forever excluded from the throne, and the Act of Settlement, as it is called, after declaring the Crown should go, after the death of Anne, to Sophia, Electress and Duchess of Hanover, and the heirs of her body—being Protestants, went on to declare that to whomsoever the crown should thereafter come should join in communion with the Church of England as by law established. During the reign of Anne, it was enacted that to dispute the right of the sovereign, acting in conjunction with Parliament to settle the succession should be high treason. Blackstone thus explains the meaning of the Act of Settlement: "Hence it is easy to collect that the title to the crown is at present hereditary, though not quite as absolutely hereditary as formerly; and the common stock or ancestor, from whom the descent must be derived, is also different. Formerly the common stock was King Egbert,

afterwards William the Conqueror, and now it is Princess Sophia, in whom the inheritance was vested by the new king and Parliament. Formerly the descent was absolute, and the crown went to the next heir without any restriction; but now, upon the new settlement, the inheritance is conditional; being limited to such heirs only of the body of the Princess Sophia as are Protestant members of the Church of England, and are not married to Catholics."

No further limitations have ever been made upon the succession. George V. derives his title solely from the Act of Settlement, and his title is not absolute, but conditional, for he would forfeit it if he should profess the Roman Catholic faith, or if, in the event of the death of the Queen, he should marry a Roman Catholic. It is no longer necessary for a new king to go through any form or pretext of election, as we have seen was the case even in the time of William the Conqueror. The heir succeeds instantly upon the death of his predecessor, the throne is not for the smallest fraction of time vacant.

Personally, William III. was not a likeable man. He was austere and reserved. He was a very capable soldier and the most accomplished diplomat of his time. His manner was blunt and unpolished. He displayed little affection and discountenanced any exhibition of it in others. But he was a just man and his private life seems to have been beyond reproach.

"HE THAT KEEPETH ISRAEL"

We stood looking over the roofs of the city towards the mountains, as they glowed in the light of the setting sun. He was what is called a hard-headed business man, one of those who looks a long way ahead, takes what seem to outsiders to be long chances and pulls off a profit by the exercise of indomitable energy and courage. For the rest he is a good deal like other people. When he is angry, he does not always speak in language that would look well in cold print. We had been talking about nothing in particular, and after a pause he began to quote: "I lift up mine eyes to the Hills from whence cometh my help; my help cometh from the Lord which made Heaven and Earth. Behold He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." Then, after a moment of silence, he said: "Do you know that when I have had a particularly hard day, and things have seemed to go wrong, I often come and stand here, look at those mountains and recall those words. It gives me fresh faith, hope, and courage to do so."

There are some people to whom the lessons of the Bible seem of no account. As they put it, they are well enough for weaklings, for women or for children, but not for red-blooded men like us. Doubtless you are acquainted with some of these self-styled "red-blooded" people. They claim to be men of the world, par excellence. Do they not sometimes when they have been indulging too freely, go into places where they would not go when fully responsible? Do they not sit up to the wee sma' hours over a card table and wake up in the morning with a dark brown taste in their mouths? Hence they are men of the world, and "red-blooded." Just in passing, they may be reminded that the man who wrote the words quoted above had more experience in a week than they are likely to have in their whole lives. David was red-blooded enough to suit the most strenuous of them. But, say some of these people, you are quoting from the Bible, and no one now takes the Bible seriously, except parsons and women. That is not the case; but we will suppose that the ground is tenable and that the Bible is an exceedingly human book, as it is in point of fact. Here are a few things that may not wholly be unworthy of consideration even by those whose blood is the reddest.

There is no doubt that the Bible is a very ancient book, some parts of it being very much older than others.

There is no doubt that there was a king of Israel named David, and that he was a man who from humble beginnings rose to the highest position attainable by any man in his nation.

There is no doubt that he lived an exceedingly strenuous life and had a wide range of experience.

There is no reasonable doubt that he either wrote, or had written for him, the Psalms, which are attributed to him;

There is no doubt that in these Psalms he gave the result of his long and varied experience.

Dismiss, if you like, every question of divine guidance. Probably he had no more of that than you or any one else can get if you take the trouble to look for it. Doubtless the Lord did not command him to do wrong or cruel things, as the narrative alleges, any more than He commands you to do wrong or cruel things. In all probability he was a man, full of human weaknesses and also full of human strength. He made his mistakes, and some of them were very bad. The stronger the case you can make out on this point, the stronger the lesson from his experience is. It was this, who, in the hour of danger, felt that "He that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." Often we hear men say of the city authorities, that they are foolish not to learn from the experience of other places; and yet we ourselves refuse to learn from the experience of other men, and especially from those men, whose lives are spread before us and who have poured out the secrets of their souls in that wonderful compilation of books known as the Bible. We would question the "redness" of a man's

blood if we caught him reading the Psalms, when there was a recent magazine handy.

"He that keepeth Israel." God may have been the God of Israel; but he did not belong to Israel. He is as much our God as he was the God of Abraham. He is just as near to us as he was to David. You may admit this readily enough and answer that it does not really mean anything at all. You may be of the opinion that the whole idea is a pleasant fiction. But how do you know it may only be this? There is a tall mast out on Shotbolt's Hill. You never saw a wireless telegraph machine and never received a wireless message, but you have no doubt whatever that from that mast messages are sent out to ships at sea. If you should go up to the office on the Hill and ask the man in charge how the message went to the ship he could not tell you, for he does not know. Nobody knows. Nobody knows how He "keepeth Israel." Nobody knows how messages can be sent from man's heart to His heart. But there is no man or woman living who has in simple faith sent up a prayer to Him, but knows that it will be answered. Perhaps it will not be answered by a shower of twenty-dollar gold pieces, or anything of that kind, but it will be answered by gifts of faith, hope, courage and all else that is needed to enable us to vanquish the real enemies that render life burdensome, that will fit us to surmount difficulties, that will strengthen us to bear disappointments caused by ill-designed plans. If there are no hills to which we can lift up our eyes for help, we are surely in a pitiable case. We may find distraction in what so-called red-blooded people call pleasure; but not rest, comfort and renewed strength. These latter are moral things—we use the word moral as we speak of moral courage, although what is really meant is spiritual. We would say spiritual, if it were not that the term smacks too much of religion, and this article is meant chiefly for those who do not claim to be religious. There is not a man of us who does not at times feel keenly the need of this moral strength, and it ought to be a source of the profoundest gratitude to know that there is One who "keepeth Israel." There is a source from which we can draw hope, strength and courage, not in the form of a conviction that there is a land of rest beyond the grave, where all that is wrong will be set right, for we do not find any such teaching in the Book of which we have been speaking. It is present comfort, present strength, present hope, present courage that we receive when, with spiritual eyes, we look to the Hills from whence cometh our aid.

Remember that the greatest thing we ourselves is not what we have, but what we are. Our greatest triumphs consist not in what we get or do, but in what we become. One man may so immerse his soul in business that his life is unhealthy, like a plant whose roots are in soil that too wet for its growth; another may bathe his soul in enjoyment, and his life becomes stunted, as does a plant that never sees anything but the sun's hottest glare. There is such a thing as being superior to business success or failure; there is such a thing as a pleasure far exceeding mere physical enjoyment. This height is reached, this pleasure is attained by those who, to use David's simile, look to the hills from whence cometh our help, who learn to trust in Him who "keepeth Israel." And this is that Christ meant when he said, "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God."

NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The terms Saracens, Arabs, Moors and Berbers have been indifferently applied to the people who inhabit the region from the western boundary of Morocco to the Persian Gulf, and even the Turks are sometimes included in it. As a matter of fact, there is neither a Saracen nor a Moorish race. The former term was applied by the Crusaders to their opponents generally. It was derived from a Latin term used by a Roman writer to describe a people in Northern Africa, but it is not and, so far as is known, never was a race name. The Moors are the ancient Mauri of the Romans, so called because they inhabited what the Romans called Mauretania; but they call themselves Berbers. The Arabs and Berbers are apparently distinct races, and there seems to be reason for believing that there was a race inhabiting the extreme west northwest of Africa before the Berbers came from some eastern home. These people are not to be confounded in any way with the Negroes, for they are wholly a different type. Neither are the Arabs in any sense Negroes, although it seems probable that they are a mixed race, one branch coming from the nearby portion of Africa and the other from Asia. There is some evidence of a civilization ante-dating the Arabian in the peninsula of Arabia, but the latter goes back very far, seemingly more than a thousand years before the reputed founding of Rome. The people of Abyssinia, of the eastern Soudan, and of the region around Lake Tchad seem to be closely akin to the Arabs, although some of the Abyssinians exhibit traces of admixture with the Negro stock. The Arab type predominates down the eastern coast as far south as Zanzibar, although there is much admixture of blood, especially of the Portuguese. An approximate estimate of the number of people who are of Arab or Berber blood is 50,000,000. The fact that they are all Mohammedans has led to a close resemblance between these two races.

The Egyptians are, as far as is known, neither Arab nor Berber. They seem to be a race apart, and are known to have been dwelling in the lower Nile valley more than six thousand years ago. Mention has already been made on this page of the discovery of relics of a race, which ante-dated what we know of the origin of Egyptian history by fully four thousand years. If the Egyptians are not descendants of these, they have no representatives as far as can be traced. Some writers have thought that they had discovered proof that the early home of the Egyptians was in the far North at an earlier geological period. It is even suggested that they migrated southward to escape the effects of the Ice Age, and one writer goes so far as to claim that the word which is translated East in Egyptian records really means North. The Great Pyramid is relied upon to furnish evidence of this northern origin, and the claim is made that it was built originally in commemoration of Mount Meru, a mythical elevation at the North Pole, where in the Golden Age of the poets and the Tertiary Age of the geologists, mankind are supposed to have dwelt. Whether this is all fancy, or there may be under it a substratum of fact, it is impossible to say, but the Egyptians always have been and now are one of the insoluble puzzles of historians. They seem to have kept apart from other races. Wave after wave of conquest has swept over the land. Indeed, for four thousand years strangers have ruled the country; but the Egyptian of today remains the same as the Egyptian whom Abraham found dwelling there, when in the twilight of history he made his journey to the Nile valley, because of a famine in the land where he had been living.

The people of Syria represent a diversity of origins. Some of them are descended from the ancient Hittites. Some of them are Turks, some Arabs, some Druses, some Armenians, some Jews, and so on, making altogether the most extraordinary racial medley on earth. In the Armenians we have what is called the Indo-Germanic stock represented; in the Arabs what is called the Semitic; in the Turk the Turanian. The Jews are assigned to the same origin as the Arabs, but this may or may not be the case. The Druses are in many respects an extraordinary people. For their origin we must look to a tribe that came down into Syria by the Babylonian king during the second Jewish captivity. These intermingled in blood with a fierce race known as the Mardi, brought down by the Emperor Constantine IV. in A.D. 636 to act as a bulwark against the Mohammedans. They are said to have been of Persian origin. To these the blood of the Maronites was added. Of the origin of the people practically nothing is known. Another element was the Arab blood, which came from the south, and to complete the medley, there is at least a slight Jewish element in it.

The Druses for eight hundred years have successfully resisted all efforts to subdue them. They are wonderfully courageous, and on occasion terribly cruel. Their industry is marvelous, for with incredible toil they have carved soil from the valleys up the slopes of mountains and made of it fertile fields where once there was barren rock. They are monotheists, but believe that God has become incarnate on several occasions, the last alleged incarnation having been exemplified in Hakem Biamr Allah, who lived about the date of the Norman Conquest. Mohammed is recognized also as an incarnation, and so also is Jesus. They accept the Pentateuch, the Gospels and the Koran, but interpret each in their own way, and so as to make them bear out the teachings of Hakem, belief in whose unity with God is the foundation of their religious system. The Druses are described as a very handsome people, and almost of them possess the rudiments of education. The hostility between them and the Armenians is of long standing and apparently irradicable. During the last hundred years there has been a cleavage between such of the Druses as were chiefly of Maronite stock and the remainder of the nationality. The Sultan of Turkey claims suzerainty over them, but it is more nominal than actual.

Some Famous Dramatists and Their Master-Pieces

(By Dr. Bertrand Lugin)

THE "AUTOS" OF PEDRO CALDERON DE LA BARCA

We have seen that modern English drama had its beginning in the early miracle plays which depicted Biblical scenes and Biblical heroes and heroines, both to amuse and to inculcate practical moral lessons. The autos for which Pedro Calderon is famous were an elaboration of these plays, designed by him to please the clergy and the people. The former had objected entirely to the secularization of the drama, and the people en masse, having become tired of the plays with only a religious significance which appealed simply to their ethical sense, had gone to the other extreme and welcomed only such plays as served to divert their minds from serious thought. In these autos Calderon strove to reconcile the two extreme opinions, and that he did so is evidenced by the great favor with which his works were received.

Even in this advanced age we have not outgrown our love for fanciful things, as witness the unqualified success of "Peter Pan" recently. The world as a whole is getting older without a doubt, but, like a person, though it may have outgrown childish beliefs and imaginings, it still loves to look back to those days, when it looked on life through the rainbow-colored mists of childhood, which gave to everything in nature a halo of wondrous romance and beauty. During the early part of the Seventeenth Century this taste for the supernatural and the mysterious was very largely in evi-

dence. Calderon's autos partook of pagan mysteries and Christ's miracles, blended in what we would now term a rather incongruous whole.

On religious festivals the autos were enacted in the streets from house to house, in the rich quarters of the town. Giants, clownishly attired, danced to arouse the merriment of the onlookers, and then, after a brief musical prelude, the play was begun. After the play came the "Interlude," made famous through the genius of John Heywood of Elizabethan times, and then followed more music and a dance by fairies or gypsies.

Calderon was an indefatigable worker. He has left seventy-three autos and one hundred and eight dramas. It is impossible for anyone not conversant with the Spanish tongue to give an impartial criticism of his plays, for it is scarcely fair to judge the work of any writer simply through the translations.

That Calderon was a great dramatist we may accept without a doubt. Writers well qualified to pass judgment, place him in the same class with Dante and Shakespeare, and he has been styled the "Spanish Ben Jonson," though he is a far more eloquent writer than the last-named, and his power of description almost unrivalled. Like Jonson, he was a poet of the court and made his plays to appeal to royalty and its followers. He is distinctly representative of the country, his autos and plays are Spanish to the core. "To know Calderon is to know the mind of the Spain of the Seventeenth Century."

Calderon was born in 1600 in that Madrid where "Spain's proud heart swelleth." His parents were noble, and as a child Calderon was surrounded by kindness and luxury. His delicate, refined, scholarly face is indicative of his character. He attended the University of Salamanca, and after graduating served for some years in the army. Late in life he took religious vows, though this final changing of his profession did not mean a change of views, as he had always been a devout follower of the Roman faith.

His friendship with Lope de Vega had undoubtedly a great influence on his life and work, as had also his familiarity with the philosophy of most of the great thinkers of antiquity. He gave his first effort to the world when he was nineteen. It was called "The Devotion to the Cross," and shows considerable constructive skill. His "Circe," which he produced at thirty-four, was a wonderful spectacular performance and was enacted on the pond of the Buen Retiro. It called for magnificent stage equipment and was considered one of the most marvelous dramatic exhibitions ever given. However, it is not in the same class with the same plays which he wrote later. His style is always simple, forceful and dramatic, and in his later productions he displays wonderful power and a sublime philosophy. Some of his most famous plays are, "Wonderful Magician," "Purgatory of Saint Patrick," "The Constant Prince," "The Secret in Words," and "The Physician of His Own Honor."

From the "Wonderful Magician"

Justina speaks:

'Tis that enamored nightingale
Who gives me the reply;
He ever tells the same soft tale
Of passion and of constancy
To his mate, who, rapt and fond,
Listening sits, a bough beyond.

Be silent, nightingale, no more
Make me think in hearing thee,
Thus tenderly thy love deplore,
If a bird can feel his so.
What a man would feel for me,
And voluptuous vine, O thou
Who seekest most, when least pursuing
To the trunk thou interlaced
Art the verdure which embraces
And the weight which is its ruin—
No more, with green embraces, vine,
Make me think on what thou lovest,
For while thou thus thy boughs entwine,
I fear lest thou shouldst teach me, sophist,
His arms might be entangled too;
Light-enchanted sunflower, thou
Who gazest ever true and tender
On the sun's revolving splendor,
Follow not his faithless glance
With the faded countenance,
Nor teach my beating heart to fear.
If leaves can mourn without a tear.
How eyes must weep. O Nightingale,
Cease from thine enamored tale!
Leafy vine, unwreath thy bower,
Restless sunflower, cease to move—
Or tell me all, what poisonous power
Ye use against me—
All—Love! Love! Love!

DRY CLEANED THEM

"Why is your grandpa's face bandaged?" asks the lady next door.
"He was sleeping in his big chair," explains the little girl, "and Willie turned the nozzle on the vacuum cleaner against his whiskers."

SOMETHING NEW

"Waiter, what is that machine I see on each table?"
"That, sir, is a tip register. It saves the palms of our hands from getting calloused."

SEEKING INFORMATION

Absent-Minded Professor (meeting a friend unexpectedly on a mountain peak)—"Hello! Did you climb up from below?—Flegende Blaetter."