

# An Hour with the Editor

## PATRIOTISM AND LOYALTY

Nowadays we hear much of loyalty and little of patriotism. One might almost say that patriotism is a forgotten sentiment, but the explanation of the measure of disuse into which the term has fallen is probably due to the fact that the vaguer term is assumed in a sense to include it. But patriotism is a distinct sentiment. It means something of itself, whereas loyalty has no meaning except in relation to something else. We say a man is loyal, but until we say to what he is loyal we convey no definite idea. If we say he is loyal to his country, we mean he is patriotic; if we say he is loyal to the Crown, we may only mean that he is devoted to the institutions which the Crown represents, quite irrespective of the individual who for the time being happens to wear the Crown. In consequence of the development of the impersonality of the sovereign the expression of loyalty to the King has not really very much practical significance nowadays. But loyalty may only mean fidelity to a political party, or to something else that is only sectional or personal.

Let us try and make our meaning clear, not because anything turns upon it but only that we may contribute a revival of the idea of patriotism. In the reign of Elizabeth the Roman Catholic gentry of England and a good many others were far from being loyal to the Queen. They absolutely disputed her right to the Crown and were prepared to fight to depose her, if any one, whom they regarded as the legitimate sovereign, was likely to be able to make good his claim. Yet when Philip of Spain prepared to descend upon the country with the Armada, the whole nation sprang to arms. The people were patriotic to the core; they were also loyal to the system of government for which the Crown stood. When the threatened danger was removed a large element of the population relapsed into its condition of disloyalty to the Queen. Today there are people in England who, while with good reason claiming to be patriotic and loyal to what the Crown represents, are not loyal to King George V., because they regard him as illegitimately on the Throne. They claim that Parliament had no right to set aside the claims of the Stuarts as represented by the descendants of James II. A story is told of a visit paid by the late King to a picture gallery in a baronial castle, when he was shown a fine portrait. The Prince of Wales, as he was then, said: "A fine portrait of the Young Pretender." The housekeeper bowed and said: "I beg your pardon, sir, but we do not call him that in this house." Yet the sons of that House would be ready to die at any time for their country and in defence of the Crown.

These illustrations show that when one says of himself or of another that he is loyal, it is always in order to ask to whom the loyalty implied is supposed to be due. A serious question is now before the people of the United Kingdom. It is to be assumed that all political parties are patriotic; that is, they desire to advance the welfare of the country, believe in it as worthy of their best energies, and are ready to fight for it if need be. Even the small minority, that might be ready to hamper the government in the event of a foreign war, would not do so because they were hostile to their country, but only because they hoped thereby to secure something they regard as good for the country. All parties are loyal to the principles for which the Crown stands, and all but a very small minority are personally loyal to the King. It seems very probable that the King will be called upon to exercise the royal prerogative in a way, and to a degree, that will be unprecedented; that is, he will either have to appoint a large number of peers in order to secure the passage of the Parliament Bill, or he will have to refuse the advice of a Prime Minister who has the confidence of a large majority of the House of Commons. In either event the personal loyalty of a large number of people of the United Kingdom will be put to a severe test; yet doubtless all will remain thoroughly patriotic.

The root of the word "loyalty" is the Latin word "lex," which means law, which passed into French as "loi"; but the word itself has a more ancient origin than the days of Rome. In old Saxon one of the forms of the word for law was "laga," although the most common form was "laga." In Swedish it is "lah," and in Danish "lov." In the ancient Gothic the word was "lagan." Thus it seems as if, as the idea of law was general, the name for it was very similar in many languages, which fact is one of the arguments for the unity of origin of the Aryan peoples, so-called. From "loi" it was easy to form "loyal," and therefore the original meaning of loyalty was the quality which found expression in fidelity to established authority. Hence when the king became the fountain of law, loyalty by easy transition came to mean fidelity to the king. The term is sometimes confounded with allegiance, but the two words do not mean the same. The old expression "liege-man" means one who is bound to another, and sometimes the word "liege" is used to express the idea of overlordship. Allegiance is a duty; loyalty is voluntary. Alliance is different again from allegiance. A nation may owe loyalty to its ally, but not allegiance. And so we come back to the real meaning of loyalty, and find it to be the personal and voluntary act of an individual to his state, his king, his family, and so on. Hence also we see that when one speaks of loyalty, he is talking of an abstract quality, which has no meaning unless it is used

in relation to something. Patriotism, on the other hand, has a distinct and specific meaning. It can only apply to one thing, namely, to our own country. An Englishman cannot be patriotic towards Mexico, for example, unless he becomes identified with Mexico, and makes that country his home. Originally patriotism meant fidelity to one's native country, but in modern times, when the migration of people has become general, we give the word a wider significance. Thus an immigrant into Canada from a foreign land may become a patriotic Canadian.

When we come to speak of such a complex entity as the British Empire, we must concede difficulty in applying the words loyalty and patriotism, and the reason is that the sentiment of British peoples is in a formative process. As yet one would hardly expect to find a native of Australia entertaining those feelings towards Canada which would be described by the word patriotism, and to what degree there has been developed between the people of the two Dominions a sentiment that can be correctly described as loyalty is uncertain. Both the Australian and the Canadian citizen of British origin may feel towards the United Kingdom a sentiment that may properly be described as patriotism; but we would not expect such a feeling to be found among the French-Canadians, or the Boers of South Africa. We can hardly say that the Boers are loyal to the people of British Columbia, or vice versa. We can, however, say that both Boers and British Columbians are loyal to the Empire and to the King as representative of the Empire.

Thus we find that an analysis of the meanings of two words in common use leads to the recognition of an important principle, demonstrating that the Crown is the common bond of the Empire, and that loyalty, whether it is spoken of in regard to the people of India, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, the United Kingdom, or elsewhere under the British flag, means fidelity to the Crown and that for which it stands, and to the King so long as he discharges his powers in the public interest.

## THE ROMAN EMPERORS

### VI.

Trajan was succeeded by Hadrian, his ward, who was a Roman by birth. He served with much distinction under his guardian and was in command of the forces in Sicily, when the death of the Emperor occurred. On the news reaching Sicily the army at once declared him Emperor, a choice which was ratified by the forces elsewhere. At this time the Empire was in a serious condition, for while Trajan had been successful abroad and a good administrator at home, discontent had arisen in many of the provinces. Rebellion broke out in the Asiatic dominions of the Empire, and the Parthians threatened the boundaries. Egypt was in a state of revolt and Mauretania was in arms. Hadrian, believing that the territories of the Empire were already large enough, agreed with the Parthians to abandon to them all the country east of the Euphrates, and having visited Britain decided that it was useless to attempt to overcome the Picts, and so he constructed the famous wall from the Solway to the Tyne. He visited Germany, Spain, Mauretania, Egypt and Asia Minor, traveling much of the time on foot and everywhere inquiring personally into the needs of the people. His character was a strange compound of gentleness and ferocity. To his open enemies he was relentless, but to all who showed a disposition to conform to what he deemed to be in the best interests of the state, he was kind and conciliatory. He avoided war when he could, but if forced to take up arms carried on operations with vigor and thoroughness and at times with cruelty. As an administrator no Roman emperor ever excelled him and so great was his efficiency in this respect that his reign of 21 years completely reconciled the Roman people to the idea of a monarchy. He inaugurated and carried out many important public works, founding several cities, one of them being Adrianople. He patronized the arts, encouraged literature, and contributed much towards the establishment of a settled system of jurisprudence in Rome, so that men in their personal affairs could count with some certainty upon their rights. He was initiated into the Eleusinian mysteries. His death occurred in the sixty-third year of his age, leaving the throne to his adopted son, Titus Aurelius.

Titus Aurelius on ascending the throne took the name of Antoninus, and subsequently the Senate, in recognition of his defence of the memory of Hadrian, who was accused of a base crime, gave him the appellation Pius. He has gone down in history as Antoninus Pius, although sometimes spoken of as the Elder Antonine to distinguish him from his greater successor. He was a native of Gaul, but presumably of Roman family. He reigned 23 years. No period of Roman history is more barren of striking incidents than this reign. Hadrian had set a splendid example of government and had strengthened the imperial office, and Antonine was content to follow in his footsteps, and his success was greater than that of his predecessor for he was a man of greater natural kindness of heart. He was averse to wars of conquest, and in consequence the borders of the Empire were at peace almost continually while he occupied the throne. The chief exception was in Britain where the Picts were

very active, but the Roman forces were able to drive them back, and by Antonine's direction a wall was built from the Forth to the Clyde to mark the limit of Roman power. He gave great encouragement to literature, promoted public works, extended commerce and acted often as an arbitrator between rulers beyond the Roman frontiers. His constant labor was to promote peace, contentment and prosperity, and he died universally respected.

Marcus Aurelius Antoninus succeeded him. This Emperor is better known by his first two names, and more celebrated as a philosopher than as a sovereign, although his career on the throne was worthy of great honor. He was born in Rome in A. D. 121. His father having died when Marcus was very young, the boy was adopted by his grandfather and highly educated. As a child he attracted the attention of the Emperor Hadrian, who conferred high honors upon him. This imperial favor was continued by the Elder Antonine, who formally adopted him and by whom he was made consul. At the death of Pius, Marcus was named as his successor, and he offered to share his authority with Commodus, another adopted son of Pius. War broke out in the East and Commodus was sent there at the head of an army, the operations of which were successful, although Commodus had little to do with them, he having given himself to gross licentiousness. Returning to Rome he was accorded a triumph, and shortly afterwards set out to Germany with Marcus in command of an army. At this time Rome was in a frightful condition. A succession of earthquakes and floods did incalculable damage, and a pestilence broke out, said to have been brought from the East by the troops of Commodus. The people died by thousands, not only of disease but of hunger, for the floods had carried away the storehouses of grain. The expedition was successful and peace was concluded with the Germans, shortly after which Commodus died. War again broke out and Marcus resolved to overthrow his restless neighbors once and for all. He raised a large force, which he was obliged to recruit from among slaves and gladiators, pestilence having carried away so many of his soldiers, and he gained two conspicuous victories. Of these the most extraordinary was one against a tribe known as the Quadi, in 174. The summer was very hot and the Roman soldiers were perishing from thirst, when on a singularly bright day the sky became instantly overcast. The parched soldiers hastened to partake of the grateful water, and thereupon the Quadi fell upon them. An overwhelming defeat seemed inevitable, but what is described as a storm of hail and fire fell upon Quadi, and so completely wrecked their ranks that the Romans were able to win a conspicuous victory. The Romans attributed this event to their prayers to the gods, and the incident, about the historical accuracy of which there is no question, was subsequently a great source of controversy between Christians and Pagans. The German tribes were prompt to make peace with Marcus, and he returned to Rome hoping to be able to devote himself to the well-being of his people, only to find himself called away to subdue a rebellion on the East, which his wife had fomented, and at the head of which was Avidius Cassius. This he accomplished without difficulty, Cassius having been assassinated by some of those surrounding him, which caused Marcus great grief, for he said it deprived him of the opportunity of pardoning his rebellious subject. The wife of Marcus also died during these operations in the East, and though she had been both rebellious and unfaithful, Marcus showed her high honors. He then visited Egypt and Greece, founding schools in the latter country, returning to Rome in 176. He was forced to head another expedition against the Germans, and died while on the frontier on March 17, 180, after a reign of 20 years. The character of Marcus Aurelius will form the subject of another article.

## THE ELEUSINIAN MYSTERIES

It is said of Emperor Hadrian, elsewhere referred to on this page, that he was initiated into the Eleusinian Mysteries. In the assumed attitude of superiority towards all other peoples than themselves so characteristic of Occidentals in the Twentieth Century, we are apt to find ourselves misjudging the character and intelligence of the men who lived ten or more centuries ago. We have coined the word "myth," which is very convenient to apply to things we do not understand, and we dispose of ancient beliefs and cults by calling them myths, forgetful of the fact that the opponents of Christianity dispose of it in the same way. When we read of the Eleusinian Mysteries the first thought that is apt to suggest itself is that they were some form of hocus-pocus that could deceive people a thousand or more years ago, but could not impose upon us for a single moment. Yet a man like Hadrian, who could successfully lead great armies and administer one of the greatest empires the world has ever known, whose word was law over more than a million square miles of territory and was accepted as such by millions of people, was of no ordinary type, and was probably quite as well fitted to discover deception as any of us today. It is, therefore, of interest to inquire what were these mysteries into which this great emperor was initiated.

Eleusis was a city of Greece, not very far from Athens, at which there was in the earliest historic times a temple, then ancient, and here was the centre of the Eleusinian mysteries. Just what these were it is not very easy at this late date to determine. They included certain subjects which initiates were permitted to see, handle and kiss, certain articles, certain rituals which were performed with great splendor and solemnity, and certain thoughts which the ceremonials and teachings of the elders were alleged to inculcate. Plato said that the mysteries exercised "a saving power connected with the future life," and that "he who has been initiated has learned what will secure his happiness hereafter." He distinguishes between them and the Orphic mysteries, condemning the latter because they made salvation the result of mere ritualistic acts without moral regeneration. Sopater said that initiation established a kinship of the soul with the divine nature, and Theon Smyrnaeus says the final stage of initiation was the state of bliss and divine favor. There does not appear to have been any dogmatic instruction in connection with the mysteries. An initiate was not required to give his assent to any form of belief. He simply subjected himself to the necessary preparatory exercises, went through the elaborate routine of initiation, and gave himself up to contemplation. He was at liberty to go about his ordinary affairs after initiation and apparently it was a matter for himself alone to decide whether or not the beneficial effect of the initiation should be permanent. Prior to initiation a candidate was required to fast rigidly for nine consecutive days. He wandered at night with a torch in his hand around Eleusis, seeking for Cora, the goddess of spring; he saw strange and impressive ceremonials, all conducing to an ecstatic frame of mind. Then he was admitted to the sacred building, where he witnessed ceremonials, the strangeness of which has never been fully described. They were not orgies in any sense of the word; there was nothing to shock the senses or influence the passions, but everything was stately and exalted in its tendency. Then the sacred objects were handed to him and after he had kissed them and put them away, he was permitted to pronounce the sacred formula. In the Homeric Hymn to Demeter, which relates to the mysteries, references are made to Iacchus, a holy child, who died and rose again, but it is not quite certain what part he played in the mysteries.

The origin of the Eleusinian mysteries is unknown, and apparently must remain so. Various explanations have been offered, but they can be little else than guesses. In some way they were identified with agriculture, but they seem to have had a far deeper significance than that. Attempts have been made to explain them on the ground that the ceremonials were merely allegorical representations of the processes of nature, but this method of accounting for them only leaves us in a maze from which we cannot extricate ourselves. Perhaps if we say that they represent the oldest of the world's religions, the first attempt of mankind to get in touch with the laws of existence and the divine source of the universe, and to discover how human life could be brought into harmony with the divine, we shall not be very far astray.

## Stories of the Classics

### THE NIBELUNGENLIED

For a time after the marriage of the two queens, Kriemhild and Brunhild, happiness reigned supreme in Burgundy. In all the world two lovelier brides than these could not be found, each one furnishing a delightful contrast to the other. Brunhild, that dauntless queen of the north, was all fire and eagerness swift to hate, and swift to love. Hers was a proud beauty, in figure she was taller than most men, and she held her noble form so proudly erect that she seemed a very goddess of style and loveliness. Her blue eyes flashed with anger one moment and softened with love the next. She was scornful, wilful and yet kindly and steadfast. Kriemhild was cast in a softer mould. Her charms were the sweeter, perhaps, because she appealed when Brunhild commanded. Her smile was as radiant as the sunshine, and her figure was all slenderness and grace. And the two queens seemed to love one another dearly. They always walked abroad together or rode side by side, and because they were so happy themselves they diffused joy all about them, and never was there a city so gay as that which saw their marriage, and the first few weeks that followed. Then came the beginning of the tragedy.

It was one day just after the hour of vespers, and the knights were sitting in the castle court. The two queens sat side by side watching the two they loved, Gunther and Siegfried, and Kriemhild musing aloud and enwrapped in her pride of her gallant husband, said:

"Siegfried is of such might, That surely one of these kingdoms he ought to rule by right."

Were there none other living but thou and he alone,  
There might no doubt the kingdoms be ruled  
by him and thee,  
But long as Gunther's living that sure can  
never be.

Thereto rejoined fair Kriemhild, "See'st thou  
how proud he stands—  
How proud he stalks—conspicuous among  
those warrior bands.  
As doth the moon far beaming the glimmering  
stars outshine,  
Sure have I cause to pride me when such a  
knight is mine."

Thereto replied Queen Brunhild: "How brave  
so e'er he be,  
How stout so e'er and stately, one greater is  
than he:  
Gunther, thy noble brother, a higher place  
may claim,  
Of knights and kings the foremost in merit  
and in fame."

So the two queens argued until they fell  
to quarreling, and when Kriemhild resented  
Brunhild naming her husband as Gunther's  
vassal and claiming precedence before her,  
Brunhild declared that the public should pronounce  
which of the two queens commanded  
most respect when she and Kriemhild attended  
the services in the cathedral that night.  
When the hour for worship drew  
near Brunhild was the first to arrive at the  
gates, and with her gorgeous robes about her  
her rich apparel enhancing her beauty, she  
stood with haughty disdain her eyes upon  
the castle gates, waiting for Kriemhild.  
And when Kriemhild did appear her coming  
was like the rising of the sun.

"With three and forty maidens whom she to  
Rhine had brought.  
Bright stuffs were their apparel in far Arabia  
wrought—  
All that the noblest maiden had ever donned  
before  
Was as wind to the splendor her dazzling  
ladies wore.  
So rich her own apparel in gold and precious  
things,  
She alone might out-glitter the wives of forty  
kings."

Brunhild was amazed and indignant. All  
eyes were turned from her in a moment, and  
the people everyone, thinking that Kriemhild  
had planned this brilliant array for their own  
pleasure, cheered their princess lustily, and  
loudly acclaimed her beauty. So when she  
would have swept past the northern queen and  
entered the cathedral first Brunhild stepped  
before her, and towering above her exclaimed  
fiercely:

"No vassal's precedent the lady of the  
land."  
This was a very dreadful affront to Kriemhild,  
and in a moment of swift anger she  
spoke rashly.

"Could'st thou still be silent, 'twere better far  
for thee  
Thou'st made thy beauteous body a dishonored  
thing.  
How can a vassal's leman be consort of a  
king?"

"Whom have call'st thou leman?" said the  
queen again,  
"So call I thee," said Kriemhild, "thy maiden-  
ly disdain.  
Yielded first to Siegfried, my husband, Siegfried's son;  
Ah! 'twas not my brother that first thy  
favours won."

And then she told how Siegfried had gone  
to Brunhild wooing her for Gunther, and how  
under cover of his cloud-mantle he had wrested  
from her the symbolic ring and the girdle,  
and when Brunhild almost fainting with anger  
and humiliation, demanded proof of this  
dreadful tale, Kriemhild showed her the ring  
which Siegfried had taken from Brunhild  
and given to her, and the girdle token of  
Brunhild's submission which he had bestowed  
upon her also.

"'Twas of silk of Nineveh, the girdle that  
she brought  
With precious stones well-garnished, a better  
ne'er was wrought."

Mifkins—Would it hurt your feelings if I  
should call you a liar?  
Bifkins—Oh, no, but it might hurt my  
knuckles.

"See here, young man," said the stern parent,  
"why is it that you are always behind in  
your studies?"  
"Because," explained the youngster, "if I  
wasn't behind I could not pursue them."

"I don't see any sense in referring to the  
wisdom of Solomon," said the man smartly.  
"He had a thousand wives."  
"Yes," answered the woman tartly, "he  
learned his wisdom from them."

Philosopher—To my mind there are just  
two problems that confront the world.  
Student—And they are?  
Philosopher—How to make money, and  
how to get along without money.