

Pack and Ship All
of-Town Orders
Freight Your Only
Charge

ed
ng?



strings to it—your
examined the Acme.

ork with
less wear
ny other



ares

for Bedroom.

by our carpet store
Tapestry Squares.
they are lacking in
and excellent quality
looking for.
come in bright and
s. The quality is
cellent satisfaction.
the floor covering for
one of these.

.....\$7.50
.....\$10.50
.....\$13.00
.....\$14.00
.....\$18.00
.....\$20.00
.....\$18.00
.....\$25.00

displaying. Almost
ty.

popular

ear, and are grow-
ineries to our first
tunity to secure a

or without ferns.

excellent value at,

ou would enjoy in

STICKS—Quaint
e use. Very hand-
.....\$1.25
.....\$14.00

Furnish-
ers of
Homes
Hotels
Clubs

An Hour with the Editor

PRE-COLUMBIAN AMERICA.

At the time of its settlement by Europeans the Indians of a large part of North America depended upon agriculture for their living. The commonly received idea that they lived chiefly upon the products of the chase is an error, for, however true this may have been of the Indians of the Plains it did not apply to those of the Atlantic slope of the Continent and a considerable part of the area west of the Appalachian range. Their chief food was maize, for that reason known as Indian corn, or more commonly simply as corn. This plant is not found in a wild state and no one knows where it originated. It is said to have been known in China a very long time ago, and a few grains of it are said to have been found in a tomb at Athens. Some persons have claimed that it was the "corn" of Egypt; but if this is the case, it is difficult to explain how its cultivation could have been completely abandoned in the Old World before the discovery of America. Corn seems to be the plant which requires human intervention for its preservation, seeing that although it has been cultivated in America for centuries it is never found growing wild. Two explanations of its existence are possible. One of them is that it is the result of experiment, that some Pre-Columbian horticulturist centuries upon centuries ago produced it by a process of hybridization; the other is that it was a food plant of pre-glacial man, and that some of the grains were preserved throughout that period of desolation. But whatever the explanation may be, the use of Indian corn over a vast area of the Western Hemisphere calls for a long period during which the inhabitants had made some progress in civilization and carried on some kind of commerce.

Dr. Charles Conrad Abbott, in a monograph on archaeology, says that previous to ten thousand years ago the Indians of the Atlantic coast had attained a somewhat advanced stage of civilization, and that then some terrible calamity or series of calamities befell them. He thinks that they were slowly, but steadily, making a new advance, when the European invasion came, although it is claimed by others that the Indians of the Fifteenth Century were in a period of arrested development. Whatever may be the explanation, it seems certain that great injustice has been done these people, who have been represented as cruel, treacherous and fond of war. The truth of the matter is that they did no more than others would have done, if their lands had been invaded by a strange race, as utterly regardless of their rights as the European settlers of America were. Naturally those who told the stories of those days looked upon everything from the European point of view. Religious prejudices blinded their eyes to the good quality of men, who worshipped the Great Spirit instead of God, although a little thought should have shown them that the object of worship was the same in both cases. Lust of gold caused them to forget every spirit of honor and morality. Their vices poisoned the blood of the red men. Their weapons made them reckless in their dealings with a proud and valiant race. And when they had worked out their own sweet will in rapine, plunder and bloodshed, they sat down and wrote the story of it all, and took good care to put the Indians always in the wrong. The barbarous theory that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian" shows the Red Man not as he was in pre-Columbian days, but as he was after contact for two hundred years with European viciousness and injustice. But interesting as speculation is as to the origin of the Indians of North America and the progress attained by them at an early period in their history, it must be admitted with reluctance that there are few data which justify definite conclusions.

At some prehistoric period a race of men known as the Mound-builders were widely distributed over the Continent. An attempt has been made to identify these people with the present Indian population, but it has not been very successful. There seems to be some relation between mound-building and pyramids, for all the intermediate stages between a rude mound and a finished pyramid are found on the American continent. The number of these mounds is very great. In Ohio alone, 1,500 mounds of stone and 10,000 of earth have been found. The word "mound," it may be observed, is here used to describe a class of structures, which are not necessarily merely heaped-up masses, but may assume the shape of walls or some resemblance to animals, such as the great elephantine mound, which, accidentally or otherwise, bears a striking resemblance to an elephant or mastodon, the great serpent mound, and so on. Their height varies from 5 to 30 feet, and their area from a few acres up to a square mile in one known instance. They are of various forms, circular, oval, square or several-sided. Frequently they are surrounded by a wall and sometimes by more than one. Brief references may be made to some of them. One is on the Ohio river. It is 900 feet in circumference and 70 feet high, and is in the form of a truncated cone; that is, it does not come to a point. Its cubic contents are equal to those of the third Pyramid. This mound has been opened. At a distance of 111 feet from the outside a vault excavated in the solid ground was discovered. It was 8 by 12 feet in area and 7 feet high, and its sides and roof had been of timber, which had rotted. Two human skeletons were found in this chamber. One of them was surrounded by 650 ivory beads and an ivory ornament. Above this vault or chamber was another, and in it was a skeleton ornamented with copper rings, plates of mica and bone beads, and more than two thousand discs cut from shells. In North Carolina a mound was

opened and found to contain the skeleton of a man, who must have been at least 7 feet tall and built in proportion. Under and around this skeleton were remains of fire. In a mound in Ohio 54 copper ornaments were found; they had been beaten out of their original shape before being buried; stone ornaments and a great quantity of mica were also found in this mound. The serpent mound is in Ohio; it is 1,300 feet in length. The mounds of Central and South America are usually of stone and of pyramidal shape, but in every case they seem to be truncated. They are built of stone, and the blocks are usually very large. In one instance, in Peru, they measure 16 feet each way. The skill necessary to quarry such vast masses of rock, to transport them to their present location, and to put them in place must have been very great, and no satisfactory explanation has ever been given of it. There is no reason to suppose that the builders of these huge structures made use of animals for traction purposes. To move a mass of rock weighing at least 500 tons would task the ingenuity of modern builders; yet these aboriginal races moved many of them, and transported them for considerable distances. In respect to such achievements we can do little more than accept the facts as we find them. Any explanation of how such things were accomplished can be little more than a guess; but that they were done necessarily implies a very considerable development of mechanical skill, a boldness of architectural conception, a long period of settled government and a numerous population. If we could unlock the stone-house of pre-Columbian mysteries a wealth of surprise would doubtless be brought to light.

ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS

It was nearly two years after his father's death that Edward I. reached England. During his absence from the realm he had determined upon a line of policy, and to carry it into effect, he summoned a Parliament in the following year, 1275, and submitted to it the First Statute of Westminster. This was a summary of such portions of the Great Charter as seemed necessary to be preserved, and the substance of the Provisions of Oxford and the Statute of Marlborough, as well as certain recent rules that had been adopted for administrative purposes. There was little, if anything, in it that could be said to be absolutely new. Up to the closing years of the reign of Henry II. the only income of the state and the only money employed for public purposes were derived directly or indirectly from the land. Personal property was exempt, and the taxes upon the land were limited to certain amounts payable on certain occasions. When the people of the boroughs gave money, they did so voluntarily in exchange for concessions, or simply through expediency. Henry II.'s advisers saw in the commerce of the Kingdom and the accumulations of the merchants, a source of revenue that was wholly untouched, and in respect to which there were no restrictions, as in the case of lands held under feudal tenure. The personal property taxation was at first levied upon property already in the Kingdom, but by a strained construction of the law, by which it was held that foreigners bringing goods into the country should pay for their protection, a system of licenses to foreign merchants was devised, which in the course of time was developed into a tax on imports. A tax on the export of wool was added by Edward to those already exacted. This was done on the advice of Italian bankers. Thus we find then in 1275 the revenue of the Crown was derived from land, from movable property, from exports and imports. The first of these was settled by the customs of feudalism; the others were imposed by the consent of Parliament. Therefore it may be fairly claimed that in view of the assimilation of the various nationalities inhabiting England into a homogeneous people, the recognition of the passage of the Crown from father to son by descent without the formality of an election, the constitution of the courts, the reservation by parliament of the right to impose taxation and the admission by the Crown that the Common Law bound the Sovereign as fully as the subject, the England of Edward I. was the England of today, with such variations as have been evolved in the passage of the centuries since that time.

Among the institutions which lost shape in Edward's reign were the three divisions of the King's Court, into the Exchequer, which dealt with matters of revenue; the Common Pleas which had jurisdiction over suits between subjects, and the King's Bench, which dealt with criminal offences, and all matters relating to the rights of the King. These courts concerned themselves chiefly with the enforcement of the customs of the realm or the Common Law as it came to be called, which began to take regular form because the system of reporting decisions came into effect, and judges had the rulings of their predecessors to guide them. About that time also the Court of Chancery came into existence although it was not so called. The principal underlying this court may be briefly stated. Notwithstanding the recognition of the binding character of the Common Law as interpreted by the judges, the King remained the fountain of justice, and it was a part of his duty, theoretically at least, to see that no man suffered wrong. Yet it frequently occurred that the strict application of the law did injustice in individual cases, and then an appeal lay to the King, who, not having time or possibly the knowledge sufficient to enable him to deal with them, turned them over to his Chancellor. The Court of Chancery was therefore originally the Court of Chancellor,

and so, indeed it is today, although it has since become one of the formal institutions of the state.

One of the chief acts of Edward's reign was his suppression of the power of the great baronage and is no longer dependent upon the will of the Sovereign. On, whereby he put an end to their private wars, and to their occasional forays upon peaceful communities for no other purposes than plunder. In order to reduce the influence of the baronage, the King in 1278 summoned all freeholders, whose lands were of the value of £20 to receive knighthood, an order which some of them were very backward in obeying. He also curtailed the power of the clergy and caused Parliament to enact the Statute of Mortmain, which prohibited the alienation of land to the Church. He also deposed the ecclesiastical courts of their jurisdiction over questions affecting the property of the Church. Among the other measures of his reign were the Statute of Merchants, which provided for the registration and collection of debts, the establishment of the law of dower, the reorganization of the national militia, the establishment of the office of Justice of the Peace, or Conservators of the Peace, as they were originally called, and others of perhaps not less importance. In 1295 the King summoned a Parliament in order to receive supplies for carrying on a war on the Continent. This Parliament consisted of the barons, the knights and the representatives of the boroughs. It is notable that the merchants and the knights were very unwilling to accept their new responsibilities, and there are records of men held to fail to compel their attendance at Parliament. The number of barons at this time was less than one hundred, and there had as yet been no separation of Parliament into two houses. From 1295 onward the will of Parliament became the law of the land. It was no longer necessary to refer to the Great Charter or to other concessions granted by kings. The fact that Parliament so ordained a thing made it the law of the land, and from that day to the present England has been under parliamentary government, in theory at least, without interruption.

Regarded from a constitutional point of view, the reign of Edward I. was the most important in the history of England; and it can be said of him with justice that his own good sense and high principles contributed much to making it such. It must not be supposed that his dealings with Scotland shows that he could be at times merciless; but as this series of articles is not a history of England, the details of these and other things which are a blot upon his name need not be given. Yet it would not be right to pass over the reign of Edward's successor without mentioning the name of William Wallace, that great Scottish hero, whose memory would be worthy of preservation, if for no other reason, because he was the first to declare for liberty and equality for all men, and to be ready to die for that great principle.

THE JEWS

The expression "The Jews" as used in the caption of this article is intended to embrace all the people who claim to be descended from Abraham through his son Isaac. When in the course of this series of articles it becomes necessary to refer to the branch of the race, which established a separate kingdom, it will be spoken of as Israel. In view of the remarkable part which the Jews have played in the progress of mankind, it is singular that so little attention is paid to their history as history. This may be due to the fact that it is so largely associated with religious worship, that its consideration from a secular point of view has seemed superfluous. We are accustomed to think of them as a people, whose career was marked by a number of events of a more or less miraculous nature, and have treated it chiefly as though it were in all respects a guide to individual action. Hence we have lost sight of its lessons upon national development. So far as we can learn there is no reason for supposing that the Jews looked upon their own ancient writings as an infallible record derived from divine inspiration. They appear to have esteemed them more highly than other nations esteemed theirs, but inspired authorship seems to be a doctrine of comparatively modern times.

Before speaking of the sources of Jewish history, it may be of interest to note a general view what the nature of Jewish influence has been. The God which Christendom worships is the God of the Jews, Jehovah, as it is written, which has usually been extended to Jehovah, although Yawveh is considered to be more nearly correct pronunciation. The Commandments, which the Jews claimed were delivered to them by Him, we recognize as the foundation of our system of laws and of Society. The Jewish conception of Creation is that which is commonly received. The Jewish idea of monotheism is our idea of monotheism. Jewish literature is the model of all modern literature. Jewish forms of worship are models upon which Christian forms of worship are based. Jewish names are largely in use throughout Christendom; among different races of Christians race names are found, but in all of them we see Jewish names very common use. Jewish conceptions of the future life are the basis of our Jewish social customs. The Jewish tradition of a Messiah is the basis of our religion, and Jesus of Nazareth, whom we regard as the Saviour of mankind, was a Jew. In modern art, literature, handicraft, agriculture, commerce, finance, inventive genius and science of government, the Jew has played a conspicuous part, and played it well. Indeed it may almost be

said of the civilized world that it is what the Jews have made it. Certainly a race, of which these things can be truthfully said, occupies a unique place among mankind, and its history is well worth far greater consideration than is popularly bestowed upon it.

Apparently we must date the beginning of Jewish history, as we have it today, from 485 B. C., when the people returned from captivity in Babylon. Ezra was a scribe, a priest and a great popular leader, ranking next after Moses in the public estimation. It is said of him that he dictated the ancient records of the Jews from memory; but Jewish critics have not accepted this tradition. It seems certain, however, that what we know as the Old Testament was collated in its present form either by Ezra or under his direction. This compilation by no means includes the whole of the Jewish records, and there are many books, which have been lost, as well as others have been preserved. Some of these are referred to in the Old Testament. The Talmud is a monumental piece of Jewish literature, although it is more a codification of laws and a commentary upon them than historical. The date at which many of the Old Testament books were written. For example, it is said in the Talmud that the Book of Job was written during the time of Moses, or about 2,500 years ago, according to the ordinarily received chronology. But by whom or when were they written, there is no doubt that their production extended over a long period, and that they were accepted in their present form fully two hundred years before the beginning of the Christian Era. There were several versions of them, but they agree in all substantial particulars. There are various sources from which corroborative accounts, apparently of a contemporary nature, can be obtained. Flavius Josephus, who lived during the first century of this era, is one of the most illustrious of Jewish historians. He relied very largely upon the Biblical books for his account of the early years of the nation, although he incorporates extracts from other writers preceding him. Speaking generally, it must be said that the history of the Jews, while very lacking in detail, is sufficiently complete to enable us to have a connected and substantially accurate account of their progress from the days when they first became a nation.

A Century of Fiction

XXI.

(N. de Bertrand Lagin)

Count Lyof Tolstoi

The moment we cease to work we begin to die, is one of the theories that this Russian novelist, philosopher, philanthropist and misanthrope has clung to consistently through his varying opinions and shifting ideals. A very eminent German scientist declares, though he does not quote Tolstoy at all, that he has proven the truth of the above theory, and that as long as man uses his faculties, just so long will those faculties continue to develop and return him a double reward for his labour. Inactivity of the faculties would have the same effect as ill-use, in either case they would deteriorate. This fact, if we may accept it as such, is a very cheering one. It means that old age may be completely robbed of its discomforts and senility; and no matter how long we live, increasing years will only mean a more gracious mental and physical maturity. For several centuries, or rather let us say, from time immemorial, for the ancient gods and goddesses were patrons of labor, and themselves set an example to humanity by their industry and devotion to the different arts and crafts. Work has been the gospel preached by many philosophers, and now comes the scientific proof that the philosophical theory is the correct one. Sometimes it seems as if philosophy held the lamp for science, and held it with a superb patience.

It would be a difficult matter to elucidate Tolstoy's exact creed, just what he believes and why. We are told a great many contradictory stories about him, and we have no autobiography as yet to go by. In the main we can only judge the man by his books, and if we do this we shall be convinced of one thing, and that is his whole-souled sincerity. His life has been divided into two phases of existence; the years of his youth and early manhood presenting an exact contrast to his maturity and old age.

He was born an aristocrat, with wealth, position and hosts of worldly friends. He studied at the universities, and later served in war, distinguishing himself in the Crimea and Caucasus. He married the daughter of a German doctor at Moscow, a most admirable woman and devoted wife. Doubtless his views of her sex are prompted by her gentle and benign influence; for though Tolstoy's novels are stories principally of passion and death, we find that in nearly every case he holds man as the culprit, which fact has, according to a critic "made him most distasteful to man-made society." He has nowhere mocked or satirized woman without some touch of pity or extenuation, and he brings Anna Karenina through her passion to her death with that tender lenity for her sex which recognizes womanhood as structurally pure and good.

After Tolstoy's return from the wars he settled in St. Petersburg, and gave himself up to literary work. When the serfs were set free, he gave his writing up for a time, and influenced by purely altruistic motives, he undertook to teach this lowly class of people to enable them to learn how best to adapt themselves to their new conditions in life. The direct contrast between his own manner of living and theirs; between their views, re-

ligious and otherwise, and his own, impressed him deeply. He had been brought up in luxury, his intellectual and sensual desires always unquestionably gratified, and he had reached a frame of mind wholly unsatisfactory. Instead of his teaching the poor, all unwittingly they proved his teachers, and he learned from them that true happiness consists only in giving happiness to others. It was then he began to preach his gospel of work, though at first he found small contentment in following his own precepts, and in despair at one time he contemplated suicide.

He began to earnestly study the Scriptures, and putting his own interpretations upon the teachings of Christ, he endeavored to carry them out to the letter. Whether he has gone to the extreme in this or not it is not in the province of this article to say; he has acted consistently according to his own convictions. In giving up honour, position, riches and friends, he felt that he was obeying the command of the Master. Whether he has aided the peasants or not by thus humbling himself is an open question. The very fact of his making shoes and giving them away, is, says a critic taking the necessary labour and reward from one of those he wishes to help. Whether the people in his own class of life are not the ones who need teaching the more is something that no one can exactly decide; but we must all honour Count Tolstoy for the stand he has taken, whether he is wholly right or only partly right. With him no halfway measures were possible; he has followed the Light as he saw the Light.

His works are many and remarkable. To those who look only on the surface of things and read with a sole desire to be amused they shock beyond expression. To others who read thoughtfully, the simplicity, the eloquence, and the power of his writing must appeal. The following extract is from a lengthy criticism of the great novelist's books by William Dean Howells.

"Passion, we have to learn from the great master, who here as everywhere humbles himself to the truth, has in it life and death; but of itself it is something only as a condition precedent to these: without it neither can be; but it is lost in their importance, and is strictly subordinate to their laws. It has never been more charmingly and reverently studied in its beautiful and noble phases than it is in Tolstoy's fiction; though he has always dealt with it so sincerely, so seriously. As to its obscure and ugly and selfish phases, he is so far above all others that have written of it, that he alone seems truly to have divined it, that he alone as experience knows it. He never tries to lift it out of nature in either case, but leaves it more visibly and palpably a part of the lowest as well as the highest humanity.

"START YOUR CAREER EARLY"

"My firm conviction is that if a career is under consideration it should be started early," writes Tina Lerner in *The Circle* in a musical symposium on "Daily Rules that Make for Success." "The work between the years of five and ten, while of no great musical value, is of the utmost importance in forming the hand and, in a way, building it to the piano. It can be started with half an hour and gradually increased, as the strength and capacity of the child grows, the maximum being two hours. The hand is most easily formed at this period, and later on all attention can be given to the musical development, as the elementary technical difficulties are, under control and less time is needed to overcome new ones.

"I have always considered the question, 'How do you practice?' of the first importance. Not, 'How much do you practice?' Know what you are doing and how and why you are doing it.

"After a certain technical proficiency has been reached I believe in not practicing exercises that are purely mechanical. There are innumerable passages in various works that build up the musical as well as the technical part of piano playing.

The Chopin studies alone have enough variety of difficulties to develop every branch of piano technique. It is my rule to begin the work of each day by practicing some of them.

"I have made it a point never to practice more than an hour at a time. This does not mean that I do not go on with my work. To get away from the piano and think over the composition has always been of great help to me."

EXPLANATORY

Mistress (to day-maid, who has arrived late)—You're two hours late this morning, Mary; what is the reason?

Mary—Yes'm. But please, 'm, mother said I was to tell you when she wound up the clock last night, she put the big handle right, but clean forget all about the little 'un.—Punch.

DIFFICULTIES FORESEEN

Patience—I understand a Japanese bride gives her wedding presents to her parents as a slight recompense for the trouble they have taken in bringing her up.

Patience—But suppose her parents have all the castors and butter-knives they can use?—Yonkers Statesman.

ELOQUENT

"I thought you didn't care for him. What won you?"

"His language. He told me that his love for me burned like gasoline, and begged me to honk-honk through life with him."—Louisville Courier-Journal.