

An Hour with the Editor

ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS

Among the sovereigns of England, Henry of Monmouth, better known as Henry V., is the most picturesque. Greater interest attaches to him even than the Coeur de Lion, or the first Edward. He was more nearly like the Black Prince than any other member of the Plantagenet family, although he had fewer vices than those, which characterized that illustrious exemplar of chivalry. As a lad he displayed a genius for military matters, and was exceptionally courageous. His father, the King, gave him an opportunity to display his fitness for feats of arms by assigning him to a command in the operations against the Welsh, and so well did he perform the duties entrusted to him that his fame and popularity led the King to believe that his son aimed at supplanting him upon the throne. He therefore removed him from his command, whereupon the young prince plunged into dissipation with a zeal like that which he had exhibited in war. He gathered around him many congenial spirits, and for some time led a life, which seemed destined to end in disaster and disgrace. But when the time came for him to succeed to the crown, he completely altered his method of living, becoming as religious as he had been reckless, and as full of great plans as he had been of boisterous mischief. In the war with France he distinguished himself, especially at Agincourt, where he gained a victory against a force of vastly superior numbers. He extended his power over all France, caused himself to be recognized as the heir to the French throne, aimed to control Naples, and died as he was planning an expedition to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the Turks. This is the Henry of whom historians love to tell, and it is the Henry of whom Shakespeare tells in his powerful drama. But there was another side to his character. His religious zeal led him to countenance, if he did not actually encourage, the burning of persons charged with heresies. His war against France, though technically only a renewal of hostilities after the truce arranged by Richard II. had expired, was a deliberate attempt to take advantage of a weak king and a distracted country. His valor and unquestioned military skill were marred by merciless cruelty. He gave little care to the welfare of his own people, and shaped his policy only so that it might gratify his personal ambition. He aimed at little short of universal dominion, and such was his ability that, if he had lived, he might have achieved it.

His reign was not marked by any development of constitutional government, for which, indeed, there was very little room, seeing that Archbishop Arundel had declared in his place in Parliament during the lifetime of Henry IV., that there was no doubt that the Lords and Commons of England had the right, in Parliament assembled, to depose a sovereign and appoint another in his stead. No great reform can be assigned to the reign of Henry V.; no notable institution was then inaugurated. Nevertheless, there was a steady hardening process going on in the institutions, which constitute the English government. It was no longer necessary for Parliament to assert its rights, for they were no longer disputed. The baronage was already showing signs of weakness in its personnel, owing to the great losses by death in battle, or on the scaffold for political offences. Henry's course towards them was in every way conciliatory. He drew the Church closely to him by his course towards heretics, and he dazzled the imagination of the common people by his splendid qualities as a soldier. He asked little of England except men and money to carry on his wars, and so long as these were available, he saw no reason for interfering with Parliament. Thus the idea of parliamentary government became strongly implanted in the minds of Englishmen; the right of the representatives of the people to say what taxes should be imposed was fully recognized and the nation learned to look upon Parliament as supreme.

Such in brief is the part which Henry V. played in English history. When allowance is made for the customs of the times, in which he lived, we need have no hesitation in declaring him to be one of the greatest of English kings in those qualities, which go to make up a strong and successful monarch. He was not a great king in the sense that Edward I. was great, but he had those qualities which win the loyal support of the populace. England is only the richer for glorious though useless war for the part which he played upon the stage of history, and yet his is a name that will always be among the most honored in the long list of English sovereigns.

THE JEWS

In the court of King Solomon there was a youth, of the tribe of Ephraim, of whom we are told that he was "a mighty man of valor." He attracted the attention of his sovereign, who made him ruler over all "the house of Joseph," that is, over the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. There was current a prophecy relating to this young man, to the effect that he was destined to be king of ten tribes of the Israelitish people. Whether it was because he believed this prophecy or because Jeroboam sought to strengthen his influence at the expense of his sovereign, Solomon sought his life, whereupon Jeroboam fled to Egypt, where he was living at the time the king died. When he heard that Rehoboam, Solomon's son, had ascended the throne, Jeroboam returned to his country, and, placing himself at the head of "all Israel," demanded of the new king certain concessions. It was a prototype of Rymmede and the Great Charter, but Rehoboam was made of sterner stuff than King John of England, and he not only refused the

request of the people, but told them that whereas his father had chastized them with whips, he would chastize them with scorpions. Jeroboam thereupon called upon the tribes to rebel, and they all responded to his summons, except Judah and Benjamin, and such representatives of the others, who were resident in the cities of Judah. He thus establishes a kingdom, which endured for upwards of two and a half centuries. The history of the Kingdom of Israel is full of vicissitudes. There was war between it and Judah for many years, and the sacrifice of life was enormous, even if we make allowance for the exaggeration that seems inseparable from ancient accounts of battles. The last fight, which Jeroboam was engaged in, was against the forces of Judah, led by Abijah, king of that nation. In this it is said he lost 500,000 men, and shortly afterwards he died. At times the two kingdoms were in alliance; at other times they were engaged in hostilities. The progress of the country was by no means great. Indeed for the next two hundred years, Israel retrogressed steadily, except only for brief periods, when some exceptionally able king was on the throne. The worship of Jehovah was abandoned, to be renewed spasmodically at times, and the whole tone of the people became lower.

Meanwhile great events were transpiring along the Euphrates, in the region over which David had extended his "sphere of influence" and Solomon had exercised sovereignty. The Assyrian Empire was rapidly coming to the front. Under Tiglathpileser it grew exceedingly powerful, and truly imperial in its character, for it came to consist of a strong central power, formed by the absorption of Babylon by Assyria, and a great number of tributary states, including Syria, Phoenicia, Israel, Judah and the various kingdoms of Arabia. Just what was the nature of the relation between these feudatory powers and Assyria is not certain, except that they all paid tribute; but it is known that Tiglathpileser aimed at the consolidation of the inhabitants of all Western Asia into a homogeneous population, for he adopted the policy of transferring the leading people of the countries, which he conquered, to places in Assyria and replacing them with Assyrians. His object seems to have been twofold. He thought by this means to prevent rebellion, and he believed the various races would become in time assimilated. While he exercised suzerainty over Israel, he did not apply this policy to that country. His successor, Shalmaneser, early in his reign, had to deal with an Israelitish rebellion. The people of that nation were resolved upon attaining their complete independence. The Assyrian king thereupon advanced against Samaria, the capital of Israel, Hoshea being king at that time, and laid siege to it. He does not appear to have been successful, though there is some doubt on the point, and he died either during the siege or shortly after the city capitulated. His successor, who took the name of Sargon, after the great founder of Babylon, completed Shalmaneser's work, and adopting Tiglathpileser's policy, transported a large number of the Israelites to the mountainous region which lies in Asia to the south of the Caucasus. He himself said that he took away about 30,000 men, with women and children, but these were the leaders of the nation, the best artisans, cultivators, soldiers and scholars. He left the people without any one capable of reasserting their nationality, and to render that task even more difficult, he colonized Samaria with Assyrians. These intermarrying with the Israelites, who remained at home, formed what were afterwards known as the Samaritans. The Kingdom of Israel passed completely out of existence, and history has nothing more to tell us of the people, who were carried away. They were the Lost Tribes of Israel, concerning whose fate there has been so much speculation, and of whom, it is firmly believed by many, the British people are the descendants.

Sargon set up a king in Samaria, but he was simply a vassal of Assyria, and after a time even this semblance of nationhood was removed, and what had been the seat of the powerful state of Israel became simply a province, passing in the course of time under the control of Persia, when Cyrus the Great established that empire supreme over Western Asia. In 107 B.C. Samaria was conquered by Judea and remained a province of that nation until the Roman conquest took place.

Judging from the Biblical narrative, the distinction between Judah and Israel began to be observable even in the time of David. There was great rivalry between the tribes of Judah and Ephraim. The latter were descended from Joseph, and seem to have resented the claims to kingship put forth by Judah. Events show that in this disputing the validity of the action of Samuel in selecting David as the founder of the royal family, the great majority of the Children of Israel sympathized. The disappearance of Israel from the stage of history is one of the most interesting of events. It is not our intention to give in these columns even a synopsis of the efforts made to follow the subsequent career of this race, but if any person wishes to send us a brief sketch of what is claimed by the Anglo-Israelites to be its history, we will be glad to print it.

CHIVALRY

It is not easy to give a definition of chivalry any more than it is to discover its origin. Some writers profess to be able to discover its germ in the respect held for women in the Teutonic tribes in days before the Christian Era. The chief evidence cited for this claim is found in certain references made by Tacitus to the practices of the Germanic races. The legends that have been preserved of the early days of Britain, such, for example, as those

which tell of Arthur and his knights are full of the spirit of chivalry, but how much of this is based on fact and how much is due to the tales of the minstrels in after years to relate to the knights and ladies, whom it was their business to entertain, must be left to conjecture. There does not seem to have been anything corresponding to the institution of chivalry among the Germans in the time of Charlemagne, and we look in vain beyond the Eleventh Century for any proof of its existence. The name "chivalry" comes from the French "chevalier," a horse soldier.

John Pentland Mahaffey in his "Social Life in Greece" contrasts the Homeric heroes with the chivalry of the Middle Ages, and after speaking of the attributes of the former, he says: "The Mediaeval knights, with whom it is fashionable to compare the princes of the Iliad and Odyssey, were wont to sum up the moral perfection, which they esteemed under one complex term—a term for which there is no equivalent in Greek—the term 'honor.' It may be easily and sufficiently analyzed into four component ideas, those of courage, truth, compassion and loyalty. No man could approach the idea of chivalry, or rank himself among gentlemen and men of honor, who was not ready to contend, when occasion arose, against any odds, and thus to encounter death rather than yield one inch from his post. He must feel himself absolutely free from the stain of a single lie, or even from an equivocation. He must ever be ready to help the weak and the distressed, whether they be so by nature, as in the case of women and children, or by circumstances, as in the case of men overpowered by numbers. He must with his heart and not with mere lip-service, obey God and the King, or even such other authority as he voluntarily pledged himself to obey. A knight, who violated any of these conditions, even if he escaped detection at the hands of his fellows, felt himself degraded."

Thus we see that chivalry meant more than, as some suppose, an exaggerated devotion to woman and a readiness to do and dare anything at her behest or for her advantage. It was an attempt to develop the highest type of manhood, and while it did not always free its devotees from grossness and cruelty, and while it often led to exceedingly grotesque results, it was undoubtedly a potent factor in the emancipation of Europe from the thralldom under which it fell after the overthrow of the Roman Empire. While chivalry was hardly an organization, it was something apart from the great body of the people. It was by no means confined to the hereditary nobility, nor were all the princes or barons recognized as belonging to it. When a parent desired his son to be trained in chivalry, he sent him as a page to the court of some king or great noble, where he served the ladies. He thus acquired an ease, grace and appreciation of the more refined side of life. Meanwhile he was instructed in the use of arms and in the principles of the order. When he became strong enough he was made an esquire, or shield-bearer, to the knight in whose service he was, and later he might, if he chose, and was deemed fit, take upon himself the vows of chivalry, after which he was knighted, the ceremony consisting of a tap of a sword upon the neck, which was meant to signify his emancipation from all control save that of his own honor. His investiture with knighthood was accompanied by a religious ceremony, and it is to be noted that the Church gave every encouragement to the development of chivalry, which indeed in some of its aspects was purely religious. It may be mentioned that in early days knighthood was regarded as of the highest rank, and a baron, earl or duke, upon whom it had not been conferred, ranked in precedence below the humblest knight, who might live upon his estate. The status of knighthood was derived from the vows taken by those admitted to it. Some of these were general and were made by every knight, but in addition individuals made special vows, some of them grotesque, some of them noble, but all alike binding. As an example of the former, may be mentioned that a band of young English knights, who previous to setting out on an expedition to France, bound cloths over their left eyes and vowed not to remove them until victory was achieved.

Knight errantry was a phase of this extraordinary institution. A knight errant wandered from place to place, accompanied by his squire and perhaps by a few men-at-arms, his object being usually the protection of women, but frequently his vow was of wide application, and he was pledged to right every wrong that came under his notice. While many of these knights errant were not much better than adventurers, there is no doubt that their influence was on the whole beneficial. It was a good thing that in communities just emerging from barbarism, and in which every feudal lord might, if he choose, be a petty tyrant, there should be some persons, who might be relied on to stand for the right, irrespective of rank or station in life. At the same time it is to be observed that chivalry did not, as a rule, concern itself with the affairs of any except the higher classes.

The use of gunpowder put an end to this institution. When a common man, with "deadly saltpetre," could with safety to himself smite down the strongest knights when fighting was done from a distance instead of hand-to-hand, the noble arts of knighthood were shorn of their value. Indeed even before gunpowder came into general use the English archers, with the grey goose shaft, spread terror into the ranks of the chivalry of France, and later the Swiss foot-soldiers demonstrated that men on horseback were no match for a man on foot properly armed. Chivalry played a very important part during the Crusades, and perhaps it was then that it attained its best development. It was the precursor of the

Renaissance. It elevated popular ideals. It brought into prominence that admirable quality of human nature known as honor, that indefinable thing that we have in mind when we say of a man that he is a gentleman. Perhaps it may not be a mistake to say that the word "gentle" took its modern meaning from Chivalry. Originally gentle meant well-born. But in early days of the English a well born man might, and was very likely to be the reverse of gentle as we use the word today. When, however, he adopted the rules of chivalry, his manner, towards woman especially, was changed. Hence to be well-born or gentle came to be synonymous with kindness, consideration and, indeed, all those qualities, which are compressed in the modern meaning of the word gentle.

A Century of Fiction

XXVI.

(N. de Bertrand Lugrin)

IVAN TURGENEV

There is something inspiring even in the pictured face of this great Russian. From under a low broad brow, over which the heavy white hair falls, the steadfast eyes look searchingly into yours. The nose is straight and broad, the lips firmly closed but kindly, and the short, neatly-clipped white beard and moustache give an air of military trimness. The head is held well erect and the shoulders are splendidly broad. It is the picture of a man well up in years, upon whom the years have had no deteriorating effect, but have simply served to further enlarge the capabilities and enhance the ideals. It is the face of youth and age in one, with only the best qualities of both apparent.

Ivan Turgeneff, with Lyof Tolstoy, easily stands at the head of Russian novelists, though the works of both are utterly dissimilar. Tolstoy never wrote except under the stress of strong feeling which almost amounted to passion; Turgeneff, on the contrary, produced his works patiently and deliberately, writing always with great conciseness and precision, never attempting to force a moral upon one, or an ideal, but trusting to the reader's perspicacity to trace his deepest meanings beneath the surface of his words. And because of the novelist's power of portrayal the task does not call for a great deal of discernment. Indeed that is one of the chief charms of a great writer or speaker to have the faculty of seeking, by mere suggestion, to call into being latent possibilities in the mind of the reader or hearer, and to produce thoughts, which, while they have their birth in the suggestion of the artist, come to such a full fruition in the mind of the one impressed that he or she seldom doubts but that the whole idea is all his or her own, and consequently the impression is the deeper and the more indelible. Turgeneff was what Henry James calls "the novelist's novelist." Continuing, he thus says of him: "Putting aside extrinsic imitations, it is impossible to read him without the conviction of his being, in the vividness of his own tongue, of the strong type made to bring home to us the happy truth of the unity, in a generous talent, of material and form of their being inevitable faces of the same medal; the type of those, in a word, whose example deals death to the perpetual clumsy assumption that subject and style are aesthetically speaking or in the living work—different and separable things. We are conscious, reading him in a language not his own, of not being reached by his personal tone, his individual accent. It is a testimony therefore to the intensity of his presence, that so much of his particular charm does reach us; that the mask turned to us has, even without his expression, still so much beauty. It is the beauty (since we must try to formulate) of the finest presentation of the familiar." Incidentally we might mention that there are few writers who love so well to veil the simplest expressions behind a galaxy of superfluous words as Henry James, but in his case, the effort to extricate the real meaning is too much of a task upon the reader's time and ability. Here lies the difference between genius and talent. In the one case we are pleased to inspiration at the evidence of our own latent powers, in the other case we are impatient of being shown our deficiency in comprehension, and are instinctively annoyed with the one who opens our eyes to our defects.

Turgeneff was born at Orel, in Russia, in 1818, but the latter half of his life was spent almost entirely away from his native land. His parents were rich land-owners, and he inherited a great deal of wealth, so that his literary labors were never necessary to his livelihood, and he was happy in always being able to leave a pecuniary interest out of his calculations. Turgeneff was a Liberal, and the years he spent in the German university only broadened these views, so that when he returned to Russia he was immediately placed under suspicion, and because of some trifling remark that seemed to reflect upon his country's government, he was confined to his own estate for fear that he might spread incendiary doctrines. As the estate was a magnificent one, and Turgeneff had all sorts of money at his command, it is not likely that he felt the punishment very keenly. At all events, it was productive of good results, for it was during this temporary exile that he wrote his charming collection, "A Sportsman's Sketches." In his studies he represented the case of the Russian peasant in a manner that was not at all pleasing to his government, and finding himself so absurdly hampered, and feeling an irrepressible incentive to write as his feelings

and reasons dictated, he determined to travel, and eventually took up his residence abroad. He had an estate at Baden-Baden and a residence in Paris on the Seine. In these two latter places he spent the happiest years of his life, years marked by signal literary successes and the acquiring of a host of friends, most of which were distinguished men and women in the world of art or letters. He never married, and died in 1883.

In Turgeneff's novel, "Fathers and Sons," the term "nihilist" was used almost for the first time, and it was a term very soon everywhere adopted. The hero of the story is a young Russian, Bazarof, who is a rebel against all forms of authority. Bazarof is in direct contrast to the other principal character in the story, who is the son of a wealthy landed proprietor, and who cherishes most of the old conservative ideals. Bazarof's career is vivid and tragic. The whole story depicts the old and the new forces at war with one another, and upon the book being given to the public, the whole country read it and took sides either with the "Fathers" or with the "Sons." It is a fearlessly written, powerfully realistic story, and made an impression in the literary world and upon Russian politics that has ever been forgotten.

"Virgin Soil" is another story of nihilism, with the love interest very strongly developed. It is graphically written and is one of the author's best.

THIS EASTER MORN

Above the flood of Pagan superstition
Above self-righteous creed of Pharisee
Above the moss grown walls of old tradition
He stood in Galilee.

No midnight oil he burned o'er stroll of teacher,
From time worn creeds his way was set apart;
His lamp the light of God's clear truth within him
His book the human heart.

The homely folk the peasant life about him
The heavy hearted, weak and sore distressed,
For whom this Life held naught but tribulation
In him found peace and rest.

And so this Easter morn his wondrous story
The world is listening to on land and sea,
Frail tortured limbs the thorny crown of anguish
The Cross of Calvary.

Beside his rock hewn tomb in tears and sorrow
The Marys held their tryst;
Today we hail with songs of glad rejoicing
The risen Christ.

The star that once shone out for sage and shepherd
Clear rayed above the stall in Bethlehem
Is shining yet undimmed its matchless splendor
A guide, a comfort still for heart-sore men.

Divine or human what he was I know not
But his great life of Love
To weary hearts comes like a benediction
Straight from above.

Isaac Nixon, Victoria B. C.

GRAVE MISTAKE

J. W. Holman, the government's official poisoner, has destroyed 750,000 prairie dogs in the last eight months. Mr. Holman, genially discussing that holocaust in Washington said: "Work like mine is best done by an expert. The farmer who poisons his own prairie dogs may get into trouble. Chemicals are serious things for the average man to fool with."

"When I think of men fooling with chemicals," he said, "I think involuntarily of Hiram Bozeman, of Gandy. It was a wet, cold, nasty December day, like this one, and Hiram, coughing and shivering, stood before a druggist's window. In this window, between two enormous jars, one filled with a beautiful clear blue liquid, the other with a beautiful clear red one, Hiram's eye rested on a sign that said:

No more Coughs.
No more Colds.
25c a bottle.

"Hiram entered the shop, the druggist said he could guarantee the anti-cold remedy, and the young man bought a bottle.

"Two days later he returned again through mire and sleet.

"I've drunk that mixture," he gasped, 'and it seems to have plugged up my throat. I can hardly breathe!'

"The druggist started.
'You drank it?' he cried. 'Why, man, it's an india-rubber solution to put on the soles of your shoes!'"—Detroit Journal.

JONES' ABSENCE

Simpkins always was soft-hearted, and when it devolved upon him to break gently the news of Jones' drowning to the bereaved Mrs. Jones, it cost him much paper, ink and perspiration before he sent the following:

"Dear Mrs. Jones—Your husband cannot come home today, because his bathing suit was washed away in the surf.

"P. S.—Poor Jones was inside the suit."—The Sketch.