

AN HOUR with the Editor

ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS

As this series of articles is not intended as a history of England, but only to set out the chief steps in the developments of British institutions as they exist today, the events of Elizabeth's reign will not be dealt with in any detail. It was a formative period in the history of England. One of its most notable products was a spirit of patriotism which overshadowed everything else. Mention has already been made of the fact that Elizabeth refused to acknowledge papal supremacy, and the consequence was a prolonged series of intrigues at home and abroad, the object of which at some stages was her dismissal from the throne and at others to secure the right of succession to Mary Stuart, usually spoken of as Mary, Queen of Scots, who was a far more devoted adherent of Roman Catholicism than Elizabeth was of Protestantism. These intrigues at times resulted in military operations in Scotland and along the border; they brought the country often to the verge of civil war; they led to foreign complications which forced Elizabeth to participate in hostilities abroad; but they did not seriously affect the peace of the kingdom itself. The ambition of Philip of Spain had an important bearing upon the affairs of England. After the death of Mary he proposed marriage to Elizabeth, and although his offer was not accepted, he nevertheless continued for some time to be the champion of English interests, not for any love of that country, but because he wished to prevent Mary Stuart, who was wife of the King of France, becoming Queen of England and thus uniting the crowns of France, England and Scotland upon one head. In the end Philip's attitude changed, for after the execution of Mary he had no longer reason to fear such a union, and he lent a willing ear to the demands of the Pope that he should invade England. He was the more ready to do so because of his fear that English influence would be exerted to deprive him of the Netherlands. The position of Philip at this time was very influential. He was King of Spain, Naples and Portugal. The Netherlands were his territory. The New World had been given him by the Pope with the exception of Brazil which was claimed by Portugal, and when he had acquired the crown of that country, not only Brazil but all the Portuguese domains in the East Indies passed under his control. No monarch before Philip ever ruled over so wide a domain, and only the British Empire has exceeded it in scope. It is not necessary to tell the history of the Armada; the interesting point to be noted in connection therewith was the complete failure of the expectations of Philip and the Roman Catholic leaders on the continent in respect to the action of the English Catholics. Spanish emissaries had reported that at the approach of the Armada, the great Catholic nobles would rise against Elizabeth, and as only a minority of the population was Protestant, this seemed certain to ensure the easy triumph of Philip. But a new spirit of patriotism had arisen in England, a spirit that would not brook a foreign ruler. The Catholic nobles were quite ready to do what in them lay to restore England to the authority of the papacy, but they had no mind to see this done by the instrumentality of a foreign conquest, and so they rallied to the support of Elizabeth with the same lofty courage and resolute determination as characterized those who were more in sympathy with her policies. The affair of the Armada demonstrated that, however much England might be distracted by domestic differences, it was a united country as against the rest of the world. This spirit of patriotism was a new exhibition of national feeling. In mediaeval times patriotism, such as characterized Greece and Rome, had ceased to exist. Feudalism killed it. Invaders found countries honeycombed with disloyalty, or perhaps it would be correct to say that there was no other loyalty than that to individual rulers. Loyalty to the country was a thing that had hardly been developed. Countries changed their rulers with apparent indifference, the people seemingly evincing no concern as to what sovereign lord they were compelled to give allegiance to. Whether it was the insular position of England or some other cause that contributed chiefly to the result, there had developed in that kingdom a feeling of patriotism that was more than loyalty to the sovereign. Thousands of those who flocked to the support of Elizabeth, would have gladly seen her driven from the throne and her place given to some one who would have been more amenable to Rome; but they were loyal to their country.

It has been pointed out that Elizabeth's title to the Crown was parliamentary. By right of descent Mary Queen of Scots could show a better claim than she, provided the papal edict of illegitimacy against Elizabeth was admitted to be legal, and as the laws were then understood by the majority, it was hard to contend otherwise. But Parliament had declared that the Crown should descend to Elizabeth after the death of Mary without children, and what Parliament said was the law of England then as now. Nevertheless Elizabeth was not minded to trust too much to Parliament, for she was irksome of restraint. She inherited from her father and grandfather exalted ideas of the position of the sovereign, and she practiced many economies rather than call Parliament together to ask for supplies. In the end she found herself compelled to do so, and at various times during her reign she sought parliamentary sanction for acts that either Henry VII. or Henry VIII. would have done without any regard to

the wishes or approval of the people's representatives. She thus, not wholly by design, but chiefly through necessity, replaced Parliament in the position it had occupied in the reign of Edward VI., although it never attained under Elizabeth the status which it had reached during the reigns of the Lancastrian kings.

The reign of Elizabeth was characterized by the expansion of English commerce and the development of a spirit of adventure, which laid the foundations of the British Empire. Such men as Frobisher, Drake, and Raleigh showed to the people of England that there were fields awaiting their energies beyond the sea. These gentlemen adventurers were notable men. They stood in a class by themselves. They were zealous Protestants and ardent slave-traders. They robbed cathedrals, burnt ships at sea, assailed fortresses, in short worked their own sweet will in whatever part of the world they found themselves. They sought for a passage to India around the north of Asia and thus discovered a route into the White Sea and developed a trade with Russia. Disappointed in finding a way to the East in that direction, they sought it north of America, and when failure met their efforts in the frozen ocean they sailed southwards in defiance of the papal grant to Spain and founded English colonies. Drake sailed around the world robbing the Spaniards wherever he found him, and came home to find his acts repudiated by his Queen, who nevertheless took care to reward him with a knighthood.

Passing mention only can be made of the great intellectual life of this period, but the age that produced Spencer and Shakespeare needs little else to be said for it. Elizabeth herself was a patron of letters. Learned, she encouraged learning in others, and she had a fondness for the lighter side of knowledge. She inherited from her father a love of painting and music, and ability in literature was a passport to her favor. The Elizabethan Age was not a revival. It was a creation.

Personally this great queen seems to have been kind of heart, resolute, ambitious, fond of admiration, not unscrupulous either in her public policy or the gratification of her private wishes. She was exceedingly untruthful, it being said of her that the only person who could surpass her in lying having been Mary Queen of Scots. With all her faults, and her greatest admirers do not deny that they were many and grave, she was a thorough Englishwoman, and it is not too much to say that the England of today is due to her strength of purpose, her far-reaching influence and the independence of her character.

NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

II.

The Celts are sometimes called Kelts, sometimes Gauls, or Gaels. It is difficult to determine just what many writers mean by the several terms, for exactness of definition is not possible. It is not quite certain whether or not the people to whom these terms apply were one and the same. Ordinarily the Gauls are associated with what is now France, the Celts generally with ancient Britain and Ireland, and the Gaels with Scotland. To the historians of Greece and Rome all peoples living in Central Europe were "barbarians," and they did not distinguish closely between them. The name Celt is from the Greek, and was applied to these so-called barbarians generally; the Romans preferred the name Gauls. But there was no certainty even thus far, for we read in the Greek account of the invasion of that country that the invaders were Gauls, and such of them as passed over into Asia Minor gave their name to Gallatia, to the people of which country St. Paul wrote his Epistle. Speaking generally, the inhabitants of Central Europe, before the Christian Era, from the steppes of Russia to the shores of Ireland, and from the Baltic to the Tagus were regarded by the Greeks and Romans as one people, and are treated by most modern writers as Celts. Thebaud, in his History of Ireland, says that they consisted of a number of independent republics and do not appear to have lived in cities. Sir Walter Scott, in his History of Scotland, advanced the same view. Pausanias, a Greek historian, who wrote in the Second Century of the Christian Era, said: "The Gauls inhabit the farthest parts of Europe, on the shore of a great sea, which at its extremity is not navigable. The sea ebbs and flows, and contains beasts quite unlike those in the rest of the sea. The name Gauls came into vogue late, for of old the people were called by themselves and others Celts." In his account of the invasion of Greece, Pausanias uses the name Celt and Gaul interchangeably. On the other hand, the Roman writers, who tell of the sacking of Rome by the same people, always speak of them as Gauls. In the case of both invasions the leaders were called by the historians of the invaded countries Brennus, which seems to have been a title equivalent to the Teutonic "konig," from which we derive our word king. Neibuh, the German historian, seems disposed to question the homogeneity of the people known as Celts or Gauls. He inclines to the view that there were several races which advanced across Central Europe at different periods before the beginning of the historical era, and he thinks the Cymri, who occupied Britain, and who are now represented by the Welsh, were not identical with either the Celts or Gaels, but a more aggressive race, who drove these tribes before them, forcing the Celts into Ireland and the Gaels into Scotland, and retaining England and Wales for themselves. He also attempts

to distinguish between the Gauls and the Cymri. The absence of any written Celtic literature dating from this early period makes it impossible to reach any definite conclusion from a comparison of languages, for while a great mass of Celtic poetry has been preserved it has come down to us in the language afterwards spoken in the several countries where the Celtic traditions were kept alive. Examination of the available authorities leaves much doubt as to the Celts, but we seem warranted in concluding that they migrated from Europe a long time previous to the beginning of the Christian Era. Guizot, in his History of France, says that the Gauls were the original inhabitants of Western Europe, a statement that does not seem consistent with the Roman accounts of the invaders, who came under Brennus nearly three hundred years before Christ, for these say that the Gauls had many slaves, which seems to indicate that they had conquered previous occupants of the land in which they lived.

The Celts were a tall fair race, exceedingly hardy, brave and resolute. The glimpses of them which we get from the accounts preserved by the people whom they defeated in battle, for they kept no records of their own deeds and left no monuments with inscriptions, suggests that they must have possessed a well organized system of government, and to have known the value of money, which facts show that they were far removed from a state of savagery. They were, nevertheless, greatly inclined to cruelty. They obliterated the tribes with whom they came in conflict, and even in the case of Rome, while they were persuaded to withdraw from Italy by the gift of what was then a vast sum of money, they so completely destroyed many cities in Northern Italy that the names of them were never again heard of after the wave of invasion had rolled away.

Such were the people who are the first known possessors of Central and Western Europe, and whose blood flows in the veins of millions of descendants today. As they drove the prior inhabitants of the country before them, so in their turn they were driven before subsequent invaders, until they had gone as far as the sea would permit. Hence we find in Ireland and Scotland the Celtic stock more strongly represented than anywhere else. Whether or not they exterminated an earlier population in these two countries the necessity remains unknown, although the probability is that they did. There was a relatively high degree of civilization in Ireland long before Rome was founded. Ollav Feola, who reigned about 1000 B. C., established triennial parliaments, which met at Tara, and the Irish Chronicle tells us that at this time "society was classified into seven grades, each marked by the number of colors in its dress, and in this classification men of learning ranked next to royalty." This statement seems incompatible with the claim that the ferocious Celts, who swept down upon Greece and Rome from Central Europe seven centuries later, could already have been resident in Ireland. There is, however, a slight similarity to be noted, for we are told by Greek writers that the Celts wore tartans to distinguish the several classes, which seems to indicate a common origin with the people of ancient Ireland. It is less difficult to discover in these tartan-wearers from the shores of the Black Sea the ancestors of the Scotch.

The Gaelic language is described as Indo-European, a term that has no very definite significance. It was Celtic in its origin and has been preserved in its greatest purity in some parts of Ireland, in the Highlands of Scotland, and in the islands of the northwest coast of Britain. It has been said above that the Celts left no inscriptions, but this must be qualified by the statement that in Ireland there was in existence at a very early day a system of writing known as Ogham, and many inscriptions on monuments in these letters have been preserved. In the early part of the Christian Era the Irish adopted the Roman alphabet, and there is reason to believe that a very considerable literature was in existence before the invasion of the Danes and other Northmen, who seem to have ruthlessly destroyed as far as possible all traces of early Irish civilization and culture.

The Celtic characteristics seem to have been strongly preserved in Brittany, the name of which country was derived from that of a Celtic king. There is no reason to suppose that the Celtic population of Western Europe was exterminated by the great Teutonic invasion. Some of the people fled before the invaders, but undoubtedly many of them remained, doubtless in a condition of slavery, and contributed to some extent to laying the foundation of the national characteristics of the people of Germany, France, Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, Northern Italy and the United Kingdom.

HERALDRY

In connection with the death of the late King and the accession of his successor, the names of certain officials were mentioned that are rarely heard of except on such occasions. A great deal of what to the ordinary individual is mysterious, and to some persons, silly, hangs around heraldry. One of the English judges, referring to an officer of the Herald's Office, who was badly mixed up in some evidence he was giving before him, spoke of him as "a silly old man who did not understand his own silly business"; but to the Herald's Office itself the "business" is almost sacred. It has been called a science, and like all sciences, it has a jargon of its own. The following is a description of the Royal escutcheon in the language of this so-called science: "The dexter chief quarter gules bearing three lions passant gardant; the sinister base quarter the same; the sinister chief quarter a field with a lion rampant gules framed in a bordure of fleur-de-lisse also gules; the dexter base quarter the Irish harp or on a ground azure." It may be added that this definition, as given above, has been somewhat simplified for popular use. Of course you could at once sit down and draw the escutcheon without making a mistake from this description. If you happen to want to make yourself an escutcheon, you must be careful never to put or upon argent, unless you happen to be one of those who have a right to bear the arms of the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, in which case you will be quite justified in having "a cross argent potent between four crosses or." That you may be further assisted in making this escutcheon without the use of colors, it may be added that "argent" in the language of the ordinary world is represented by white; "or," by white with black dots; "azure," by horizontal black lines on white; gules, by vertical black lines on white; sable, by crossing vertical and horizontal black lines; vert, by lines from the dexter chief to the sinister base, and purple, by lines from the sinister chief to the dexter base. In plain English, argent is silver, or is gold, azure is blue, gules is red, sable is black, vert is green, and purple is purple.

While heraldry seems rather an absurdity nowadays, it had its value once upon a time. It was designed to enable knights to recognize each other, which was a matter of some importance in times when they went out to fight clad in hardware, their faces covered by closed visors. One of these gentlemen would look very much like another unless he was provided by some means of identification, and he might very easily be belaboring his best friend instead of his arch enemy. Hence it was necessary to have arms appurtenant to certain houses. There is some confusion in the minds of many people between arms and crests. A crest is really a badge, sometimes worn as a mark of honor, but often as a means of identification. A knight might bear a shield or escutcheon, and it might or might not be surmounted with a crest; but if it bore a crest his followers might also wear the latter so that it might be known to whom they were attached. It is admitted by the Herald's Office that anyone now may assume any crest he may fancy, for they are no longer regarded as anything more than an ornament; but a grant of arms is a more serious matter. In the old books on family pedigrees you will find this expression: "Arms he beareth (here the arms are described), and for a crest" (here will follow the description of the crest); but the arms are the great thing. The Royal House displays its arms, but never its crest, if it has one, and we find no reference to any in any books on heraldry at hand. It is said that the plainer the escutcheon the older the family, as a general rule, but this must be accepted with some qualification, for many families have adopted the arms of others with which they have intermarried, and the result is a somewhat complex escutcheon.

Heraldry was deemed of such importance that at one time the chief heralds were crowned amid religious ceremonies. In England there are three kings-at-arms, namely, the Garter King-at-Arms, who is chief; Clarendieux, who presides over the southern shires, and Norroy, whose jurisdiction is over the north. There are six subordinate heralds and four pursuivants, the latter being distinguished by their mantles; thus Blue Mantle Pursuivant, Red Mantle Pursuivant, and so on. Over the King-at-arms is the hereditary Grand Marshal, who is always the Duke of Norfolk. Formerly all knights could bear arms, that is, so far as England was concerned, but in the reign of Henry V. a decree was made that thereafter no person, who had not born arms at Agincourt or his descendants, should assume an escutcheon without special permission from the Herald's Office.

A Century of Fiction

XXXV.
(N. de Bertrand Lugin)

GUSTAVE FLAUBERT

In taking into consideration a man's convictions, we must also take into consideration the times in which he lived and that time's prevailing spirit. We must, moreover, know the moral and physical qualities of that man. Perhaps it is not too much to say that the moral judgment of any person may be questioned unless that person is mentally and physically normal. Try as we may to prevent it, the condition of our bodies, if they be in any sense diseased, must influence our views of life. Early environment, too, leaves an ineffaceable impression which corrects or distorts the mature deliberations of later years. Therefore in reading or writing of the life of Gustave Flaubert, we must take into account many things before we accept in whole or in part his estimate of life and its meaning; and then if we are normally healthy in mind and in body, we can perceive the falsity of his views, and accept the man's works for what they are worth.

Flaubert was a pessimist, living in a pessimistic age, and for the cause of his individual pessimism we have not far to seek. He was born in 1821, and until the age of eighteen lived in a hospital, where his father was one of the head physicians. He was a dreamy, impressionable, sensitive child, and "his room overlooked a court where the invalids walked, and an amphitheatre where his father's pupils dis-

sected bodies. The dreams of his childhood and youth moved side by side with horrible impressions of physical decay." In addition to this between the father and the son there was no understanding whatever. The father was a rough, practical surgeon, skilful in his profession, but who had no patience whatever with fancies or imaginings. He desired his son to follow in his footsteps, and was unreasonably angry at young Flaubert's distaste for such a calling. As the lad grew older, symptoms of epilepsy began to show themselves, from the age of twenty until his death he was to suffer intermittently from this dread disease. Small wonder that he took a bitter view of life, especially as he could not, or did not permit himself, to participate in those blessings which are compensation for the cruellest of human ills, and make life worth while to the greatest of sufferers. He believed such sufferings as his not to be an isolated case, but that everyone must share in it to a certain extent, that suffering grows out of the very fact of existence. He did not perceive where in suffering could be glorified, and that the greatest results are great in proportion to the pain we endure. He saw only the misery and pain of life; the narrowness of human destiny "horror of the future," weariness of enduring; woefulness of yielding, falsehood of desire; and vanity of hope.

He made friends among the greatest writers of his day, and his genius was honored by them all. His literary works are not many, but the few he produced are almost perfect specimens of language, style and artistic finish. The most brilliant of his books is undoubtedly "Madame Bovary." This is a story of wonderful conception and infinite literary beauty. While he wrote it, it possessed his body and soul. He had no thoughts apart from it. Through long sleepless nights he worked out his ideas to write them down in the daytime. He would be satisfied with nothing less than perfection, as near as he could reach perfection, and the writing of the book was an almost too exacting task. Nevertheless, it was well worth while, for if we are to believe M. Paul Bourget, it has established his reputation for genius, and has become part of the classical tradition of France.

Flaubert died in 1880.

We produce below a few extracts from Bourget's admirable criticism of this author, wherein may be found some literary hints, which those who undertake writing conscientiously may accept as of no small value.

Flaubert's beautiful choice of language gave his books their greatest charm. "An isolated word," writes Bourget, "taken by itself should have its value of tone for the author, as the color on the palette has its value of tone for the painter. . . . Are there not words of whose presence at the end of a pen or at the tip of the tongue betrays a patrician manner of feeling and thinking, while others reek of bad company and soil the paper on which the pen traces them? It is not their meaning which gives them this elegant or brutal, this ignoble or aristocratic bearing. It is their trace, visible or not, of their Latin origin, their tonic accent, their sonority, and still other elements which can not be analyzed and which the artist discerns through practice. For Flaubert, the profession of authorship consisted in developing in himself this sense of the physiognomy of words to the point of always finding the exact and, as he maintained, the only term to express a truth, a form, a feeling. . . . The choice of words resembles the choice of colors in a painting. The value of a tone changes with the value of a tone placed next it. Therefore the second step in authorship consists, once the words are chosen, in putting them together and in constructing sentences. . . . Flaubert thought that a well-constructed phrase adapts itself to the rhythm of the respiration. He reasoned a little like this: In presence of such or such an idea we experience such or such an impression. This impression has its rebound in our organism. It leaves it colder or warmer; our blood beats quicker or slower; our breath is hurried or stopped. The phrase which translates this idea should accord with the state of our organs, and how better ascertain this than by trying it with the register of our chest? "Badly constructed sentences," said he, "never resist the test." If sentences are made to be read aloud, harmony is their ruling quality; and from that spring these two laws; constant renewal of forms, and suppression of all rhyme, of all hiatus, and of all repetition. "The author in his work," wrote Flaubert, "should be like God in the universe, everywhere present, and nowhere visible. Art being only second to nature, its creator should exercise analogical methods, so that one feels in every atom, every aspect, a hidden, a limitless insusceptibility of injury from external things."

Mrs. Nocash—Mercy! you let your girl off every afternoon.
Neighbor—Yes, indeed, it is such a saving. The more she is away the fewer dishes she breaks.—Illustrated Bits.

"Do you have well water on your place?"
"I shouldn't say it was exactly well water," replied the man who is obsessed by the germ theory, "but the latest analysis shows it is on the road to recovery."—Washington Star.

Said the young wife: "I am 28 years old today."
"What?" cried her husband, aghast. "Why! we've been married only a year, and you told me on our wedding day that you were only twenty!"
"Ah, yes," she replied sadly, "but I've aged very rapidly since my marriage!"

Headquarters
For All Needs in
Summer Furniture

Flowers

the home decorations they deserve
for using
and choose a
shown, and

the offer-
represent



At \$8.00
At \$10.50
At \$12.00
By. Priced from, per doz.
..... \$9.00
ns and 1 table cloth—packed
June Bride. Several pic-

ner Time

service
els receive more strenuous
used at the bathing resorts
g the warm season than at

l towels that are built to
of the right quality—made
laundry.

d on any anywhere. Qual-
fect from the largest man-
g prices.

Towels

\$1.00 or, each 10c
5 or, each 25c
5 or, each 35c
each 75c
..... 60c
..... \$1.00
..... \$1.25

Way



put a curtain on it in no
curtains last almost three
years.

at this Store

of all lines required for
to plan the camp, and
at we can offer you.

Mail Orders

Send your
orders by mail
to us and have
them filled
where it is a
habit to fill
mail orders
right.