

NTS

but woman



FOURTH FLOOR

Wants

serving necessities should they will find everything FRUIT JARS, JELLY reover, we sell the famous doz. 80c; Quarts per doz. 50c



ants

and comprehensive collection ert wares in our showrooms— ed, thereby enabling visitors ulty. You do not buy a pig- d by fictitious values. Every



Want

an call his own—sacred to ening or Sunday afternoon, us to all earthly cares and WEILER Morris; give oth. No! We are not going her husband.



S. FURNISHERS of HOMES CLUBS



An Hour with the Editor



THE WESLEYAN MOVEMENT

At a meeting of the Anglican Synod, of Ontario, some years ago, a clergyman described the Wesleyan movement as "a demand for personal piety." He added that he saw no reason why the Anglican and the Methodist organizations might not work hand in hand. The speaker expressed the sentiments of John Wesley, the great preacher, who is looked upon as the founder of the Methodist Church, although he himself deprecated the idea that he was founding a separate organization. John Wesley was an ordained minister of the Established Church, and was rather High Church, as that idea was understood in his day. Nothing was further from his intentions than to build up an institution that could be called nonconformist. Indeed he thought it was to be found, and among the books, which he repented for the use of his followers, were some written by Roman Catholics and others by Unitarians. His famous definition of a Methodist is too long to be given here, but it opens with the statement that "a Methodist is one who has the love of God shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost given unto him; one who loves the Lord his God with all his heart, soul and mind and strength." It then goes on to say that a Methodist must be one whose life and habits are simple, who does not join in any diversion having a vicious tendency, who is kind, charitable, truthful and given to good works. In all the definition there is nothing said about belief. He took the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, omitted such of them as seemed to him to have a sectarian bias, and gave them to his followers as the basis of their belief. He added nothing of his own to them. He said that he wanted to form a platform upon which "all who loved the Lord could rally," and there is no doubt that he hoped to be able to so present the Christian religion that the result would be the reunion of Christendom in one grand organization. He was greatly attached to the liturgy of the Church of England and endeavored to modify it so that it would come into general use, but in this he was only successful in a limited degree. His catholicism was shown in the fact that he prescribed no form of baptism and was even willing that persons might be rebaptized if they believed the form, which had been practiced in their cases, was incorrect. While he recommended that all persons should kneel when receiving the communion, he permitted those to stand, who desired to do so, or to sit, if they thought best. It was by no means necessary for persons uniting with the new organization to break off their connection with those with which they had previously been connected. They not only went at liberty to attend their own churches, but were exhorted by Wesley to do so when they could. His object was at the outset, at least, to unite those who desired to aid each other in the development of a Christian spirit and the living of Christian lives. Wesley earnestly hoped that his work would be recognized and acknowledged by the Established Church, and as is well known very many of his fellow clergymen would have been glad to if such had been the case. He had many warm friends among the regular clergy, and was at the beginning of his career welcomed by some of them into their parishes. One writer says:

"The relation of the movement to the Church of England is not hard to define. Wesley was a sincere lover of the Church of his fathers, and hoped that the bishops would ordain his preachers and in some way articulate his results into the normal ecclesiastical life of the country. In this he was disappointed, but nothing daunted, he went on his way independently, holding that he was justified in this by the unique position he occupied in the movement, and consolidating what became a vast ecclesiasticism. Wesley tried hard to be a loyal churchman as far as circumstances permitted. But England's call always sounded louder than the church's, so that he came to feel that he was serving the church most best when disregarding her." It is not proposed here to trace the history of Methodism or to comment in any way upon the differences which arose between the new movement and the Establishment. The former has already been treated in these columns; the latter is hardly an appropriate subject for discussion here and no good would come of it, if it were. The point that is aimed at is to give a general idea of the effect of the Wesley movement upon the history of the English people. And here let it be said that the effect of the movement was by no means confined to "the people called Methodists," but the stimulus to personal piety, the appreciation of the importance of the religious life and the recognition of the duty of men to their Creator and their neighbors permeated all classes of English society. In this fact we find the great influence of the Wesleyan movement. John Wesley began his work when Evangelical Christianity, as it has been called, was at a very low ebb in England. "Religion" says one writer, "had come to be regarded as a species of life insurance for the next world by the uneducated classes; the better educated, when they thought of the matter at all, relied upon the goodness of the divine

nature as sufficient for human salvation, and a large and growing class was inclined to disavow all faith in religion of any kind. The revolt against Puritanism, as it was exemplified in the strife between King Charles and his parliaments, went to the other extreme with the restoration. Then followed a period of social and national confusion intensified by religious discord. On the Continent writers were assailing the Christian religion and others were advancing doctrines that, however in accord we may in these days think they are with the Christian religion, were then thought not to be in conformity with it. France especially was seething with disbelief in the principles of religion, and the church was rapidly losing its hold upon the people. The doctrine of the "rights of man" was being preached by its apostles, and although it found uncongenial soil in England, there was during the early part of the Eighteenth Century an unmistakable drift away from that confidence in the church, which has played such a prominent part in the development of British institutions. It is a notable thing that during the years that the people of France were ripening for the Revolution, Wesley was preaching the doctrine of personal righteousness and of faith in Christ, not in the churches attended by the rich and cultivated, but in the highways and by-ways, around the mouths of coal mines, among the farm laborers, and everywhere he could get an audience. While the French proletariat was being instructed in the terrible doctrines of the Revolutionists, the English proletariat was being exhorted by the fiery eloquence of a great preacher to take Jesus of Nazareth as the pattern of their lives. It would be to do violence to the teaching of history if we did not recognize that it was, in part at least, through the influence of such teachings that England was spared such horrors as befel France. John Wesley appealed to the emotions, it was said, and so he did, but it was from parents, whose emotions he kindled, that were sprung the men who on land and sea maintained the honor of the British name. If he taught men that they were to be meek and lowly followers of the Nazarene, he preached nothing that weakened their patriotism or lessened their courage. No one can say what might have been if certain great leaders had not played their parts on the stage of history, but when we reflect that England was never stronger or more united than in the years following Wesley's labors, we seem forced to admit that his work contributed to produce that result. England passed unscathed through the terrible storms which swept over Europe a little more than a century ago, and the candid historian will not hesitate to recognize that this was the England, whose common people were swayed by the eloquence of this remarkable man, and cried out: "What shall we do to be saved?" It has been said above that the Church has ever played an important part in the development of British institutions and the preservation of British freedom; but it has not done this without upheavals from within, that have resulted in pressure from without. Of the wisdom of some of these movements there may be two opinions, but this does not touch the fact that the Church and the State have been inseparably bound up through many centuries. The latest of these great upheavals was the Wesleyan movement, the real nature and effect of which will not be appreciated by those who regard it simply as the organization of a new religious sect. It was one of the great formative agencies of the English-speaking race.

REIGNING FAMILIES

The German Emperor is of the House of Hohenzollern. It is a very old family. The first Counts of Zollern, or Hohenzollern, as they were afterwards known, and who derived their name from the Zollern Mountain upon which their castle stood, appear in written history about the year 1061. A family tradition says that these counts were sprung from the Colonna family of Rome. The Colonnas were among the princes of Italy for many generations and undoubtedly in their veins flowed the blood of some of the patricians of ancient Rome. Therefore if the legend is accepted as history, the Hohenzollerns are of noble descent for many centuries indeed. There is very great uncertainty about family pedigrees during the Dark Ages. The irruption of the great Asiatic hordes, which overran Europe and subjugated Rome, threw society into terrible confusion, and it was a wise child indeed that knew its own father in those dreadful days. Many princely families became extinct, and some of their followers seized upon their estates. In other cases where the rightful owners were slain, the victors usurped the estates and the title that went with them. In those days what we call family names were not the rule. Indeed, one may say that they were not recognized. The counts of Zollern had no family name as we understand the term. Burchard of Zollern was the first of them to get his name into history, but we are not forced to assume that he was a descendant of some other Count of Zollern, who preceded him. The fact that a man was the owner of the Castle of Zollern and the estates appurtenant therefore would give him a right to call himself the count, and his claim would be recognized by sovereigns who might need his as-

sistance in times of stress, without any questions being asked as to the right by which he claimed the title. From the time of Burchard and his brother Wezel to the present day there is an unbroken chain of descent, so that the Hohenzollerns may claim antiquity as a noble family for nine hundred years and ancestors, probably noble, even for a longer period. In 1191 Count Frederick III of Zollern was made Count of Nuremberg, and thus the fortunes of the house were established. He had two sons, who founded the Frankish and Swabian branches of the family. The Frankish branch steadily increased in wealth, power and influence, and in 1263 it was raised to princely rank. In 1415 the electorate of Brandenburg was conferred upon it by the Emperor Sigismund, and in 1701 the Elector Frederick III became first king of Prussia. The Swabian branch of the family was for a time greatly divided and weakened by the dissensions of its members, but after several generations it also reached great power and influence. In 1695 an agreement was reached between the two branches of the family that in case of the failure of male heirs of either of them, the estates should be inherited by the other. In 1848 the Swabian princes resigned their offices, which were transferred to the King of Prussia, but the tie of blood proved sufficiently strong for the Prussian monarch to desire that his remote relatives should also wear a crown, and it was the proposal to place Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern upon the throne of Spain that led to the war with France in 1870. As Prussia did not insist, after defeating France, that Leopold should ascend the Spanish throne, we may without violence assume that the proposal was more the excuse for than the object of the war.

The House of Hohenzollern has given many men of note to Europe. Frederick William, known as the Great Elector, was a man of tremendous energy and remarkable ability. When he succeeded to the electorate at the age of twenty he found the state almost in ruins, being overrun by irregular soldiery, who had taken part in the Thirty Years War. He drove them out. Afterwards he engaged in several wars with distinction, but his greatest work lay in the development of industry and commerce within his dominions. He left the electorate in excellent condition to his son, who, however, was nearly as great a failure as his father was a success. His claim to distinction lies in the fact that he was the first elector to be recognized as King. The kingdom prospered greatly during the reign of his son, Frederick William I, by whose efforts the army was put upon a splendid footing. His son was Frederick II, generally referred to as "The Great." This was one of the most remarkable men of whom history tells us anything. He was a liberal and enlightened ruler, and was undoubtedly the most conspicuous figure of his time, or say from 1740 to 1750. His rule was absolute. We read of his having ministers, but they were in point of fact only his agents, who were compelled to do his bidding unquestioningly. He attended to the minutest details of the government as far as was possible. The army received great attention at his hands. He more than doubled its numbers, greatly increased and strengthened the fortifications and was always prepared for instant war. He encouraged science and promoted education. Under his rule Prussia advanced to a first place among the nations of continental Europe, rivaling if not supplanting Austria as the head of the Germanic states. He was in many things eccentric and in nothing more so than in his hatred of the German language and literature. His efforts to supplant these with French and his absolute certainty that German could never be anything else than the language of bores seem very absurd in view of the place German literature has since taken in the world. He left no children.

It will be seen from this sketch that while the family of the German Kaiser has not long enjoyed the standing attaching to royalty, and is in fact one of the youngest of the reigning houses, its members have played important parts on the stage of history.

CULLODEN

"M. A. P." relates an anecdote of King Edward VII. when he was Prince of Wales. He was visiting Warwick Castle, and being shown all the sights of that historic spot by the housekeeper, a lady whose dignity was in keeping with her surroundings. She had handed the Prince a relic, remarking as she did so: "This belonged to James III." "James III?" queried the Prince, who, after a moment's thought, added, "You mean the Old Pretender?" The housekeeper looked unabashed at the young Prince as she replied: "Your Royal Highness, we do not call him that." This good lady was by no means the last of her class, for there are yet some people in England who look upon King Edward as occupying a throne to which he has no legal right at all, the true sovereign of England being a young lady, who traces her descent to the person whom the housekeeper called James III. Culloden and various "Acts of Parliament" may have settled the kingly office de facto, but not de jure in their opinion.

In 1689 an English Parliament, summoned without a royal writ, met and declared the flight of James II to France, after William of

Orange had landed in England, to be equivalent to abdication, and the sovereignty of the Kingdom was thereupon offered jointly to William and his wife Mary, and accepted by them without any question of the legality of the transaction. In strict law a Parliament could only be chosen in England by a command of the sovereign, and hence it must be conceded that, unless we grant the claim of popular sovereignty to the fullest extent, and regard the royal prerogative as merely a form, it must be admitted that the deposition of James II was irregular. When William died he was succeeded by Anne, who was daughter of James II. During her reign the claims of James, the son of James II, were kept alive, although not overtly asserted. The Legitimists hoped that on the death of Anne the Pretender would be invited to accept the crown. This might have been the case, if he had been a Protestant, but England was in no frame of mind to accept a Roman Catholic King. George, Elector of Hanover, was proclaimed King. When we come to consider the history of the reigning family of Great Britain, the steps by which the House of Brunswick came to the throne, and its rights thereto in point of birth will be considered; at present only the efforts of James the Pretender and his son, Charles Edward, "Bonnie Prince Charlie," will be spoken of. James the Pretender landed in Scotland in 1715 and advanced to invade England, where he hoped there would be a popular demonstration in his favor. In this he was disappointed. A part of his army encountered the royal forces at Preston and suffered a severe defeat, after which the suppression of the uprising was not difficult. The Pretender made no further overt act, and the remainder of the reign of George I, which lasted thirteen years, was undisturbed by any serious attempt to dispute his right to the crown. But the House of Stuart was not disposed to relinquish its claims, and in 1745, when George II was king, Charles Edward, son of the Pretender, landed in Scotland. Many of the Highland clans rallied to his standard. At Edinburgh he was received with much popular enthusiasm, and later the people of the Lowlands, who resented the extinction of Scottish independence, gave him a promise of their support. The English army was at this time in a greatly disorganized condition, and when it came into collision with the troops of Charles Edward at Prestonpans, it met with a complete defeat. The fortunes of Charles were now in the ascendant. At the head of five thousand troops he invaded England, advancing almost without resistance to Derby. He had looked with confidence to popular support in the southern part of the Kingdom, only to be bitterly disappointed. An overwhelming force was despatched to meet him, and he was compelled to retreat. The pursuit was vigorous, and on April 16, 1746, he made his final stand at Culloden, where he was completely defeated by an English force under the Duke of Cumberland. Not much glory attached to the victory, for the unhappy Charles only had under him a broken, dispirited and half-starved force. The result of the battle was decisive. Charles became a fugitive and a price of £30,000 was set on his head. His few friends remained faithful, and at length he escaped to France. He spent some time in intriguing for support both in Paris and Madrid, but without success. After the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle he was compelled to leave France; but he returned secretly, even going to England, it is said, with the hope of inaugurating a plot to overthrow the government. His life became exceedingly profligate, and in 1766, after the death of his father, his claim to be heir to the British throne was formally repudiated by all the European powers. He died in 1788 in his 68th year.

The Birth of the Nations

XXXII.

(N. de Bertrand Lagin)

The British, III.

Small wonder that the British people consider the sea as their heritage, when we read that in the earliest days of our race, the love of the sea was deeply rooted in the hearts of our forefathers, and that they were never so happy as when out in the open, the leaping waters about them, the wind in their faces and the taste of the salt on their lips. And this in spite of the fact that their boats were most primitive affairs, and forced them in stormy weather to creep cautiously along from the shelter of one harbor to that afforded by another. Just the sort of craft they used we are able to describe, for the peat-bogs of Sleswick have disclosed a tangible reminder of the days of Saxon ocean-roving. It is a boat, flat-bottomed, seventy feet long by eight or nine feet wide. Its sides are oak boards, fastened with bark ropes and iron bolts. There are row-locks for fifty oars, and in its hold were found, heaped together, axes, swords, and knives, the weapons of the band of warriors, that, hundreds of years ago, used this vessel as their fighting craft. Such fierce fighters were they, and so fearless upon the sea, that a Roman poet voiced his people's sentiments when he sang "Foes are they, fierce beyond other foes, and cunning as they are fierce; the sea is their school of war and the storm their friend; they are sea-wolves that prey on the pillage of the world."

So when an increasing population and a lust for new lands took possession of the Saxons, they travelled far afield and came upon the shores of Britain, and made efforts to settle there. For three hundred years after the island's conquest by Rome, and while the legions still remained, Britain was comparatively free from invasion. But when the great Empire began to decay and the Franks, the Goths, and the Vandals swept down upon civilized Europe, then Rome, trembling with the dreadful anticipation of what was to come, hurriedly called home her troops from this westernmost Province of the Empire, and Britain was left unguarded and a prey to the incursions of any and all.

For forty long years the islands in its south was besieged by the Picts from the north, and the Scots from the west, while the Saxons attacked them by sea. Finally driven to desperation by civil strife, the rulers decided to call upon one enemy to aid them against the others. Accordingly a band of warriors from Jutland, with Hengest and Horsa at their head, arrived in England, or Britain as it was still called, about the middle of the Fifth Century, first landing on the Isle of Thanet as a spot since known as Ebbsfleet. "No spot can be so sacred to Englishmen," writes Green, "as that which felt the first tread of English feet. There is little to catch the eye in Ebbsfleet itself, a mere lift of ground with a few grey cottages dotted over it, cut off nowadays from the sea by a reclaimed meadow and a sea-wall. But taken as a whole the scene has a wild beauty of its own. To the right the white curve of Ramsgate Cliffs looks down on the crescent of Pegwell Bay; faraway to the left across grey marsh levels where smoke wreaths mark the site of Richborough and Sandwich the coastline trends dimly toward Deal. At the time of Hengest's landing a broad inlet of sea parted Thanet from the mainland of Britain; and through this inlet the pirate boats would naturally come sailing with a fair wind to what was then the gravel spit of Ebbsfleet."

Though the Picts were defeated and all danger from them was soon over, the army of mercenaries proved themselves the greatest menace to Britain's liberty. Their successes in the country attracted the attention of kindred tribes, and in the latter part of the Fifth Century many more of the Saxon invaders began to seek for rich plunder in Britain. Little by little her gallant defenders were forced to give up their land, one town after another was taken. The great forest of Anderida, which guarded the coast from the borders of Kent to the Hampshire Downs was taken and the kingdom of the South Saxon was established. "Aelle and Cissa beset Anderida" runs the old record "and slew all that was therein; nor was there afterward one Briton left." Later still the crown of the West-Saxons was placed upon the head of Cerdic after the famous battle of Cuarford, which ended the struggle for Gwent.

But now a new leader appeared and for a time led the British forces to victory. His name was Arthur, and for many years after his triumph, the country from London to St. David's Head from the Audresweald to the Firth of Forth remained free.

Who this Arthur was history does not definitely tell us. We would like to think he was that brave King of legendary fame that Tennyson has immortalized; but histories and encyclopedias alike tell us that our beloved hero of the Round Table was only a mythical person and probably did not live at all, and that the legend upon which Tennyson based the Idylls of the King is without foundation. But we know that there was an Arthur who for upwards of thirty years held the barbarians at bay, and why not, in the absence of any definite information to the contrary, believe him to have been that goodly King who lived a blameless life, and established order and virtue and peace in the country as long as he ruled there.

But the final and fiercest struggle of the Britons was against the English, and of this struggle history can tell us but little. We know that the last invaders were successful, and the West-Saxons rallying again to the conflict, the conquest of Britain was complete.

We are told that in "all the world-wide struggle between Rome and the German peoples, no land was so stubbornly fought for as Britain and none so hardly won." In Britain the invader was met by a courage almost equal to his own—field by field, town by town, forest by forest, the land was won, and as each bit of ground was torn away by the struggle, the Briton suddenly withdrew from it only to turn doggedly and fight for the next. Victor and vanquished they were brave men, these ancestors of ours.

(To Be Continued.)

UNDECEIVED

The proprietor of a Buffalo newspaper, while travelling on the Erie Railway, handed a pass to the ticket collector. The official did not like the looks of the passenger, and doubted that he was the right man, so he wired to the head office:—"Man representing himself as William J. Connors presents Connors' pass. Think he is a fraud. Looks like a prize-fighter and talks like a blackguard." Back came the answer, "That's him."