

An Hour with the Editor

SCOTTISH HISTORY

The history of Scotland after the accession of the Stewarts continues for many years to be little else than a series of wars, national and domestic. The condition of the country at that time illustrates very clearly the difference between patriotism and loyalty. The Scots were undoubtedly patriotic. Their patriotism in the first instance chiefly extended to the particular area belonging to the noble to whom they owed allegiance, but it went far enough on occasion to embrace the whole of the kingdom. Of loyalty there was scarcely any. Nobles gave or withheld their allegiance to the King as suited their own interests. Intrigues were constantly on foot. What seems strange today is that these things were regarded as quite justifiable. Now and then a strong king would cause the execution of those who opposed him and were unfortunate enough to fall into his hands, but in the majority of cases what we would look upon today as treason, was considered to be within the right of each petty chief or powerful baron. This was possibly due in a measure to the uncertainty of the tenure by which the Scottish crown was held. The law of succession was never fixed by universal consent, and all those persons in whose veins flowed the blood of William the Lion considered that their claims to it were as good as those of any one else. The situation was complicated by the assertion of the English kings to a right of lordship over the kingdom, a claim which, as we have seen, several of the occupants of the throne had unhesitatingly recognized. Nor was all Scotland, or indeed any part of it, ready to admit that the King possessed anything more than a nominal authority within his supposed realm. The Lords of the Isles, as they called themselves, exercised all the functions of independent sovereigns, and the same was true of many of the great nobles in Scotland itself. It would be flattery to say that the country at large had reached anything like as high a plane of civilization as prevailed in southern England and in France. Indeed it could not be expected to. We have seen that the defensive policy of Robert Bruce consisted in retreating before an enemy and laying the country waste. His successors emulated his example, and as has been already mentioned, the result was that for years the land remained untilled, so that what had been cultivated fields became covered with thickets and were the haunts of wild beasts. When a French contingent came over to fight for Scotland against the English king, they were amazed at the course their allies adopted. As soon as the English hosts advanced, every one would abandon their homes and betake themselves to the mountains, burning and destroying what they could not carry with them. Such tactics did not commend themselves to the French adventurers, who had come with the hope of reaping some glory and much booty, and they returned home. In time of truce with England, there were wars between the barons themselves under such conditions civilization could not make progress, and moreover their refinements were felt to be unnecessary by men who would set out on a campaign with no other provision than a bag of oatmeal tied to their saddle-bags, and to whom a bed was a useless luxury.

In the reign of the first of the Stewarts, Robert II., as he is called, the most conspicuous man in Scotland, was undoubtedly James, Earl of Douglas, who was among those who claimed the crown. He withdrew his pretensions upon being given the hand of Euphemia, Robert's daughter, in marriage. He was a fine soldier and a true patriot in the broadest sense of the term. In the wars with England he was opposed by a worthy antagonist, Henry Percy, better known as Hotspur, son of the Earl of Northumberland. These two men were splendid types of the best product of the age in which they lived. Douglas fell at Otterbourne in a battle with Percy. Froissart, the historian, says that this was one of the most hotly contested fields of which we have any account. Victory rested with the Scots, but it was very dearly bought. Robert II. was not an efficient monarch, and when he died in 1388, after a reign of nineteen years, he left to his son John a kingdom distracted by domestic disorders and threatened by a fierce foe.

John took the name of Robert on being crowned, in deference to a popular superstition that the former was an unlucky name in Scottish history. He was weak mentally and physically. He had two sons, David, Duke of Rothsay, and James. David was much the elder and was a fine fellow in all respects, but incurred the hostility of his uncle, the Duke of Albany, who was able to persuade the King that David was leading a dissolute and rebellious life. The King therefore instructed Albany to discipline the Duke of Rothsay. The latter had done the kingdom splendid service on the battlefield, and especially in his able defence of Edinburgh Castle against Henry IV., but this was not able to save him from the hatred of his uncle. A conspiracy was formed to bring about his death, and it took the form of representations to the King that something should be done to cure the young man of his profligacy. The king consented to his son's arrest, and David was thrown a prisoner into Falkland Castle, where he was starved to death. Thus perished a man who was of the very type needed by Scotland in this period of her dire distress. James, the King's second son, was at this time in his eleventh year, and his father was easily persuaded to send him to France to be educated. The ship in which the

lad sailed was captured by the English, although it was during a truce, and James was taken to London, where Henry IV. assumed charge of his education, in which it must be conceded he showed much kindness and excellent judgment. But the shock was too great for the Scottish king, who died a year after, that is in 1406, leaving the kingdom in the hands of the unscrupulous and incapable Duke of Albany, who acted as regent until it became possible years after to effect an arrangement for the release of James to assume the Scottish Crown.

THE FOUNDATION OF LAW

II.

Last Sunday an attempt was made to show that the foundation of law lies in the right of every person, being alive, to remain alive as long as natural conditions will permit, and that out of this grew the right of property and the principle that the welfare of the state is the supreme law. It may not be unprofitable to follow the same line of thought a little further. Life is reproductive. This is true of everything that lives, from the lowest vegetable organism up to man. There is in the whole organic universe not only a desire for self-preservation, but also an impelling influence for reproduction. Perhaps one of the most striking illustrations of this is to be found in an ear of corn. Grown in its natural habitat, corn produces a minimum number of fertile seeds, but as it is grown in latitudes less favorable for germination, the seeds become more numerous and more generally fertile. All animate nature is inspired with the instinct of reproduction. A little thought will demonstrate that, as the human animal requires an exceptionally long time to become able to defend and support itself, the institution of the family is necessary to the preservation of the race. In the case of other animals, a few days, weeks or months are all that is required to enable the young to get enough food and seek shelter from danger; but even in their case infant mortality, from one cause or another, is very high. If it were not, the earth would be overrun with wild creatures. In the case of mankind, years are needed to qualify the young to protect and feed themselves, even under the most favorable conditions. Hence some recognized system for the protection of the young must be provided, or the earth would become depopulated. Herein we find the natural basis of the institution known as the family. It is necessary for the preservation of the race. From this we see that whatever tends to destroy the family relationship is an offence against the race, and the race is bound by every instinct of self-protection to punish those who offend against that relationship. Doubtless in working out this problem of racial protection by means of the family, mankind has made errors, but as that is the case with every other department of human law, we need not be surprised. "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee," was a commandment so expressed in order to emphasize to the Children of Israel their duty in that regard. They were seeking a promised land, and naturally everything bearing upon the tenure of their future domain would produce a profound effect upon their minds; but the inclusion of such a command in the fundamental laws laid down for their guidance has a special interest. The Israelites, who were gathered around Sinai, had just escaped from bondage and were enjoying a freedom unknown to their race for many generations. It is easy to understand the importance of impressing upon them the necessity of preserving the family relation. Hence this commandment, one that is spoken of as "the first commandment with promise." Indeed, it is the only commandment in the Decalogue to which a promise is attached. One might argue from this that of all the Ten this was deemed the most important; and if one reflects upon the object of the Israelitish migration from Egypt, we will see that, if the Ten Commandments were simply the edicts of Moses, he would very naturally lay the greatest stress upon the commandment, the observance of which was essential to the life of the nation; and if they were of Divine origin, we have the remarkable fact that the same pre-eminence is given to this fundamental principle in human society. The strength of Israel as a nation lay in the family relation, and one only needs to read history, or to observe the peoples of the modern world, to recognize that those, which are the most loyal to the family relation, are the strongest. It could be proved from the records of mankind that the days of those races, which have honored father and mother, in other words the family relation, have been long in the land, which the Lord their God has given them. The strength of Greece in the days of her golden glory lay in the family tie. Rome drew her all-conquering force from the same fruitful source of power. British greatness rests upon the family as a corner stone. Germany's strength arises from her fidelity to the family relation. It is not surprising, therefore, that sins against the family as an institution are regarded by mankind everywhere as those which are the hardest to forgive; that those vices, which tend to the destruction of home life and the rearing of healthy children, are looked upon as the most hateful of all, as the only vices which place those who practice them, outside the scope of human forgiveness. Now and then some self-styled champion of

woman's freedom protests against certain recognized social laws as survivals of man's tyranny; but they are not. They are the expression of the wisdom of human experience; they are necessary for the maintenance of the family as an institution; they are necessary for the preservation of the race.

THE EARTH

XV.

In proportion to its area Europe has an exceptionally large number of important rivers, although none of them approach in magnitude the great river systems of America. The greatest European river is the Volga, lying wholly in Russia, and having a drainage basin of 563,300 square miles. The Volga is 2,200 miles long. Its source is only 550 feet above the sea level. Its mouth, by which it flows into the Caspian Sea, is 86 feet below sea level. Therefore the river for a very considerable part of its course is also below the level of the sea. This is the only large river in the world of which this can be said. The Danube is the second European river. It has a length of 1,875 miles and a drainage basin of 300,000 square miles. Its source is on the northerly slope of the Alps and not far from the source of the Rhine. It breaks through the mountains, which extend northward from Switzerland into Germany, traverses the great plain of Hungary, breaks through the mountains of which the Balkans are the southern part and the Carpathians the northern, and then flows across the Wallachian Plains to the Black Sea. Its source is 2,850 feet above the sea level, and it receives the waters of sixty navigable streams. It is itself navigable for a long distance, and has played a very important part in the development of central Europe. The Dneiper is a fine river in southern Russia, having a length of about 1,000 miles, navigable almost all the way from its source to the sea. The Northern Dvina, which flows into the White Sea, is another Russian river, or rather group of rivers, having a common outlet. Their united length is upwards of 1,000 miles. The Rhine is 850 miles long, and has a drainage basin of 86,000 square miles. Of feeders, big and little, most of them little, it has 1,200. Its sources are in the Alps, one of them being at an altitude of 7,500 feet above the sea. It is nowhere half a mile in width. While navigable in many parts, its course is frequently interrupted by rapids and cascades. It enters the sea by means of a delta, where, in the course of ages, it has built up extensive alluvial deposits. The resemblance between the Rhine and the Fraser is in many respects very striking. Other important European rivers are: The Rhone, which rises in Switzerland, but flows chiefly through France. It is 550 miles long and navigable for 360 miles; the Loire, which is wholly in France, and is 645 miles long; the Seine, also in France, is 497 miles long, and is navigable for 350 miles; the Elbe is 550 miles long; the Ebro is a river in Spain, 340 miles long; the Tagus, in Spain and Portugal, is 540 miles long; the Vistula, chiefly in Russia, is 530 miles long; the Oder, 550 miles long, is in northeastern Germany; the Don, a river in Russia, is 468 miles long. Others might be named, but these will serve to give a general idea of the magnitude of European rivers. In the United Kingdom, the rivers are necessarily small, but the magnitude of some of them may be interesting for purposes of comparison. The Thames is 215 miles in length; the Severn 210, the Trent 140, and the Ouse 160, unite to form the Humber, 27 miles long; the Tyne, only 35 miles long, the Tweed, 95, the Clyde 75 miles, the Shannon 224.

The rivers of Europe have played an exceedingly important part in the history of the world, a much more important part relatively than the rivers of America are likely to. Their number is very great, and perhaps it may be said with accuracy that their total mileage is greater than that of the rivers of any other part of the world of similar area.

THE THERMOMETER

Replying to a request for some information regarding thermometers, it may be stated that, while there are various kinds of "heat-measurers," for that is what thermometer means, the variety in popular use depends upon expansion of mercury under heat. Of all known metals mercury, that is quick-silver, melts at the lowest temperature, and as it melts, it expands just as other metals do. A rod of steel would serve as a thermometer, if it were not that steel responds very slowly to changes in temperature. The ordinary thermometer is a glass bulb at the end of a glass tube. Sufficient mercury is placed in it to fill the bulb, when solid. As soon as it melts, the mercury rises in the tube, and it mounts higher and higher as the heat increases. If the tube were open at the top and the heat were sufficient, the mercury would pass off in the form of vapor. Let us suppose we have such a bulb and tube with mercury in it. We place this in a mixture of finely pulverized ice and water, that is water just ready to freeze, and note the point at which the top of the mercury stands in the tube. This is the freezing point, and is marked accordingly. Then the tube is placed in boiling water, and the point at which the mercury then stands is marked, and this is the boiling point. We can divide the space between these points as we see fit, and the divisions would

be called degrees. Celsius, of Upsala, called the freezing point of water Zero, and divided the distance between it and the boiling point into 100 degrees. We use the Fahrenheit thermometer in this country, and it is also used in the United Kingdom and the United States. Fahrenheit endeavored to produce what he thought was the lowest temperature artificially obtainable, and he mixed salt and snow together. Putting his thermometer into this, he noted where the mercury stood, and called this Zero. He noted the freezing point of water and the boiling point of water, and divided the distance between them into 180 parts or degrees. He found that the difference between his Zero point and the freezing point of water was 32 degrees, and measuring downwards it was subsequently found that the point at which mercury stood when it is solid was 45 of these degrees below the Zero point. In the Fahrenheit thermometer, therefore, Zero is to be understood as the degree of cold produced by a mixture of snow and salt. When we say "below zero," we mean that it is colder than such a mixture. When we say "above zero," we mean that it is warmer than such a mixture; and the degrees are only a convenient means of indicating differences in temperature. When we say that there were a certain number of degrees of frost, we mean that the mercury contracted under the influence of the cold so that it stood so many degrees below the freezing point of water.

Some Famous Dramatists and Their Master-Pieces

(N. de Bertrand Lagren)

RICHARD WAGNER

II.

What Wagner accomplished in the artistic world may be described as the creation of a national music-drama. For his literary themes he sought amid the heroic traditions of the German people, and clothed them in his own inimitable poetry; his harmonies originated with himself, thus the whole conception of his art having taken place in his own mind, the result is consistent in every detail, the poetry is incomplete without the music, the song and action incomplete without the orchestra. In regard to the latter, a competent critic thus writes: "The orchestra speaks an articulate language; suggests, warns, alarms, melts, threatens or moves to tears of sympathy or joy—produces in short that 'demonic' emotion, the effect beyond all for which the reason can account, the effect which Goethe considered the highest achievement of all art. Indeed the music will not yield the whole secret of its charm until the words, the poetic thought, and the entire dramatic conception, have become completely a part of the hearer's mental equipment."

"The perfect artwork, according to Wagner, is the drama, and in order to bring about the perfection of that work, the artist must have the longing to impart, and his hearers a parallel longing to receive, there must be an intense sympathy between a composer and audience, or the work will prove ineffectual, unappealing. To put it a little more strongly, there must be a want on the part of a people for a great art, before that art can be produced. Wagner, in making his argument, cites Shakespeare, who 'created for his fellow-players that drama which seems to us the more astounding as we see it rise by might of naked speech alone, without all help of kindred arts. One only help it had, the fancy of his audience, which turned with active sympathy to greet the inspiration of the poet's comrades. A genius the like of which was never heard, and a group of favoring chances never repeated, in common made amends for what they lacked in common. Their joint creative force, however, was need; and where this shows its nature-bidden might, there man can compass even the impossible to satisfy it; from poverty grows plenty, from want an overflow; the boorish figure of the homely folk's comedian takes on the bearing of a hero, the raucous clang of daily speech becomes the sounding music of the soul, the rude scaffolding of carpet-hung boards becomes a world-stage with all its wealth of scene. But if we take away this artwork from its frame of fortunate conditions, if we set it down outside the realm of fertile force which bore it from the need of this indefinite epoch, then do we see with sorrow that the poverty was still but poverty, that want but want; that Shakespeare was indeed the mightiest poet of all time, but his artwork was not yet the work for every age; that not his genius, but the incomplete and merely willing, not yet canning, spirit of his age's art had made him the Thespis of the tragedy of the future. In the same relation as stood the car of Thespis, in the brief time-span of the flowering of Athenian art, to the stage of Aeschylus and Sophocles, so stands the stage of Shakespeare, which made of him a universal man, a very god, is yet but the kindred deed of the solitary Beethoven, who found the language of the artist-mankind of the future: only where these twin Prometheus—Shakespeare and Beethoven—shall reach out hands to one another; where the marble creations of Phidias shall bestir themselves in flesh and blood; where the painted counterfeit of nature shall quit its cribbing-frame on the warm-life-

blown framework of the future stage—there first, in the communion of all his fellow-artists, will the poet also find redemption."

The above words, when we bear in mind that they are but a translation, prove the right of Wagner to the title of philosopher as well as poet. It is small wonder that a man who had such wise and noble convictions, and the genius of a hundred artists rolled into one, made such a deep impression on his own nation and the artistic element of the whole world.

We have space only to cite a few of Wagner's poems. The central theme in all of them is Love, usually Love triumphant.

"Tristan and Isolde" is a modification of the old romance which artists before and after him have used as a theme to embellish with beautiful poetic harmonies. Wagner made a slight change in the original story. Tristan and Isolde had loved one another before they drank the potion, and throughout the poem Tristan remains faithful to King Mark. The triumph of the lover's passion is attained only in a death which reconciles all that has gone before.

The power of gold in "Rheingold" is contrasted with the power of love. "The love and faithfulness of Siegmund and Sieglinde in the 'Walkure' show Brunnhilde for the first time what love can do, and when Siegfried in the idyllic fairy-tale that bears his name, awakens her from her long sleep, she throws aside her Walkure nature for the joy of human love. Siegfried is the free, fate-defying man, triumphing over the powers of darkness and destiny; to him Wotan, ever seeking guidance from the mother of wisdom, is forced to yield. In the 'Götterdämmerung' the god awaits the fulness of time, while the guileless Siegfried falls a victim to the wiles of man. But the end towards which Wotan blindly strove is attained by Siegfried's death. Brunnhilde, to whom the counsels of the gods are known, restores the symbolic ring to the daughters of the Rhine, and in twilight the ancient reign of the gods comes to an end. The reign of love is proclaimed as Brunnhilde immolates herself on Siegfried's funeral pyre.

It was in 1882 that Wagner saw his life work crowned by the performance of "Parsifal" at Bayreuth. On February 13, 1883, the poet-composer died in Venice.

ETUDE REALISTE

(Apologies to Swinburne)

A wife's a wife, a thing to love,
To soothe, to pet;
But who could pet—ye gods above!
A Suffragette?

A wife's to sew a cushion fine,
And dinner get;
Would she be ever home to dine,
A Suffragette?

A wife's to soothe the bairnies sma'
Where'er they fret;
Could she sing Bal-a-loo and a'—
A Suffragette!

A wife against hard luck is like
An amulet.
But no such superstitions strike
A Suffragette!

A wife's a woman, formed to please;
But 'tis a debt
Paid to the Public Ear, if she's
A Suffragette.

—Jessie Anderson Chase, in Life.

ORIGIN OF THE CALENDAR

The Julian year consisted of 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days and exceeded by 11 minutes 13.95 seconds the solar year of 365 days, 5 hours 48 minutes 46 seconds. In consequence of this, the equinox in the course of a few centuries fell back considerably. In the time of Julius Caesar, it corresponded to March 25, and by the sixteenth century it had retrograded to March 11. It was at this time that a physician of Verona named Ghiraldi proposed a plan for amending the calendar. He died before he had opportunity to carry it forward, but his brother presented it to Pope Gregory XIII., who assembled a number of learned men to discuss it. It was passed upon favorably and adopted, and thus was given to the world what has since been known as the Gregorian Calendar. In 1582 Gregory issued a brief, abolishing the Julian Calendar in all Catholic countries, and introducing the reformed one.

The reform of the Gregorian or new on the Julian or old consisted in dropping 10 days after October 4, 1582, so that the 15th was reckoned immediately after the fourth. Every 100th year, which by the old style was a leap year, was to be a common year, the fourth century, divisible by four, excepted; that is, 1600 was to remain a leap year, but 1700, 1800 and 1900 were not to be reckoned as such, while 2000 is to be so reckoned.

In this calendar the length of the solar year is taken to be 365 days 5 hours 49 minutes and 12 seconds, the difference between which and the true length is immaterial.—The Canadian Herald.

"Ere, Bill, wot's the matter? You're lookin' worrid."

"Work—nothing but work from mornin' till night."

"Ow long 'ave you been at it?"

"I begin tomorrow."—M.A.P.