

ENTERBROS

lue

ishings



ice Here

ishing values for your  
give attention to this

nt want furniture that  
over up defects and de-  
ter careful thought be-  
nt—back of it, ready to  
at has been doing busi-

alues

to be able to save you  
our offerings. We list

The Kitchen

generators  
teledware  
are  
en Tables  
Tables, 1 set to 10  
en Cupboards  
en Chairs  
eums  
the "kitchen things."

on

ose dainty, small style  
Come in and see the

is a neat little buffet  
k—finished in golden  
r, 3 small drawers,  
nd a large bevel plate  
est quality. Priced  
\$50.00

already profited by  
bathroom, hall, pan-  
all gone tomorrow.



6 cups and saucers

\$7.50

sec. These include  
stone, mosaic bodies,  
h scenes, landscapes

easy enough to per-  
y to secure the pick

15c  
15c

Furnish-  
ers of  
Churches  
Schools  
Boats

THE VICTORIA COLONIST



# An Hour with the Editor



## SOVEREIGNS OF ENGLAND

Richard I. is possibly the most picturesque figure among the sovereigns of England, but he was nevertheless the least English of her kings. He was born at Oxford, but his native country seems to have seen very little of him. He ruled it, if he can be said to have ruled it at all, as a foreign land. He only visited it twice after his accession to the crown; once in order that he might be crowned, and once that he might be recrowned after his release from his German prison. When quite a youth he was invested with the government of his mother's domains in the southern part of what is now France. After some serious troubles with his father, Henry, Richard took the Cross and prepared for a crusade, but his departure was delayed until after his father's death. His coronation was a gorgeous ceremony, and it has served as the model for all subsequent incidents of the same nature in England. Richard at once began to collect funds for the Crusade, and for this purpose sold to the Scottish king freedom from fealty to the English crown and conferred great concessions upon the Church. He then sailed for the East, and for five years was not again on English soil. His achievements on the Crusade have been the theme of many a story, and his capture on his return journey by the Archduke of Austria, who handed him over to the Emperor Henry VI, his ransom and his return home are matters familiar to every one. What is not so generally known is that he did homage to the Emperor for the English crown, which he surrendered into the Emperor's hands and received it back as his vassal. This act was more than his English subjects would submit to, and the vassalage was ended by a second coronation. Richard spent a few months in England restoring order, for the country had been somewhat disturbed through the plotting of his brother John, and then, gathering what funds he could, he set sail for France to try conclusions with King Philip of that country. He never returned to the kingdom. For five years he and Philip strove for supremacy, and then, exhausted, agreed on a truce for five years. Richard was slain by an archer, while besieging the castle of a rebellious vassal. He died in 1199, after a reign of ten years.

Richard has gone down into history as Coeur de Leon, and the title has assisted in centering around his name a halo of romance. The title was not bestowed upon him, as many suppose, because of his intrepid personal courage. He would, indeed, have been a degenerate descendant of the family of the Conqueror and of the Counts of Anjou if this quality had not been highly developed in him. Personal valor was too common an attribute of the knighthood of those days to permit any one to be singled out because he possessed it. He was called Richard of the Lion Heart because of his relentless disposition, his passion for war and, of course, for his absolute fearlessness as well. Like the rest of the Angevin family, he was by nature ferocious. He was vicious, a bad son and a bad husband. At the same time he was generous and lavish. He possessed little or no faculty for government, and seemed incapable of formulating comprehensive plans. No one knew his shortcomings in this respect better than himself, and because of this knowledge he made possible the further development during his reign of those institutions, which we are accustomed to call English.

Hubert, Archbishop of Canterbury, was the virtual ruler of England during the reign of Richard. He had only one commission from the King, and that was to raise as much money as was possible for the purpose, in the first place, of carrying on the Crusade, in the second place, of ransoming him from the hands of the Emperor, and in the third place, for carrying on the war against Philip of France. Englishmen took only a minor part in the warlike operations of their king, and most of his fighting was done by mercenaries, for whose pay the English people contributed freely, though not always as willingly as the king desired. Hubert, with rare sagacity, saw it was hopeless to enforce contributions in money, and with the desire of preventing friction as far as possible invited the people to participate in the government of the country. A representative assembly was constituted. It is not quite clear to what extent popular election contributed towards the personnel of this institution. It is certain that some of its members were appointed by the sheriffs, and that some of them were chosen by popular vote; but in whatever way it was brought into existence, Hubert, with splendid sagacity, cast upon it the responsibility of deciding almost everything of a public nature, including the levying of taxes. Thus was laid the foundation of British representative government and the right of the common people to the control of the tax-imposing power. It is true that this right was not very clearly defined, but it is also true that the right was declared to be in keeping with the ancient rights of the people of England. It is true, indeed, that subsequent sovereigns paid little attention to this popular control of the right of taxation. Nevertheless, the foundations of the system were then laid, and it is interesting to note that in the year 1910, more than seven centuries after Hubert recognized the existence of this right, the control of taxation by the Commons is again in issue. Later in Richard's reign, this representative body, under the guidance of two of the bishops, refused to sanction any further levies for the maintenance of the army in France.

While, personally, Richard did absolutely nothing for the advancement of his country, and his only legacy to it is his name and a record of valiant, though profitless, achievements,

his reign was marked by great constitutional development. His absence from the kingdom left the people largely free to work out their own problems, and freedom from any prolonged discord at home, for the attempt of John to secure the crown did not amount to more than a family quarrel, gave Englishmen an opportunity to develop the faculty of self-government. The assimilation of the races was proceeding rapidly. It is said that when Richard ascended the throne all traces of difference between Norman and Saxon had disappeared. So complete had the absorption of the Norman element been, that in a very long poem, written during this reign, professing to give a synopsis of the history of England from the days of Alfred, only fifty Norman words appear. In the century and a quarter after William of Normandy had overthrown Harold at Senlac, the English people had been formed by the complete intermixture of the Celtic population still held aloof in Wales and Cornwall, but the remainder of the nation had become homogeneous. During that century and a half England had been very fortunate as compared with continental nations. Except for the anarchy resulting from Stephen's usurpation, and a few minor disturbances, the country had been at peace. It was increasing rapidly in wealth. It has always been the wonder of historians where the money came from that was spent so lavishly in foreign wars; but it was a common saying of the people that they would stand by their kings with their goods "for the good peace they gave." When Richard died he was ruler over all the country from the Tyne to the Pyrenees; but his continental territory had been bled white in countless battles, while his insular dominion had parted with little except its money, and the industrious population were always able to replenish their store of this commodity and at the same time increase the scope of their priceless boon of freedom.

## BEGINNING OF HISTORY

About 450 B.C., Ezra, who had led an expedition of the Jews from Babylon to Jerusalem about eight years before, compiled and classified the English Scriptures. We are without any definite knowledge of the sources of his information, and cannot say how much, if any of the history of the Children of Israel was actually written by him, and how much by persons preceding him. We do know, however, that he was held in the highest esteem by the Jewish people, who regarded him as the second founder of their nation. As Ezra was a man of great learning, and had lived and been educated in Babylon, he doubtless had access to the stores of knowledge then accumulated, and to the historical and traditional records of the Chaldeans. Between the Babylonian accounts of creation, the antediluvian period and the deluge, and the account given in Genesis of these same stages in the world's history, there is considerable similarity, but the former is full of details and characterized by much that to our modern ideas seems grotesquely absurd, while the latter is dignified and a simple statement of events. If, as has been suggested, the early chapters of Genesis are founded upon Babylonian tradition, there is one remarkable difference between them, namely the prevalence of the monotheistic idea in the Jewish narrative, although there are not lacking traces of polytheism in it. If the Jewish narrative came from an independent source, it and the Babylonian account corroborate each other to a certain extent. The latter professes to explain what took place before the visible universe was created, and we may dismiss this and the story of creation in both instances as outside of the domain of history. It seems impossible to regard the story of the Deluge as anything else than historical. There is altogether too much testimony to its occurrence to permit its dismissal as a fable. No one account of it may be anything like correct. The probability is altogether against anything of the kind; but every candid student must admit that there is ample evidence to establish the fact that a great epoch-making flood occurred several thousand years before the Christian era. The date cannot be fixed even with an approach to accuracy, but whenever it took place, or however general it may have been, in its extent, there is reason to say that it is the earliest historical event in the history of mankind.

Both the Jewish and the Babylonian records profess to tell of the history of the world before the Flood; but if our credulity finds itself staggered when asked to believe that Methuselah lived for upwards of nine hundred years, what shall we say of Oannes reigned 36,000? It is much more difficult to fit in the periods as given for Babylonian dynasties than it is to harmonize the duration of the lives of the antediluvians as related in Genesis, and therefore, when we find that something like 600,000 years must be allowed for the period between the Creation and the Flood, to allow for the events related in the Chaldean records, we are compelled to give up any attempt to adjust the alleged facts to terms of history. Even when we come to the post-diluvian period, we have exceedingly long periods claimed by the Babylonian writers for the several dynasties, which ruled the Mesopotamian valley until the Persians came. At least 36,000 years are required to give time for the alleged succession of ruling families. These periods may or may not have actually elapsed. In this connection, as was mentioned a few weeks ago in connection with Biblical chron-

ology, we are without any certain measure of time, for we do not know with certainty what system these ancient people followed, and although apparently the length of the era between the Flood and the Persian invasion as above stated, seems to be confirmed by astronomical data, these are too few and too uncertain to warrant the opinion that deductions from them are even approximately correct.

The dawn of trustworthy history shows a people living in the Mesopotamian region, who were of Northern origin. They were of what has been called Turanian stock, although for this particular branch of that race the term Sumerian has been suggested. Other members of this section of the human family were the Turks, the Huns, and several more. These people brought with them to the South a tradition that their home had once been at the foot of what was called the "World Mountain," which was supposed to have been a link between the Earth and Heaven, and the home of the gods. A fairly successful attempt has been made to locate this fabled mountain at the North Pole. We saw in our reference to the early history of India that a somewhat similar race overran that country before the great Aryan invasion. These Sumerians were well advanced in civilization. They understood working in metals, built houses of stone and possessed the system of writing known as the cuneiform, or wedge-like. How long they lived in uninterrupted possession of their new home is purely a matter of surmise, because no one knows when they came from the North; but the termination of their rule can be fixed with something approaching accuracy. About 4,000 B. C. a Semitic race, who were a wandering people, invaded Chaldea, or Mesopotamia, and succeeded in establishing themselves. After a time they imposed their institutions and ideas upon the people of the land, the process being somewhat similar to that which created the English people out of the Saxons and Normans.

The origin of the Semitic race is not certain, but the best opinion seems to be that its home was in Arabia prior to the northeastern migration, which carried them into the valleys of the Euphrates and Tigris. The Semites are sometimes called the Aryans, and signifies noble. They correspond to those peoples, who according to the narrative in Genesis, trace their descent from Shem, the son of Noah. Physically and mentally they appear to have been superior to any other branch of the human family, and it is worthy of notice that it was in this branch alone that the idea of one omnipotent God seems to have been preserved. After the amalgamation of the Sumerians and the Semites, the progress of Babylon and Chaldea was rapid. It was then that the famous Queen Semiramis reigned, although the story of her life and deeds is largely fable. Many centuries passed concerning which we know little with certainty, for history, reliable in its details and possessing some certainty in respect to dates, only begins to deal with the region of Chaldea after the time of Cyrus the Great, or about 550 B.C.

## PROOF

In one of his Epistles the Apostle Paul advises those to whom he was writing to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." In other words, he told them to use their own good sense in determining what they ought to accept as rules of faith and conduct. The word "prove" in this sense does not mean what it does in an arithmetical or geometrical proposition. We can prove that 2 and 2 make 4 because we call what 2 and 2 make 4 and the fact is apparent to the eye. We can prove that two straight lines cannot inclose a space, or that any two angles of a triangle must be together less than two right angles. We can not only prove that these things are true, but also why they are true. Paul did not use the word in this sense, but as meaning "test." There is a fundamental difference between proving that a thing is and proving why it is. You can prove that an unsupported stone will fall to the ground simply by testing it; but you may search forever and not find out why it falls. You can learn the rules governing "why" of it. Speaking generally, it may be said that science does not concern itself with reasons, but with facts and laws. Many tests have established the facts and the laws, and we go on to utilize the forces of nature with implicit confidence as to the result. Close by the manuscript of this article stands an electric light. Experiment has shown that the cord which conveys the electricity to the carbon film is charged with a potent energy, yet no one would hesitate about turning off the light through fear of receiving a shock. We know that the energy-laden wire is encased with something that makes it safe, and that the switch is a non-conductor of electricity. But we do not know why it is a non-conductor. Here is a telephone. Some of us know how it operates; but the wisest investigator does not know why it works. In the natural world it is the same. We know that under certain circumstances a seed will germinate; but we do not know why it germinates. We live, move and have our being; we build houses and ships, we do the thousand and one things that go to make up our complex civilization, but we do not know the "why" of even one material phenomenon.

On the other hand, when they consider the things of the spiritual world, many men insist upon proof not of the facts, but of the reason of the facts. In his discussion with Jesus as to spiritual birth, Nicodemus asked at least twice how certain things could be. He wanted to know reasons. Facts were not sufficient for him. No one ought to suggest that there

is anything wrong in seeking for reasons; but it may be a great waste of energy and lead to a great loss of opportunity. If whenever we went into a telegraph office to send a message we insisted on some one explaining why it is that the magnetization and demagnetization of one end of a wire magnified and demagnetized the other end of it, we would not only never get the message sent, but make ourselves great nuisances. We accept the demonstration of the fact, and send the message. It may be granted that in the spiritual realm there are certain uncertain factors in demonstrations made by other people. We never can be absolutely sure that they are telling the truth.

That wonderful invention, the telegraph, if that is the correct name for the instrument which records telephonic messages, by some mysterious process impresses the spoken words upon a fine wire, and though you may handle that wire and examine it with a glass, you cannot detect in any particular how it has been affected. Pass a magnet over it, and to all appearance the wire is just the same, but the record of the words is gone. You find no difficulty in believing this, although no one, not even the inventor himself, can explain the reason of it. The process is explainable, but the ultimate "why" is not. If one should say that by the exercise of the power of faith alone he had accomplished what seemed inexplicable, the chances are that you would decline to believe him. You would want him to show you how such things can be. But surely, apart altogether from the teachings of Christianity and other religions in regard to the operation of spiritual forces, we have reached that stage in human progress when we may well restrain our doubts about the reality of such things. It is quite possible that we may cease to regard them as supernatural; but we have never had any warrant except in superstition and ignorance for supposing that they were. If you read the New Testament you will see that to Jesus and the Apostles these wonderful spiritual things were wholly natural. The narrative in regard to Nicodemus shows that to Jesus the idea of spiritual birth was no less natural than that of physical birth.

But to return to the question of proof. St. Paul says that spiritual things are spiritually discerned. The application of spiritual forces to natural things is a matter of evidence; the effect of these forces upon the spiritual side of our natures is a matter of experience, and it is just as absurd for a man, who has never had such an experience, to deny its possibility as it would be for a person, who had never seen a telephone, to deny that we can talk over wires. Things are proved by tests. There is no other way in either the physical or the spiritual world, outside of the realm of mathematics, which is itself outside the domain of things, being a part of the law governing things. For obvious reasons every one must make his own spiritual tests. He cannot employ any one, pope, cardinal, archbishop, bishop, priest or minister, nor all of them sitting in the most solemn conclave, to make them for him. He may accept their conclusions and act, acting in the light of them and of the experience of others, proceed to make his own tests; but the final and conclusive proof is his own experience. He may say that he accepts this or that doctrine, he may say he believes this or that teaching; but he can never say he knows until he has himself made the test. Hence those persons, who in their assumption of superior wisdom, decline to believe that others have had the experience of a spiritual life, are utterly unscientific, and it is not impossible that the day may be near at hand when the learning of the world will recognize that certain things have been hidden from the wise, but "revealed unto babes."

## A Century of Fiction

XVII.  
(N. de Bertrand Lagim)

### Charlotte Bronte

There have been greater women novelists than Charlotte Bronte, but none who has occupied quite the same place in literature. Hers was a peculiar personality, and impressed itself indelibly upon her works. She wrote powerfully and realistically, so powerfully in fact that her first novel, "Jane Eyre," was severely condemned by some critics, who said that if, indeed, it was the work of a woman, and most people thought the author was a man, that she had no sense of feminine delicacy, and should be ostracized from her kind. Probably were such a novel produced today, it would occasion no comment on the grounds of its realism, but Charlotte Bronte belonged to another period, when very different things were expected from women than we look for today. And yet the real author was not at all the sort of person that the critics painted her. She was a plain, shrinking, timid, refined, sad little woman, who did not in the least deserve their calumny, and wrote only from her own bitter experience.

She was born in the parish of Bradford, in 1816, and her mother dying young, left her to the care of a stern, harsh father, who never made any effort to understand his children or win their affection. He was a clergyman, and quite unnecessarily strict in his views, therefore the life at the parsonage was a gloomy one for all concerned. When they were old enough to go to school, the situation was not changed for the better for Charlotte and her two sisters. So badly was the institution which they attended conducted, that the pupils were ill-used and never given enough to eat, in consequence

of which treatment one of the sisters, Maria, fell ill, and died the following year. A few months later, Elizabeth, the other sister who had been at school, died, probably from the same cause or causes. Almost broken-hearted Charlotte was allowed to return home, where she remained for six years, going after that time to a school at Roehead for three years. Afterwards, wishing to become proficient in French, she went to France to study, and it was here that she met M. Heger, and the two became deeply attached to one another, which fact gave rise to unhappy misconstruction on the part of their friends and acquaintances.

Charlotte's two other sisters, Emily and Anne, had also distinct literary ability, and when the three were at home together, after Charlotte's return from France, they were of mutual assistance to one another. They produced, in conjunction, a little book of poems which they published at their own expense, and which was mildly and favorably reviewed. Charlotte's masterpiece appeared in 1847, and she wrote it under stress of much sadness. Her father was ill, and in danger of becoming blind. Her idolized only brother was ruining himself, mind and body, through dissipation. It is not surprising that the story bears the impress of sorrow and disappointment. However, it brought her fame at once. The novel produced a profound sensation, and in spite of adverse criticism had an enormous sale. With it all, Charlotte remained unaffected, and quietly continued her work, refusing to go up to London to be made much of by an admiring public; making few friends, but those sincere ones, and among them Thackeray, George Henry Lewes, and Harriet Martineau.

Then came still further sadness. Her brother died—in disgrace. A little later Emily and Anne followed him. Life to the lonely young woman seemed almost too bitter to bear, when love came to her like a ray of sunshine. She married, in 1854, her father's curate, and for a brief time she knew the blessings of peace and joy. Then at the expiration of a few months, life ended for her too. She died in 1855, leaving her husband and father to mourn her. Hers was an inexpressibly sad life, and yet we are told through all her sorrows she was bravely cheerful, never quite losing heart. She was a tender and obedient daughter, to an undeserving parent, and possessed rare patience and sympathy with those whom she loved. Her works, if they do not show genius, give evidence of extraordinary talent and great power of taking pains. Her choice of language is always the best. She believed, with all great writers, that there is but one word to exactly express a particular idea or shade of meaning, and no substitute would answer for her. Hence her descriptions are always appealing and forceful. She has drawn some remarkable characters, and her realism is never overdone.

### Jane Eyre

The opening chapters of this story are almost an autobiography of Charlotte Bronte's own childhood. Here we find the school with its gloomy environment, its rigid cruel discipline, and its atmosphere of frigid propriety, the counterpart of the institution which the author attended with her two sisters. Jane Eyre is the unhappy inmate of the school in the book, from which she goes after some years to work as a governess in the home of a Mr. Rochester. Mr. Rochester is a man of the world, rather eccentric and tied to an insane wife, who is confined in a secret part of the Rochester house. Jane knows nothing of the existence of this unhappy woman, and when Rochester falls in love with Jane and asks her to marry him, she is prevailed upon to consent. Rochester wins her through sheer force of will, and the strength of his personality, unlike most heroes of fiction, he possesses no gallantry whatever. Jane, too, is unlike the ordinary type of heroine, in her utter lack of conventionality. The two are married, but before they leave the church, the girl is made aware of the existence of her lover's wife, and she and Rochester are separated at once. The book is decidedly tragic in its tone, and it is a tragedy that brings Jane and Rochester once more together.

## THE LAUGH LINE

The man who is always dreaming of making money usually wakes up and finds his pockets empty.

A woman usually begins to lose interest in a man after she has succeeded in getting him to say that he loves her.

You may acquire a reputation as a sure thing prophet by arranging to have your predictions come out a hundred years hence.

### Parental Insight

"Pa what is heaping coals of fire?"  
"Something the janitor has never learned, son."—Boston Herald.

### Deserted

The only girl I ever prized  
Deserted me one day.  
She left me for a neighbor  
Who offered her more pay.  
—Life.

### In Current Parlance

"Whiskey," said the physiologist, "not only injures and discolors the skin, but it destroys the coating of your stomach."  
"I see," answered Mr. Chuggins; "it damages the inner tubes as well as the outer casings."—Washington Star.