

The Sun
WILLIAM M. LEFFAN
THURSDAY, JANUARY 15, 1903.
Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.
DAILY, Per Month \$2.00
DAILY, Per Year \$20.00
SUNDAY, Per Year \$5.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year \$25.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month \$2.00
Postage to foreign countries added.

THE SUN, NEW YORK CITY.
PAPER—Kiosque No. 12, Near Grand Hotel, and Kiosque No. 10, Boulevard des Capucines.

11 our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication we have repeated articles returned they must be all cases send them with postage.

The Generations.

The genealogy up to the present time is straight and simple. It is about as here set forth:
The original great-grandfather was the Hon. CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD of Maine, a statesman and a serious thinker. The Littlefield family had lived twelve months or thereabouts and begat the President's Message.

The President's Message lived twenty-four hours, more or less, and begat the Cullom anti-monopoly bill.
The Cullom anti-monopoly bill lived in a pigeon-hole for Mr. HOAR's committee room for full thirty days and begat the Hoar trust-revelation bill; but the record of this offspring's birth was by the Senator most cunningly antedated, in order that it might appear to many that the Cullomite was not so very much the elder.

The Hoar bill, commonly known as the Drastic, lived nine days and begat twins, namely: The Roosevelt-Knox-Jenkins anti-trust commission bill and the Roosevelt-Knox-Jenkins Federal-compulsion-within-the-States bill. The twin were better known as the Administration Measures.

And one of these twins, it is not well known which, has now begotten a new child of light, the Littlefield-Jenkins composite or compromise repressor.

This descendant of the aboriginal Littlefield trust bill now occupies the land and is soon to be beheld by the sons of men.

Thus pass swiftly away the old, and thus doth one generation of trust-busters follow close upon another; but of what sort will be the immediate progeny of the Littlefield-Jenkins composite or compromise repressor is as unknown to you and to us as the whereabouts of the ashes of its successive progenitors.

A Greater President.

Of the many points on which the Knox-Roosevelt anti-trust bills would effect innovations in our system of government we call attention to one in particular, occurring in the bill creating a commission to enforce the Sherman act:
"A commission to be created to aid in carrying out the provisions of the act of July 2, 1890, to be appointed by the President, and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one of whom shall be by him designated as chairman.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of said commission to make diligent investigation into the organization and conduct of the business corporations, joint stock companies and combinations engaged in commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, and to annually, in each year, and oftener if he shall require, to report to the President of the United States.

Among the complaints, if not among the anxieties regarding our Government has been one to the effect that the American President was clothed with too much power. No constitutional monarch is his peer in this respect. Yet here is a proposition to make the President the head of the grandest inquisition ever instituted, the maker and boss of a commission to which the business of the greatest industrial country in the world must report and bow.

In his addresses in New England last spring President ROOSEVELT asked for the establishment of some Federal sovereignty that could control the corporations. The Administration programme would make him such a sovereign with a vengeance, in short, the equal of the forty-five State Governors rolled into one.

Mr. Edward M. Shepard on the Bible.
On Tuesday evening Mr. EDWARD M. SHEPARD spoke to the Bible class conducted by Mr. JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER, Jr., in the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church, Jr., his theme, appropriately, was the Bible and the great profit of its study and the great value of its literary influence, in the form of our admirable English version, more particularly.

Our marvelous English translation, was Mr. SHEPARD'S fit description of the King James version. New translations made with the aid of all the appliances of advanced scholarship have proved powerless to displace it in the general use and affection of English Protestants; it remains a great pillar of English literature. No religious scepticism has yet been able to lessen its pivotal importance and even the present scientific criticism of its originals will be unable to destroy its influence on English speech and thought. Its use as a text book in schools, simply as a treasury of rich and vigorous English, is advocated by a considerable educational association, though that the Bible can be other than a strictly religious book is, obviously, impossible. The very prevalence of criticism of it, however, is now bringing it into new prominence. A great pile of letters, in which appeals are made to the Bible as a means of controversy or sustaining the positions of the Unitarian Dr. STAVROS, now lies before us, and, undoubtedly, the number of them will be increased by every year.

Mr. SHEPARD told young Mr. ROCKEFELLER'S Bible class that now there is, relatively, "greater study of the Book of Books than ever before." Nor can it be denied that the printing and circulation of the Scriptures were never so large as they are now. Of all books, the Bible is most numerous and extensively printed. It has been translated, in whole or in part, into nearly four hundred languages and dialects. Thousands of Bible societies are engaged in the circulation of these versions, and the aggregate of them printed and distributed since the

organization of these agencies must be equal to something like one-quarter of the population of the entire globe. It may be questioned, however, if Mr. SHEPARD'S belief that the study of the Bible is now greater than ever before, "per hundred of men and women," is supported by the facts, more especially so far as concerns the run of the people of Christendom. No one can read the current literature of this day without being impressed with the lessened influence of the Bible on it, or, at least, the less familiarity with the Bible it exhibits, as compared with the writing of a generation or two generations ago. Biblical phrases and illustrations do not enter into contemporary literature and into the current speech so extensively as they did formerly; and, oftentimes, when they are used they are lugged in and are not the natural expressions of minds saturated with the Bible, as were so usually the English writers of a past period. Even in Mr. SHEPARD'S own speech, as reported, we observe the absence of this distinctively Biblical flavor.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER'S Bible class is a flourishing institution, but how is it with such classes in the churches of that neighborhood generally? Family prayer, with the reading of selections from the Scriptures, was once almost universal among pious Protestants, but, according to reports, it has fallen into disuse so extensively that it is now rare. The reading of the Bible as a regular daily exercise, once usual among all earnestly religious Protestants, has become infrequent. From pulpits criticisms of the Bible or attempts to explain away its obvious meaning are frequent. In private conversation little is likely to be heard of the Bible, unless in the way of criticism.

It is true that at the same time the study of the Bible by special students is proceeding more thoughtfully than ever before, but the results of their critical inquiry, analysis and comparison, as exemplified in the fashionable "Higher Criticism," do not tend to promote popular reverence for "the Book of Books." It has been brought into the field of scientific investigation, and inferentially displaced from its supreme elevation as the indisputable Word of God. The Churches which rest on the Bible as the sole authority in religion do not seem to be making as strong an appeal to the religious taste of our people, in the great towns, more especially, as do those which supplement it with the authority of tradition and are made attractive by the splendor of ceremony and symbolism. Professionally religious papers, once prosperous exceedingly, are now usually finding feeble support, except where they have been secularized or their religion has been so far diluted as to be scarcely recognizable.

Mr. SHEPARD, however, was justified wholly in saying that now more than ever the moral tone of the Bible pervades civilization; and that this is true of New York, more especially. As compared with the other great capitals of Christendom, New York is probably the most religious, so far, at least, as concerns the formal expression of religion. The ratio of church attendance here as compared with London is much greater, as the recent enumeration of that attendance in the two cities has demonstrated. The number of absolute believers in the Scriptures and of devout students of them has been greatly increased in New York during the last decade by the large immigration of Orthodox Jews from Eastern Europe, so far as concerns the Old Testament. It is among these that the Bible of the Old Dispensation seems now to be best known.

A Jeffersonian Dress Reformer.
Out of Chicago, the home of thought and the inexhaustible treasure house of ideas and women's clubs, fly winged words of awful meaning to mere men. Mrs. DANIEL M. LORD, a clubwoman, has been talking to a collection of clubwomen on "Dress," an immortal theme. She traced the triumphant march of clothes from the rivers of Paradise and the fig tree to the automobile coat and the rainy-day skirt. A mighty maze, but not without a plan to the seeing feminine eye. We should like to linger on the journey, for Mrs. LORD has no garlands to give mere man at the end of it. She celebrates the modern garb of women and jeers the toga of men. She insists that "women are more sensible to-day than men." That is a safe general proposition and carries but a cold compliment to the sense of women. Mrs. LORD finds in women's clothes proof of this feminine majority of good sense:

"They wear practical shoes, skirts and shirt waists. They have discarded the tight corset, the hoop skirt, the disgusting bustle and the useless pantafoote. And now turn to men's dress—their unbecoming hats, protruding baldness and those terrible stiff shirts. They should wear dress suits in business hours and dress affairs they could do no better than to try to look as much as possible like THOMAS JEFFERSON, who was always beautifully and becomingly arrayed."

She is a most sarcastic woman, this quiet Mrs. LORD? We can see the laughter flashing around that circle of clubwomen, as she calmly recommends the men to imitate JEFFERSON. This is a clear case of lese-majesty, but we suppose there's no way of punishing the offender. This contemptuous treatment of mere man is regrettable common in "club circles." JEFFERSON was a good deal of a skyscraper. Most men come nearer to SIMON TAPPIT than to the Sage of Monticello. We like to believe that golf and its brother exercises are improving the columns of the temple of man. The bicycle and many other modern improvements have long made it possible and even common for the legs of men to appear without trousers and with impunity. Thousands of worthy citizens seem to be in golf stockings and to derive happiness from the contemplation of their emancipated shanks. Still, let the end be truth be told. This is an age of specialization. Supply walks leg-in-leg with demand. The best-furnished legs are all in leathers. The Jeffersonian footmen are many. We shall not pursue a subject at once interesting and distressing. We merely remind Mrs. LORD that trousers are democratic, equal, truly Jeffersonian and not to be abolished or handed.

As to hate: many men's hats are vent-

ilated. As to baldness: it is a known character of the age, an accepted alibi though not yet indispensable mark of high civilization. As to stiff shirts: they are cleaner, easier and give more moral satisfaction than any soft Campanian substitutes. As to "dress affairs": how often shall we have to repeat the frayed saying that men wear evening dress for the same reason that the gondoliers were painted black?

John Mitchell.
The subjoined questions may be food for profitable thought, if not the basis of official action:
"TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: It is not true that JOHN MITCHELL was made to suffer some punishment for his conspiracy last summer against the American people, interfering with the coal trade, so important to the welfare of the people? Ought it not to be made a criminal offense and punished accordingly? A. P. New York, Jan. 13."

If our correspondent would punish MITCHELL for ordering the strike, we must remind him that such acts belong among the liberties common to all Americans and are to be protected like other rights. When a man wants to stop working he can stop.

If, however, he would get at MITCHELL for being practically all last summer the head of organized lawlessness, preventing by violence the coal companies from producing coal, then he is on the right track, except that the indictment applies properly to all MITCHELL'S sympathizers, including the Governor of Pennsylvania and his official colleagues in demagoguery and the misguided citizens who persisted in giving MITCHELL aid and comfort in the form of commendation or money.

The Federal courts had occasion to pronounce the United Mine Workers a lawless organization at the very beginning of the strike. It may not be too late to take notice of that even now.

The Increase of Real Estate Valuation.
The debt of this city is already near the Constitutional limit, and the only way in which more money can be borrowed is to increase the assessed valuation of real property.

The practical question raised by Mayor LOW'S valuation scheme is whether real estate owners in this city will patiently endure this additional burden merely because our officials desire to legalize their administration by lavish expenditure of the public funds. Will the citizen who is compelled to pay thousands of dollars in excess of what he has paid in the past be reconciled to the new burden by the reflection that more and more new tunnels are to be constructed, or that more public works of various kinds are to be constructed?

The Evening Post says that the present Mayor and Comptroller have an eye single to the public interest in the conviction of every human being in Greater New York. Even Tammany Hall believes this. This dictum is uttered in an editorial upholding the new tax scheme. We venture to assert that if a referendum were taken to-morrow it would be found that many thousands of our voters do not believe that the "eye single to the public interest" can be discovered in this new scheme of taxation.

The statement that the amount of taxes paid in the aggregate would be no greater than before may possibly be true for the current year, but it certainly will not be true for any subsequent year.

What a piece of work is man and by what strange and unheroic means he seeks to undo himself! Take the case of JASPER CONNINGHAM, farmer, of Rockport, Ky. JASPER had all Grandmother EVE'S fondness for apples. The other day he ate twenty-five at noon, eighteen at nightfall. He woke up at midnight and put down twelve more, making a grand total of fifty-five for the twenty-four hours. In the morning he didn't wake up. No poetical form of euthanasia, but presumably satisfactory. We read in the papers almost every day that apples are a healthful fruit, to be eaten with especial benefit before you go to bed. But you must beware of the apple habit, which, as the story of JASPER CONNINGHAM teaches us, may be as deadly as the applejack habit.

In a world of surfeits and indigestions, the safe rule is to eat nothing, a rule otherwise recommended by its cheapness. Dr. IMMANUEL PRETZER of Boston can fast in health and happiness for a month. Various fast and otherwise afflicting persons in Minneapolis and St. Paul live on nothing but faith and air for periods of from twenty to fifty days. Thus is Mind getting the better of Matter; and thus slowly but surely, this bad old habit of food and eating is breaking up. It must be admitted that in this town folks eat most of the time a little less than usual. The more reason for fasting elsewhere. There would be perpetual famine if all the country tried to stuff itself in the luxurious Manhattan fashion.

We call the attention of the readers of THE SUN, and of all decent members of labor union in particular, to the following found in another column of a Chicago strike picket as to the money he was paid by the Brass Moulders' Union for assaulting non-union workers.

American management of the Philippines has moved the people there to submit to the chief governor, Judge TART, so urgent a request to remain at his present post that he is willing to forego one of the greatest honors in the gift of his country—a seat on the Federal Supreme bench!

There have been numerous testimonials to the worth of our administration in the East, but nothing to equal this. Judge TART'S public spirit in complying with the Filipinos' wish merits the highest praise.

You might as well try to drive a camel through the eye of a cambric needle as to pass a real anti-trust bill through a Republican Congress.—Chicago News.

Does our Democratic contemporary really want a real anti-trust bill passed through Congress?
His Need Satisfied.
Judge—Why didn't you steer out for the pedestrians?
Whelan—I hadn't time.
Judge—Well, I'll give you ten days.

What He Will Give Up.
De Style—Have you decided to give up anything in the new year?
Gumbusia—Oh, yes Mr. De Style, as usual.

An Appeal.
Knicker—Highland boasts he is a self-made man.
Knicker—Well, he must have made himself out on strike before he finished the job.

THE KNOX THEORY.
The Revolutionary Attempts to Extend the Meaning of "Commerce."
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: You have done it! You pointed out last Monday the way by which the rights which those stupid men who made our Constitution and Union permitted the several States to continue to hold and exercise, such rights as family rights, can be circumvented on the Knox-Roosevelt plan. The fact that each State can regulate for itself the relation of its wife and hold a divorce, the regulation of marriage and divorce has made unhappy very many good people. They advocate, therefore, an amendment of the Constitution, by which shall be imparted to Congress the powers to regulate marriage, divorce and remarriage, as Congress can now regulate interstate commerce.

The State of New York has, for example, much to say in its Penal Code of bigamy and of remarriage after divorce. Many persons wish Congress to have power to put an end to the condemned practices.

You have solved the problem by the suggestion that the Knox-Roosevelt idea of "commerce," as intercourse, be utilized to sweep marriage and divorce into the lap of Congress.

Perhaps you were not serious, but ironical. However that may be, you had warrant in a definition of "commerce" by the Supreme Court in 1824, in that famous case wherein owners of New Jersey ferriesboats plying between Elizabeth and New York deprived the assignees of Fulton, who first in New York applied steam to navigation, of the exclusive right given by New York for a term of years to navigate all New York waters "with boats moved by fire or steam." Oakley and Emmet, two learned New York lawyers of that day, argued that "commerce" covered only trade and traffic, and did not include navigation, and, therefore, the Court would not take away from Fulton's assignees the exclusive right given by New York in consideration of Fulton's grant of invention. But the Court said, by the pen of Marshall:

"Commerce, undoubtedly, is trade, but it is something more. It is intercourse. That definition has been used ever since in an endeavor to sweep into the hands of Congress everything covered by it. Social intercourse has not been contended for openly, but perhaps the contention is in sight."

The Attorney-General disclosed in his recent letter that he is endeavoring, in the Supreme Court, to sustain the conviction of a man for going over an interstate bridge from Kentucky to Ohio with a lottery ticket in his pocket, in violation of the Federal anti-lottery law of 1865. The accused insists that the Constitution has not imparted to Congress a power to suppress lotteries; that the regulation of lotteries is exclusively left to the States, and that carrying a lottery ticket in one's pocket across State boundary is not "commerce among the several States."

It would be rather strange if a farmer's house be on one side of the State line and his barn on the other that Congress can "regulate" his going to and fro over the boundary. And yet what may not be on the theory that commerce means intercourse among the States?

It turns out, however, that the Supreme Court in the case referred to explained in the next sentence that by "intercourse" it was "commercial intercourse" which was intended, and, therefore, marriage and divorce could not be embraced.

The story of the successive steps by which, since 1824, Congress and the Supreme Court have extended the meaning of the provision of all commerce, its vehicles and instruments is an interesting one. It should be told.

The latest effort is to deteate the regulation of State corporations, because they are, or may be, indirectly, the instruments of "commerce among the several States."

But that is not so striking as the effort to punish as criminals, under a Federal law, farmers, planters, miners and producers of raw materials, who are engaged in monopoly by keeping a check or "bargain counter," with no pretence of a fixed price, endeavor afterward to send their production outside of the State.

That, if successful, will be giving the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution a new twist in 1903 under the pen of President ROOSEVELT. STATE RIGHTS. NEW YORK, JAN. 13.

Salvation Army and Lodging Houses.
To THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Lodging-house keepers in the neighborhood of Chatham Square have no reason to entertain apprehensions regarding the Salvation Army's new enterprise. The lodgings are in the edge of the experience of the Salvation Army in the lodging-house line does not warrant very jealous frowns over the threatened systematized system of collecting money for the poor by the Salvation Army lodgings from public charity, and the partial, if not entire, relaxation in their favor of sanitary laws and municipal ordinances, these establishments are nearly completed, and will be completed successfully with those conducted by private enterprise.

I do not care just now, to enter upon an extended review of the fact that such a fact is well known to all lodging-house keepers, and to none of the politicians, and is not to be kept secret. To the proud and sensitive feelings of the average American citizen, even the intelligent, the fact is a little less than usual. The more reason for fasting elsewhere. There would be perpetual famine if all the country tried to stuff itself in the luxurious Manhattan fashion.

We call the attention of the readers of THE SUN, and of all decent members of labor union in particular, to the following found in another column of a Chicago strike picket as to the money he was paid by the Brass Moulders' Union for assaulting non-union workers.

American management of the Philippines has moved the people there to submit to the chief governor, Judge TART, so urgent a request to remain at his present post that he is willing to forego one of the greatest honors in the gift of his country—a seat on the Federal Supreme bench!

There have been numerous testimonials to the worth of our administration in the East, but nothing to equal this. Judge TART'S public spirit in complying with the Filipinos' wish merits the highest praise.

You might as well try to drive a camel through the eye of a cambric needle as to pass a real anti-trust bill through a Republican Congress.—Chicago News.

Does our Democratic contemporary really want a real anti-trust bill passed through Congress?
His Need Satisfied.
Judge—Why didn't you steer out for the pedestrians?
Whelan—I hadn't time.
Judge—Well, I'll give you ten days.

BERNHARDT'S NEW PLAY.
"Théâtre de Méliocourt" in the original French, the latest production of the divine Sarah, has just reached New York. It was partly described by cable and its salient points lightly noted, but no idea of a ponderous work in six acts whose purpose on the stage is to depict the presentable events of one of the greatest catastrophes of modern history can be obtained by a hearing of it; it must be read several times. The dramatic events following closely on the heels of each other that the compacting and crystallizing of them in theatrical form is more than a one-night auditor of a three-hour performance can absorb.

The author is a youthful, thoughtful-looking man, whose picture shows him in the official costume of the great Academy. He certainly has little to apologize for in his own hand; he is an artist, he has not distracted his attention by any trumpery "heart interest" as managerial folk consider a primary essential, but has written a play for a "parquet of kings" to witness, or at least for a highly intellectual audience that has read, if not studied, the problems that culminated in the popular uprisings, the effects of which are active until our day.

The devotion of the author to history and the skill with which he has made a tremendous drama dramatic, which attests the personality of Bernhardt and at the same time does justice and gives vital interest to a crowd of characters are the notable mainstays that do not doubt controlled the author. How it would stand transferred to another stage is another affair. The American theatergoer has seen more of France than the average actor, and, even with all the Gallic simulation the latter can give, the play of France is rarely set in a factory to a cultivated New York audience that knows enough French to see how little of "atmosphere" has crossed the water, and how well the scene painter and costumers have done their work for the New York production.

"Théâtre de Méliocourt" has a long list of names, including the names of some of the most famous and sixteen female. The first act is in Vienna in 1791, and we are shown the secret participation of the Emperor Leopold Joseph in the plot to assassinate the Emperor. The protagonist appearing in the imperial palace to show her antecedent revolutionary war as she makes clear to the Emperor the true situation of the Empire. Act II shows the interior of the centre pavilion of the Tuileries the evening of Aug. 10, 1792. The royal family of France have fled to the Tuileries, and there is a very graphic exposition of the wavering nature of Louis XVI. the heroism as well as the miserable fears of his queen, and the horror of the infuriated populace that is constantly before the eyes of the king and queen.

In the brief space of the act the author has most skilfully delineated and made sympathetic a large group that a less capable author's hands would have been merely a bunch of supernumerary figures. Act III takes place on the same night in the humble quarters of Thérogne. There is a meeting of the conspirators of 1792—the immortal presence of Pétion, Mayor of Paris; Danton, Camille Desmoulins; Barreau, Collet d'Herbois, Cabot, Grangevine, Sieyès, Homme, Fabre d'Églantine, and others, and a compact, which Thérogne hides in her dress. Sureau, an emissary of the King, enters to carry off Pétion. He suspects, and, from the still more dramatic scene of the act, a dramatic scene of the required intensity succeeds. She is robbed of the compromising paper by Sureau, who disappears, and she is left alone in the street while the marching soldiers and the singing of the Marseillaise are heard below. Act IV takes place the following morning, in the garden of the Tuileries on one side; the hall of the "manège," where the Assembly was sitting on the other. The effect of this act is largely dependent on stage management and on the delivery of their lines by actors entitled Pétion and Sureau, who tell the story of the action in a series of scenes of armed insurgents menacing death, and murder is the crisis of the scene, as Sureau is killed by Thérogne's orders, and the scene ends with the fact that the insurgents are finally quieted by a citizen announcing the destruction of the monarchy. The final word before the fall of the Bastille is spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once to speak a few words and to be no more. Act V shows the same scene as the preceding act. The time is May, 1793, nearly nine months later. A stageful of people, and there are orators and speakers, and the assembly is in session. Thérogne meets Danton, and next Sieyès. The story of the Girondists is told by them in dialogues of considerable length, and the fact that they are spoken by a young officer who has been active in saving the life of a Swiss guard. He replies to the request to give his name, "Bernhardt," and the fact that he is of doubtful good taste, to introduce the greatest actor of the Revolution to appear but once