VIRGINIAN - PILOT.

—BY THE—
VIRGINIAN AND PILOT PUBLISHING COMPANY.

NORFOLK VIRGINIAN AND DAILY PILOT.
(Consolidated March, 1898.)

Entered at the Postoffice at Norfolk, Va., as second-class matter.

OFFICE: PILOT BUILDING, CITY HALL AVENUE,
NORFOLK, VA.

OFFICERS: A. H. GRANDY, President; M. GLENNAN, Vice-President; W. S. WILKINSON, Treasurer; JAMES E. ALLEN, Secretary.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS: A. H. Grandy, M. Glennan, L. D. Starke, Jr., T. W. Shelton, R. W. Shulitce, James E. Allen, D. F. Donovan.

THREE CENTS PER COPY.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

The VIRGINIAN-PILOT is delivered to subscribers by carriers in Norfolk and vicinity, Portsmouth, Berkley, Suffolk, West Norfolk, Newport News, for 10 cents per week, payable to the carrier. By mail, to any place in the United States, postage free:

DAILY, one year - - -	$5.00
" six months - - -	3.00
" three months - -	1.50
" one month - - -	.50

ADVERTISING RATES: Advertisements inserted at the rate of 75 cents a Square, first insertion; each subsequent insertion 40 cents, or 50 cents, when inserted Every Other Day. Contractors are not allowed to exceed their space or advertise other than their legitimate business, except by paying especially for the same.
Reading Notices invariably 20 cents per line first insertion. Each subsequent insertion 15 cents.

No employe of the Virginian-Pilot Publishing Company is authorized to contract any obligation in the name of the company, or to make purchases in the name of the same, except upon orders signed by the PRESIDENT OF THE COMPANY.

In order to avoid delays, on account of personal absence, letters and all communications for The VIRGINIAN-PILOT should not be addressed to any individual connected with the office, but simply to The VIRGINIAN AND PILOT PUBLISHING COMPANY.

TWELVE PAGES

THURSDAY, MARCH 30, 1899.

IS MR. BRYAN A PROFANER?

"The linking of the Lord's Supper with a political banquet, as was done by Mr. Bryan in a speech at Birmingham yesterday, will grate upon the nerves of all those who have a respect for things that are holy. If it was no sacrilege, it was horrible taste, and will stand to Mr. Bryan's lasting discredit. He has made just one speech too many."—Charlotte Observer.

"What the Lord's Supper is to a Christian, so a Jefferson banquet is to a Democrat.

"For the same reason that a good Christian would revolt at having the sacrament presided over by an infidel, for the same reason I would object to being present at a Jefferson banquet presided over by Perry Belmont."—The Hon. William J. Bryan, in a recent interview.

Setting aside all questions of political opinion, and speaking in an absolutely general way, we do not see how anyone with proper reverence for sacred things, even though he be not a professed Christian, can fail to be shocked at the remarkable comparison which Mr. Bryan has made in his effort to be epigrammatic. The man that can drag the Lord's Supper into a controversy connected with a political banquet must have a very imperfect realization of the respect that is due to divine subjects. Mr. Bryan's greatest admirers are dumb with astonishment at this semi-blasphemy, which they cannot attempt to defend. The silver champion would do well to select his "bon mots" with greater care for the solemnity of the relations between God and man."—Norfolk Landmark.

Now what is there in the language used by Mr. Bryan that justifies these solemn animadversions, pronounced with all the gravity of the Sanhedrim? Small success has attended the efforts of Mr. Bryan's political adversaries to refute his logic heard and read so frequently in the late memorable campaign. Scoffers might mock at the rhetorical methods of him whom they delighted to call the "Boy Orator of the Platte," and seek to ridicule what they would fain say was crude and sophomoric in his style and expression. But the keen, dexterous logic of Bryan, the debater, was approved too often by the judgment of his hearers on the hustings and in the halls of legislation to be whistled down the wind. His opinions became the opinions of the bulk of the American public, for it is a fact that a majority of the white people of the United States were his disciples, and voted to support his views of the economic issues of the day.

His private character is irreproachable. Neither envy nor malice has yet been able to besmirch his escutcheon.

But certain of the "Unco guid" have been completely horrified by Mr. Bryan's similes and metaphors. He has been held up to censure as an iconoclast. He has been roundly rated for what his monitors declare to be his sacrilege and irreverence towards things sacred. An example of this species of criticism is cited at the head of this article.

We say nothing as to the divergence between the views of W. J. Bryan and those of Perry Belmont, nor as to the merits of their mutual observations. Mr. Bryan states that the celebration of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson is to a Democrat what the Lord's Supper is to a pious Christian. Nothing more, nothing less. He might have said, to illustrate the importance of this anniversary to a sincere Democrat, that it was to him what the Feast of the Passover was to the ancient Jew, what the Hegira is to the devout Moslem, or, as for that matter, what the anniversary of the death of Charles the Second was to an ardent Jacobite. No one can imagine that Mr. Bryan meant to assimilate the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to the natal day of Thomas Jefferson in point of sanctity and importance to mankind. In this point of view, the criticism is the idlest of cavilling.

There be some who regard the Bible as a fetich; who regard its very language as possessing in itself, without reference to its spirit or its purport, a specific charm; who look upon the very letter-press and tooling of the volume as talismanic, and nothing less. Among this class, the allusion by the nominee of the Chicago Convention to a "cross of gold" brought the whole of this hyper-sensative cry of critics about his ears. As if, while one ideal cross were an object of hallowed and awful moment, yet every cross of gold, or wood, or stone, were a thing of superstitious veneration. Thieves were wont to hang upon crosses, and crosses of divers kinds are among the insignia that have often, in one sense or another, hung upon thieves. The species of irreverence that marks Mr. Bryan has no terrors for us. We are sure, from what is known of his character, that the mind and heart of the man is as susceptible of religious awe as those of most men, not even excepting his critics.

INHERENT POWER.

We regret that we have not seen the opinion of the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia, submitted with its recent decision, refusing to obey the legislature of Virginia and pronouncing null and void that body's action in regulation and restriction of the absolute and unlimited power claimed by our courts in matters of injunction and contempt of court. In last Saturday's Richmond Times we were editorially informed that the court had made a

"decision holding that the act of the Virginia Legislature, depriving courts (in certain cases) of the powers of punishing contempts of courts, is void and of no effect,"

and upon this a deluge of adulation and eulogy was poured upon the court and its decision, without any further details or information. In the Times of the Sunday following we are told specifically that the act of Assembly nullified by the court is

"the famous anti-injunction bill was introduced in the Virginia Legislature on February 2, 1898, the Richmond Dispatch explained that this bill was 'designed to carry out the declaration of the Chicago platform against government by injunction, and to render impossible in this State those sweeping injunction orders which have become so common in recent years in some of the States of the Union.'"

But, practically, the fact that we assume the annulled act to be that embodied in the Code of Virginia as to contempts, makes no difference on the main point raised by the court's refusal to obey the legislature and revolting against the authority bestowed on that body to erect courts and "regulate" them. For the court, as the Times informs us, makes no pretension to any constitutional warrant for its action in this case, but, speaking through Judge Keith, says:

"That in the courts created by the Constitution there is an inherent power of self-defence and self-preservation; that this power may be regulated, but cannot be destroyed or so far diminished as to be rendered ineffectual by legislative enactment; that it is a power necessarily resident in and to be exercised by, the Court itself, and that the vice of an act which seeks to deprive the court of this inherent power is not cured by providing for its exercise by a jury; that while the Legislature has the power to regulate the jurisdiction of Circuit, County, and Corporation courts, it cannot destroy, while it may confine within reasonable bounds, the authority necessary to the exercise of the jurisdiction conferred."

The same constitution that authorized the legislature to create courts, also authorized that body to "regulate" their jurisdiction and that of Judges, "except so far as the same is conferred by this constitution." The constitution then confers among other things, jurisdiction as to "the constitutionality of a law;" but it immediately adds to this a proviso requiring a majority of the judges elected, necessary to declare a law unconstitutional, and that "to declare any law null and void" must be "by reason of its repugnance to the Federal Constitution, or to the Constitution of this State."

Judge Keith would have surely shown this repugnance to one or the other, or both, of these constitutions, if he could; but there is no such repugnance, and on the contrary, several fatal repugnances between fundamental provisions of both, and the pretensions set up by the courts and judges with respect to contempt and injunction, wherein all the guarantees of both as to liberty and property, if not life, as to "due process of law," "trial by jury," the right to call and examine witnesses in self-defence, &c., are all set at naught by a pretended "inherent power" utterly repugnant to all our constitutions, institutes, principles and the spirit of our free self-government by representation.

There are no such inherent rights or powers, except in the people; nor is the slightest recognition given to them under our system of Federal or State government. Yet Judge Keith rallies this imaginary power in the court against the inherent and constitutional right and power of the people! Everybody knows that this "inherent" right or power claimed by Judge Keith, in theory and practice, grossly violates the inherent rights and powers of man, upon which our government is based, and every guarantee of our constitutions, State and Federal as to our rights of property and personal liberty. We repeat, there are no inherent rights except those possessed by the people; and the constitution was designed chiefly for the purpose of excluding all such pretences; by definitely fixing and conferring, or granting, or delegating, or visiting and defining all rights, powers and privileges to be exercised by any public officer, department, or branch of government.

Judge Keith, or the Supreme Court of Appeals, might as well attempt to set up "divine right" again in this country, as his equivalent doctrine of "inherent power"—and he had some sense of this, as shown by his avoidance of the term "right" and resorting to the word "power." But there is only one power superior to the constitution and the people, and that is divine power; and if that does not interpose unmistakably, it is puerile to have recourse to "inherent power" against the power that, in conjunction with the constitution, makes and unmakes courts, "regulates" them, and may impeach and remove and disqualify judges for maladministration, corruption, neglect of duty, or other high crime or misdemeanor.

The courts and judges may illegitimately conceive and declare themselves this, that and the other, and their jurisdiction and power and duty thus and so, or otherwise; but there is not a scintilla of warrant for their conception of this, that and the other, or of thus and so, or otherwise, except as "conferred" by our constitutions or our legislature. Their jurisdiction, power, duty and right or privilege, are all "conferred," and none and nothing of these can by any reason be, or become, "inherent" in them. It is so "nominated in the bond," which neither courts nor judges can amend or alter honestly or with impunity. They are what they are created by constitution and law, no more nor less; and ministers and sworn custodians of these, they are doubly bound to respect, obey and uphold them, in letter and spirit.

The Court of Appeals of Virginia does not attempt to claim that the said Act of our Legislature is unconstitutional, but that it deprives them of their "INHERENT POWER": that is to say, their "divine right"—their Kingly power.

The Court of Appeals of Virginia, or any other court in this country; or all of them put together, have no "inherent power." It has no power at all, none whatever, excepting only that which is CONFERRED by our Federal and State Constitutions, and the laws enacted IN PURSUANCE THEREOF; and the constitution requires (as we have hereinbefore stated) that "to declare any law null and void" must be "by reason of its repugnance to the Federal Constitution, or to the Constitution of this State." Yet the Court of Appeals of Virginia declares the said Act of our Legislature null and void on the ground that it deprives them of their "inherent power"—an assumed and self-arrogated power.

M'KINLEY'S NAVAL MINION.

President McKinley's recent letter of sympathy, condolence and commendation to Rear Admiral Sampson, strikes the public very much as a like letter from him to Eagan would, sympathizing and condoling with him, and highly commending him and his beef. Commending Sampson for "disinterested action" sounds very much like similar commendation would of Eagan for "diligence and care" in supplying the army with embalmed, rotten and maggotty beef, which even buzzards would fly from; and complimenting Sampson highly for "consummating * * the destruction of the Spanish fleet," is a conspicuous example of inveracity and contempt of the facts, and public opinion that should rank him side by side with Sampson as a twin brother in morality and honor.

McKinley expresses the "highest appreciation of your" (Sampson's) "services as Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic Naval forces during the Spanish war." What these "services" are may be located with those others for which the unknown "Captain" Sampson was thus rushed over the head of superior men and officers, with high reputations and noble records—above Dewey, Schley, Watson and others—and who did nothing as "Commander-in-Chief" but show a zealous daring to capture unarmed vessels and an eager avidity to claim his lion's share of the prize-money,—as he has shown a similar disposition to engross the glory of exploits which were wholly performed by others, whom he has meanly sought to despoil. "It was in recognition of your services," says Mr. McKinley, "and of your great skill that I recommended you to the Senate for the advancement which you had earned."

Gracious heavens! This Sampson (with a p) has done great services and exhibited great skill, which the President is able to "recognize," though nobody else can, and yet cannot "recognize," what everybody else does, the favorite's immeasurable meanness in seeking to thrust himself in front of Schley and the other real heroes in the Santiago sea-fight, before the public, although he knew nothing of the fight itself,—in fact, "not in it" at all.

Is this a man to be President of the United States? and to be endorsed into a second term? with such favored minions as Hanna, Alger and Sampson as his Piers Gavestons over better, abler and truer men?

At the present writing the prospects of Senator Quay, of Pennsylvania, for going to the United States Senate or the State penitentiary are about evenly divided.

Aguinaldo may congratulate himself on not having a navy for Admiral Dewey to wipe out.

VIRGINIAN-PILOT'S HOME STUDY CIRCLE

(Copyrighted, 1899.)

DIRECTED BY PROF. SEYMOUR EATON.

SUBJECTS OF STUDY IN THE ORDER IN WHICH THEY WILL BE PUBLISHED.

EVERY SUNDAY—
History—Popular Studies in European History.
EVERY TUESDAY—
Geography—The World's Great Commercial Products.
EVERY WEDNESDAY—
Governments of the World of To-day.
EVERY THURSDAY AND FRIDAY—
Literature—Popular Studies in Literature.
EVERY SATURDAY—
Art—The World's Great Artists.

These courses will continue until June 26th. Examinations conducted by mail, will be held at their close as a basis for the granting of Certificates.

POPULAR STUDIES IN LITERATURE.

V.—BUNYAN.

THE RELIGIOUS ELEMENT IN EARLY LITERATURE.

BY EDWIN MIMS, A. M.,
(Trinity College, Durham, N. C.)

Probably the most interesting section of Green's "History of England" is that devoted to an account of the puritan movement. Beginning in the age of Elizabeth, puritanism had slowly but surely made its way into the life of the English people, reaching the climax of its power between 1640 and 1650, and then declining in importance after the restoration, to reappear with renewed force in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Speaking in general terms it was an attempt on the part of an ever-increasing minority of people to reform and purify the life of England, the political, social and religious life—in short, to bring about a real reformation where there had been only a pretended one.

It is only in recent years that the full significance of this movement has been realized. There was much that was unattractive in the puritans, much that was crude, narrow and intolerant, but, on the whole, the cause of liberty and righteousness—what Milton called the "good old cause"—depended for success upon the heroic conduct of these strange people. Matthew Arnold said that in puritanism the Hebrew theocracy was again realized in history. They, too, were the elect of Jehovah, and they read the Hebrew bible as the only word of God. One of the first glimpses we get of Milton is that of the 12-year-old boy reading at midnight his old testament in the original, and when in his old age he wrote his poems his subjects and many of his thoughts were from the same book.

Cromwell at the head of his Ironsides charged the hosts of the enemy uttering the words of the psalmist and in the council chamber found nothing better to quote than Isaiah. Bunyan must have known the bible by heart, for his books are so saturated with its language and thought that it is difficult to tell what is original and what borrowed. Verily, English people were then "the people of one book" and "the Lord saith" was their highest authority.

I have referred to Milton, Cromwell and Bunyan. If one would understand the puritan movement in all its phases he must study the lives and sayings of these men, for they are puritanism in-

OLIVER CROMWELL.

carnate—Milton, the pamphleteer and poet; Cromwell, the man of action and power, and Bunyan, the preacher and prophet. Milton, with all his enthusiasm for art and culture, was wandering amid the classic scenes of Italy and contemplating a journey to the yet more classic scenes of Greece, when the still, small voice of Duty called him back to take part in the coming conflict between puritanism and its opponents—with what splendid weapons did he wage war! Cromwell, a raw country lad, with a sense of his past sins and of his obligation to God, organizes the Ironsides and makes the royalists feel the might of those who fear the Lord and causes the name of Jehovah to resound through the world. Bunyan felt no interest in the civil and political conflict—we do not even know in which army he fought in the civil war—but when, with the restoration, came the corruption of social life and the "loathsome opposite" of all the puritans had dreamed, Bunyan reuttered the gospel of puritanism and in the forests his voice was heard preaching righteousness and justice and from Bedford jail went forth words of power—"thoughts that breathe and words that burn." Three more widely different men could scarcely be found. There were but few points of contact between the scholarly Milton and the almost illiterate tinker of Bedford; Cromwell was far removed from either, and yet they were all animated by the same sense of God's omnipotence and man's responsibility; sin and pardon, the eternal conflict between God and the devil were living realities to them. The "Holy War" of Bunyan has often been compared with "Paradise Lost," and many parallel passages might be cited between "Pilgrim's Progress" and the speeches and letters of Cromwell.

It would be interesting to speak further of puritanism, but we are to notice especially in this study the character and writings of Bunyan as reflecting this general movement. The principal events of his life are soon told. Born in 1628, he was the son of a tinker who lived not far from Bedford; at an early age he was sent to school, where he learned to read and write, though the evidence is that in later years he had to learn again the art of writing. He was a rollicking, mischievous boy, the ringleader in all sports and pastimes, although he was not altogether so depraved as in after years he represented himself to have been. In 1645 he went to the war and for several months he served one side or the other. He was married soon after quitting the army and became the father of several children, one of whom was blind. For the next few years he passed through the religious experiences of which we shall speak later. In 1660 he was imprisoned for preaching to dissenters, and, with the exception of a few intervals, he remained in jail twelve years, preaching to his fellow-prisoners and writing his sermons and books. In 1675 appeared the first part of "Pilgrim's Progress,"

ELSTON, BEDFORD.
(Bunyan's birthplace.)

in 1682 the "Holy War" and in 1680 "The Life and Death of Mr. Badman." After his release from prison he became a famous preacher, exercising a great influence over a large section of England, so much so that he became known as he was styled "Bishop Bunyan." He died in 1688 from a cold contracted on a trip made to reconcile a father and his son.

The chief interest in Bunyan's life is the development of his spiritual nature as depicted in the "Grace Abounding" and as implied in "Pilgrim's Progress." The first of these works should be read by every one who would know the real story of his life. Carlyle defines genius as the capacity for taking infinite pains. Bunyan was a religious genius, for he took "infinite pains" to "get religion" and infinite pains to keep it when once he had it. It was said that Socrates was at ease in Zion. But Bunyan was not; for several years he was passing through the different phases of his religious experience. He has given us every detail of his spiritual life; not more minutely does George Eliot trace the inner workings of a mind like Gwendolen Harleth's, or Browning the changing career of Paracelsus. Step by step Bunyan passes from one experience to another, from the time when playing at "cat" he sees the vision of Christ in the heavens and hears a mysterious voice calling him to [illegible] till finally he attains to perfect peace and rest. It will do any man good to work out carefully and accurately the successive steps he makes. The incidents are all very vivid in his mind—the very hour of the day, the scene,

JOHN MILTON.

all the circumstances, are given with the verisimilitude that reminds one of Defoe. I give only a few instances of his manner of relating his experiences:

"Now, therefore, I went on in sin with great greediness of mind, still grudging that I could not be satisfied with it as I would. This did continue with me about a month or more; but one day as I was standing at a neighbor's shop window and there cursing and swearing and playing the madman, after my wonted manner, there sat within the woman of the house, and heard me; who, though she was a very loose and ungodly wretch, yet protested that I swore and cursed at the most ungodly rate; that she was made to tremble to hear me, and that I by thus doing was able to spoil all the youth in the whole town if they came but in my company. * * * Wherefore, while I stood there, and hanging down my head, I wished with all my heart that I might be a little child again."

After this incident he becomes a moral man, but morality only does not satisfy him.

"Upon a day the good providence of God called me to Bedford to work on my calling, and in one of the streets of that town I came where there were three of four poor women sitting at a door in the sun, talking about the things of God; and being now willing to hear their discourse, I drew near to hear what they said, for I was now a brisk talker of myself in the matter of religion; but I may say I heard but understood not; for they were far above, out of my reach. Their talk was about a new birth."

He afterward experiences the new birth, and finally, after doubts and trials, after many climbings up and fallings down, he is able to say: "Now was I got on high, I saw myself within the arms of grace and mercy."

The experience that I have indicated is found in "Grace Abounding;" it is made universal in "Pilgrim's Progress." Here all of his experience is taken into the realm of art. He no longer talks in terms of theology, but of life; abstract terms give way to living persons (although perchance, they are personifications) as real as any of the characters of fiction; the prosaic places round Bedford become typical of those that all mankind pass on their journey to the Celestial City. Suddenly, by the magic of genius, the experience of one man becomes that in which all men read their destiny.

"Pilgrim's Progress" is one of those books (classics) that every person is expected to read and nobody reads, and yet the characteristics that have made it live in the hearts of the English people are still there. I had not read it for several years until recently. It is a little hard to become interested at first, for one has heard its story so often that it is almost hackneyed, but if he will but read on he becomes fascinated as by a novel. It is old, yet forever new. The book, notwithstanding the fact that it is an allegory, is full of dramatic scenes; the climbing of the Hill Difficulty, the battle with Apollyon, the passing through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, the trials and persecution at Vanity Fair, the imprisonment at Doubting Castle, and, finally, the entrance into the Celestial City—these scenes will never lose their power. Bunyan had the gift of characterizing people by a few touches, with something of Chaucer's felicity. Macaulay has suggested the contrast be-

"TRIPLE EPISCOPACIE."
(Satire of the puritan party on Land and the court bishops.)

tween Shelley's characters and Bunyan's, the former are represented as real persons, and yet are the mere abstractions of Shelley's mind, while Bunyan's characters are abstractions with all the vividness and reality of living people. Cases in point, aside from the principal characters, are Legality, Atheist, Bye-ends and Talkative, to mention only a few. All this is but to say over again that "Pilgrim's Progress" is the greatest allegory ever written. Aside from these points that he who runs may note, the careful reader feels the same touch of genius in some of the passages scattered here and there throughout the book that the casual reader might not notice. I give only two. After climbing the Hill Difficulty and passing the Lion, Christian arrives at the Palace Beautiful, where Miss Prudence, Miss Charity and Miss Piety talk with him about "the Lord of the hill." "Thus they discoursed till late at night, and after they had committed themselves to their Lord for protection they betook themselves to rest. The pilgrim they laid in a large upper chamber whose windows opened toward the sun-rising; the name of the chamber was Peace, where he slept till break of day, and then awoke and sang." In the fight with Apollyon Christian is severely wounded. "Then there came to him a hand with some of the leaves of the tree of life, which he took and applied to the wound that he had received in the battle."

[illegible] this study will be concluded to-morrow.

EXAMINATIONS AND CERTIFICATES.

At the end of the term of seventeen weeks, a series of questions on each course, prepared by Professor Seymour Eaton, will be published in the Virginian-Pilot, and blanks containing the questions will be furnished every subscriber making application for same. Two weeks will be allowed after the courses close, for the receipt of examination papers containing answers. These papers will be referred to a Board of Examiners, who will assist Professor Eaton, and as soon as the work of examination is complete, the result will be reported, and certificates issued to the students entitled to them.