

volve a preparatory stage of many years before the benefits actually accrue to the workman. It is likely, however, that some provisional arrangement will be made for bridging over the time before the scheme gets into complete working order, else the immediate object to be attained, the check to discontent and socialistic agitation, will fail for the time being. The remarkable skill, energy, and patience with which all these statutes have been carried through make it certain that the German legislators will not permit a long period to pass before the last measure of the series actually goes into effect. When this is done, the scheme for improving by compulsory insurance the lot of the poor will have reached its final shape, and will be fairly and completely in operation. What its ultimate result will be, however, cannot be judged with certainty until it has been tried on a generation or two of workmen; and only our children and children's children are likely to know—if, indeed, they know—whether the lot of the mass of civilized mankind can be alleviated permanently by these methods.

THE GERMAN SABBATH.

As everybody knows, Sunday is not kept as a day of rest on the Continent of Europe in the same sense in which it is kept in England or America. That is to say, even those Continental Protestants who think abstinence from toil, properly so called, on the first day of the week a religious duty, differ greatly from English and American Protestants as to the way in which those who abstain from labor should pass the day. The view of the more rigid English and American Protestants is, that not only are we bound not to follow our ordinary pursuits on Sunday, but we are bound not to amuse ourselves; and to confine our reading to religious or devotional books or newspapers. To this length the Continental Protestants—even that very rigid sect of them, the French and Dutch Calvinists—have never gone. They have always allowed “innocent amusements” on Sunday, meaning by that term, if we are not mistaken, all amusements which did not involve violent physical exertion or some form of gambling. The late Count Gasparin, for instance, was very much shocked by President Lincoln's going to the theatre, but it was to him no aggravation of the sin of going to the theatre to go on Sunday. We remember, too, being told by an eminent American divine of the shock it gave him when he first went to Germany as a young man, and delivered his letter of introduction to a prominent German Lutheran theologian, to receive a note from him appointing a meeting on Sunday afternoon in a beer-garden. The meeting took place, and they had a very interesting talk, with the accompaniments of beer and tobacco, without the slightest suspicion on the German's side that his young American friend saw anything unseemly in their surroundings. That the Anglo-Saxon Protestants should, under these circumstances—that is, with so little support from their brethren on the Continent, and with

open opposition from the whole Catholic world—have been able to maintain the Puritan Sabbath, even as well as they have done, down to our day, shows the wonderful vigor and tenacity of their character and beliefs.

On one point they have undoubtedly been beaten by the course of events. Their prediction that popular morality would suffer greatly from the decline of Sabbath observance—that is, that as men became less ready to abstain on Sunday from all “worldly amusements,” and to devote the day wholly or in great part to religious exercises, their respect for the elementary social virtues would diminish, and that Sabbath-breakers would on the whole be readier to cheat, and lie, and drink, and swear than Sabbath-observers—has not been justified by experience. There is little doubt, in fact, that the spread of the habit of devoting at least part of Sunday to simple recreation, in or out of doors, has done much to sweeten people's tempers and elevate their tastes. In the old days, when the Sabbath-breaker was obliged to conceal his frailty or revolt, he was apt, as in Scotland, where Sunday used to be, and perhaps is, a great day for private drinking among the ungodly, to pass the day in a state of mind which stimulated or fostered all his baser inclinations. From his present freedom to enjoy himself publicly in his own fashion without incurring serious social discredit, he derives at least cheerfulness, and a sort of kindly respect for those who keep the Sabbath without outward signs of condemnation for those who do not take the same view as themselves of its nature and obligations.

But on one other point the friends of Sabbath observance have undoubtedly found themselves somewhat justified by experience. They have always maintained that if Sunday were not kept as a sacred day, its retention as a day of rest from toil would prove very difficult. In this they are apparently right. In all the Continental countries, along with readiness to be amused on Sunday comes also readiness to work. It seems difficult, if not impossible, to enforce a rule which allows people to play lawn tennis, or go to the theatre, or sit in beer gardens, but forbids them to work in factories or keep their shops open. The experience of Germany, which has recently been collected, though in a somewhat imperfect way, by a Prussian Government investigation, seems to contain a great deal of instruction on this point. From returns obtained from thirty out of thirty-five provinces or departments, containing 500,156 manufacturing establishments and 1,582,591 workmen, it was found that 57.75 per cent. of the factories kept at work on Sunday. On the other hand, the larger number of the workmen, or 919,564, rested on Sunday. As regards trade and transportation, it was found that in 29 provinces (out of 35), of 147,318 establishments of one sort or another, employing 245,061 persons, 77 per cent. were open on Sunday, and 57 per cent. of the employees worked on that day.

This state of things has led to a demand in Prussia for legislation absolutely prohibiting Sunday labor. With a view to such legislation, a canvass of the persons interested, both

employers and employed, has been made. They were asked whether they were in favor of or opposed to total prohibition. It was found that of those consulted in the great factories or stores only 13 per cent. of the employers and 18 per cent. of the employed were in favor of total prohibition. In the smaller industries only 18 per cent. of the employers and 21 per cent. of the employed were in favor of total prohibition. In trade only 41 per cent. of the employers and 39 per cent. of the employed, and in transportation only 12 per cent. of the employers and 16 per cent. of the employed were in favor of total prohibition. These are very curious figures, and have been tabulated by M. Maurice Block with some care. It is difficult to say how many things they prove, but they prove one thing with tolerable certainty, and that is that the footing of Sunday as a day of rest is almost as precarious in Germany as its footing as a day of religious observance.

THE REVISED CONSTITUTION OF THE NETHERLANDS.

BERLIN, November 24, 1887.

AFTER a contest extending over four years, the revised Constitution of the Netherlands has been adopted by both chambers, and has received the royal signature. Its formal proclamation will take place December 1, and the special election of a new Parliament to confirm it will take place four months later. The reasons which led to this revision were the necessity of regulating the descent of the crown in case of the death of the young Princess Wilhelmine, the redistribution of electoral districts, owing to a change of population, the extension of the suffrage, additional powers necessary to deal with socialistic agitation, and the question of compulsory military service and of national defence. The Constitution has not simply received additional articles, but has been subjected throughout to a careful restatement; and while the substance is essentially the same, slight changes, omissions, and additions have extended to 125 of the 197 articles. Some of the articles are far-reaching in their consequences, and the passage of chapter viii., relating to the national defence, was uncertain until the final vote in the Upper House.

The original Constitution of the Netherlands was adopted in 1815, and the present Constitution after the reform agitation of 1848. The new Constitution, although adopted by more than a two-thirds vote in both houses, must now be subjected to the popular judgment, and ratified by a similar majority in a new Parliament elected expressly for this purpose. There is a striking analogy in the steps by which changes are made in the Constitution of the Netherlands, and the provisions by which amendments are made to the Constitution of the United States, and of some of the separate States. As the First Chamber is chosen directly by the estates of the different provinces, and the Second Chamber by direct popular vote, the voice of the separate governments, as well as the voice of the people, is taken in the ratification of the Constitution. On the adoption of amendments to many of our State constitutions, the people vote directly upon the merits of the proposed amendment, and not, as in the Netherlands, by representatives chosen for that purpose.

The present Heemskerk Ministry came into power as a Conservative Ministry in 1883. The former Ministry of Van Lynden was defeated on a motion to extend the suffrage. Heemskerk

saw that in order to retain power his party must adopt many of the reforms demanded. He immediately proposed the appointment of a committee which should not only consider the question of the suffrage, but should suggest other changes in the Constitution. The Committee consisted of the Minister, Heemskerk, and seven Conservatives and seven Liberals. The first question which demanded solution was that of the succession to the throne. Many of the provisions were vague and difficult of interpretation. The death of the Crown Prince William in Paris, followed by that of his brother Alexander, transferred the succession to the young Princess Wilhelmine. The House of Orange-Nassau was thus left without a male descendant, the son of an heir to the throne. The King's nearest relative and, next to the Princess Wilhelmine, the legal heir to the throne, is the Grand Duchess Sophie of Saxe-Weimar. Here a difficult question arose. According to the Constitution of the Netherlands, every heir to the throne who marries without the consent of the States-General forfeits his claim to the crown. The Grand Duchess Sophie received the consent of the States-General upon her marriage, but her son, the Hereditary Prince of Saxe-Weimar, who had then no prospect of ascending the throne of the Netherlands, married without the concurrence of the States-General. In case of the death of his mother before the Princess Wilhelmine, the crown would be left without a legal heir, or a dangerous conflict might arise and lead to foreign intervention.

The literature to which the controversy regarding the succession has given rise is very extensive. Leading scholars have argued the question from the standpoint of Roman law, of Salic law, of the laws of contemporary descent in other European States, and from patriotic considerations. The Dutch statesmen have always been shrewd to forecast political contingencies which might interfere with their national independence. In case the crown should not devolve upon the descendants of the Grand Duchess of Saxe-Weimar as the sole remaining heir of William II., the succession must be sought in the descendants of other children of William I., viz., in the children of Prince Frederick or of Princess Marianne, who married Prince Albrecht of Prussia, brother of the Emperor Wilhelm. The present representatives of Prince Frederick are the descendants of his daughters, one of whom married Karl XV., King of Sweden, whose only daughter married the present Crown Prince of Denmark, and the other the Prince of Wied. The Prussian heir to the throne would be Prince Albrecht; the present Regent of Hanover, as belonging to the oldest female line. The same provision of the Constitution which would prevent the succession of the children of the Grand Duchess of Saxe-Weimar would exclude these other heirs.

The Constitution provides that in case of a failure of male descendants of the House of Orange-Nassau, born of male heirs to the throne, the crown passes to the female line nearest related to the last King; but it cannot pass to a younger line so long as there are descendants of the older branch or line. The King can wear no foreign crown. By the new Constitution it is provided that in case the crown passes to a side line, the provision of the Constitution requiring the consent of the States-General to the marriage of an heir to the throne shall apply only to marriages contracted after that event. This secures the succession to the Saxe-Weimar line in case of the death of the Princess Wilhelmine, or in case she leaves no descendants. The next in order of succession is

Prince Albrecht of Prussia, and after him the children of the Princess of Wied.

The number of members of the First Chamber is fixed at fifty instead of thirty-nine by the new Constitution. The increase of representation is greatest in North and South Holland, where the great commercial cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam are situated. In place of six and seven members respectively, the number is now nine and ten for these two provinces, increasing their relative importance from 33 to 38 per cent. of the whole Chamber. These States have always exercised a leading influence in Netherlands affairs. Of the remaining nine provinces the representation of North Brabant, Gelderland, Friesland, Groningen, and Drenthe is increased by one member each. The members of the First Chamber are chosen, as formerly, for nine years by the different provincial assemblies; the election of members is no longer confined to those who are most highly assessed, but those who have held certain high public positions are eligible as candidates. A third of the Chamber is elected every three years.

The number of members of the Second Chamber is raised from 86 to 100. One member was formerly elected to every 45,000 inhabitants; the number of members is now limited to 100, and distributed according to the number of inhabitants. Members of the Second Chamber must be thirty years old, and are chosen for four years. Their salary is 2,000 florins, with travelling expenses. One-half of the Chamber no longer retires at the end of two years.

The reform of the suffrage has excited more popular interest than any other question associated with the revision of the Constitution. The programme of the Radicals is universal suffrage, compulsory school attendance, personal military service, the abolition of State support of religion, and a law controlling manufactories and for the protection of workmen. Such sweeping changes are contrary to the traditions of the Government, in which the aristocratic and conservative element has held sway for so many hundred years. In the new Constitution the provision imposing a property qualification upon voters is omitted. Heretofore no one possessed the right to vote for members of the Second Chamber unless he paid a direct tax of from 20 to 160 florins, according to the law of the district where he resided. By a provisional electoral law embodying in part the features of the new Constitution, the number of voters is raised from 136,000 to 350,000. This is far from universal suffrage in a country with a population of 4,336,012, and with 800,000 men of legal age to vote. By removing the restriction upon the right of suffrage from the Constitution, it rests with the States-General at any time to extend still further the right to vote. The age of electors, however, remains fixed by the Constitution at twenty-three years.

The question of national defence in the presence of the vast armaments of Europe, and of the extensive fortresses which Belgium has begun on the Dutch border, has occasioned earnest discussion. Corresponding military preparations mean an increase of debt and accompanying taxation and compulsory military service. The present Constitution provides that the King shall see that a sufficient land and naval force is kept in readiness; also, that a volunteer militia shall be maintained. In case of the lack of sufficient volunteers, a draft may be made from all those who have reached twenty years of age. The new Constitution provides that a land and marine force shall be maintained of volunteers and of those *liable to military service*, which shall be regulated by

law. The old provision that those liable to service cannot be sent to the foreign colonies of the Netherlands is retained. The provisions respecting a national volunteer militia are omitted in the new Constitution, although a kind of Landwehr for defence will be maintained by the communes or districts. The Minister of War announced, on the passage of this section, that arrangements had already been made in his bureau to carry out these provisions.

Article 187 of the new Constitution provides that the King can declare any district in a state of siege, during which the administration of public order may be intrusted in whole or in part to the military authorities. Power is thus conferred on the Government to deal with any socialistic outbreak.

Among the features of the Constitution which are noticeable, either from their correspondence to the usages of our own country or as presenting distinct features, are the following: Courts are declared open, but the right to hold a non-public session in the interests of order and morality is conceded to the Judge. All decisions and the reasons for them, however, must be publicly pronounced. All breaches of trust or official misconduct on the part of ministers, royal deputies, governors, members of the States-General, and other high officials are brought directly before the Supreme Court (Hooge Raad), either upon the initiative of the King or of the Second Chamber, *during, as well as after, their resignation of office*. Ministerial responsibility is provided for, and the presence of the Ministers in the Chambers can be required. While public sessions of both Chambers are held, one-tenth of the members can require a secret session. The article which made the King and members of the royal family amenable to the Supreme Court is omitted. The Supreme Court has an oversight of the administration of justice, but there is no appeal to it in the case of offences tried by military law, or in questions of military discipline. The security and equality of all before the law, whether native or foreigners, is one of the first articles of the Constitution. Only in times of great national excitement, when the Government is passive in the presence of popular feeling, could such persecution exist as is manifested in the present *Deutschhete* in France.

The recent rumors of the illness of the King of the Netherlands have revived popular discussion of the future sovereignty of the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg. The relation of the King to Luxemburg is a purely personal one. Luxemburg was granted to William I. by the Treaty of 1815, as an indemnity for the loss of his Nassau lands, which he had been forced to resign. By a family treaty of 1783, between the two branches of the House of Nassau, the Otto and the Walram lines, it was provided that in the succession to the throne of Luxemburg the agnatic rights of the Duke of Nassau should be respected. This was recognized later in the London Conference of 1839, which was called to settle the relations between Belgium and the Netherlands. By this treaty the King of the Netherlands was forced to cede a portion of Luxemburg to Belgium. He was obliged also to secure the renunciation by the Duke of Nassau for himself and his successors of any claim which they might subsequently urge upon this territory. This was granted by the Duke with the express stipulation that any rights which he might subsequently possess on the rest of Luxemburg should remain unimpaired.

The question has been recently raised whether Prussia, as the heir of the sovereign rights of Duke Adolf in Nassau, would not, in virtue of this succession, possess a valid title to the throne

of Nassau. But the succession to Luxemburg is not derived from the possession of Nassau, but is based upon the rights of the Duke of Nassau as nearest agnate of the House of Orange-Nassau, which were not affected by the Treaty of 1867 between Prussia and the Duke of Nassau. In 1885 a Dutch Minister, having proposed to take measures to perpetuate the relation of the crown of the Netherlands to Luxemburg, was informed by the King that the latter had signed the Treaty of 1867 between Prussia and Nassau, and that he wished the Family Treaty of 1783 to be observed. This settles the question of the right of Duke Adolf of Nassau to the throne of Luxemburg upon the death of the King of Holland. Prussia will thus practically acquire possession of Luxemburg in its possession by a German prince. In case the crown of the Netherlands should pass to the House of Saxe-Weimar, a German prince would become ruler of this country. What remote consequences might be connected with either one of these transfers, cannot now be determined.

W. T. H.

"ŒDIPUS" AT CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON, November 28, 1887.

A NOT unimportant topic of the day in London is what the *Times* of Wednesday noticed at great length under the caption of "Œdipus at Cambridge." Of the other newspapers, however, not a few failed to send reporters, and made no extended mention of the performances, which began on Tuesday last and continued through the week. This comparative indifference in some quarters shows that the academical representation of a Greek tragedy has ceased to be a nine days' wonder. These performances have found their proper and permanent place, and they have a public of their own. The treacherous preëminence of a fashionable "fad" they have lost, and it is to be hoped they never may regain it.

Upwards of six years ago this same play was given at our own Cambridge, and it is therefore not necessary to dwell upon the afflictions of *King Œdipus* which are its theme. Mr. Stanford's musical interpretation, the power of which effectually swayed all moods on Tuesday last, treated too hopefully the mystery and gloom of heaven-sent pestilence which overhangs the outset of the play. Had the stage of the Theatre Royal in Cambridge offered room for the solemn entrance of Theban suppliants in mournful progress towards the altars of the gods, then the composer's beginning would no doubt have given fuller expression to the universal woe of Thebes. In this respect Mr. Paine, at Cambridge, in America, was more fortunate than Mr. Stanford has been. Mr. Stanford's overture is brightened by a leading *motif*, which recurs ever and anon during the course of the play, and, unfinished and uncertain at the first, becomes each time more certain and more sad. This pathetic progression begins with notes that echo from the shepherds on the far-off hills, from the uplands of Cæthæron, where *Œdipus* once lay so near to death. They recall the Alpine sweets and freshness that breathe from Rossini's overture to "William Tell." This melody escapes pursuit at first only by its elusive recurrence to tempt the hearer on and on till he sits surprised to hear its burden all of woe. Surprised, indeed, but never for a moment overwhelmed. As before suggested, Mr. Stanford's music offers alleviation rather than interpretation to the horror of the woes of *Œdipus* and all his house. The very effectiveness with which this is done interferes somewhat with the intensity of the climax. Mr. Stanford does not help the

heavens to fall when *Œdipus* discovers and depairs.

Mr. Stanford's choral masterpiece is the song of the chorus which brings to fullest expression the anti-climax in the plot. Just before the whole mass of accumulated misfortune heaps itself upon *King Œdipus* and ends all hope, there is a moment made for joy—a breathing-space before the tragic end draws near. Here the movement of Mr. Stanford's choral song is *allegro vivace*, and the evolutions of the chorus while singing indicate gladness—perhaps even greater gladness than was here provided for them by Sophocles in the play. In Mr. Paine's "Œdipus" music, on the other hand, the most breathless and thrilling moment was—as is well remembered by those who heard it—the choral song that came immediately after the complete discovery of his woes by *Œdipus*. The relentless forward onset of unfearing and unfavouring fate was borne in upon all hearers by the power of Mr. Paine's interpretation of "Woe is me for you, sons of men!" Mr. Stanford's music was hardly adequate here. Nevertheless, he has earned the lasting gratitude of all scholars for the wonderful care with which he follows in detail the movement of the Greek choral rhythms. It is like borrowing a new sense for the appreciation of poetic form to hear Mr. Stanford's music with close reference to the Greek. Here, and here only, is the right way to teach the more complicated Greek metres. Indeed, no one without fondness for music and some knowledge of it is qualified himself to enjoy, or to help others to understand or enjoy, the choral odes of Greek tragedy. This must be plain to any one who, after hearing Mr. Clark's music for the "Acharnians," an American performance not to be forgotten, takes pains to appreciate Mr. Stanford's most scholarly work.

That the latter has studied his Wagner, and to great advantage, abundantly appears, not in the overture only, but also in the "incidental" music. Perhaps the most marked and magical effect thus obtained was in the trochaic dialogue between *Creon* and *Œdipus*, just at the close. These Mr. Stanford accompanied with short snatches following in the train of each speaker's thought. Thus he aided marvellously the consolatory effect which the playwright intended. Another point where Mr. Stanford excelled was in the dramatic cries of rhythmical horror with which the chorus turned away from *Œdipus* as he entered with blinded and bleeding eyes. Furthermore, his music bridged the difficulties resulting from the adoption of a modern subdivision of the play. This subdivision made the rising and falling of a curtain necessary, and involved repeated entrances and exits of the chorus. All these, with help from the music, were most smoothly and admirably managed. In Sanders Theatre, at our American Cambridge, it would have been impossible—without the greatest difficulty—to have subdivided the play in this fashion. It is therefore well that no attempt was there made to do this or to use a curtain. One further point of essential difference between the American representation and the English one connects itself, as do many others, with the near approach of the ground plan of Sanders Theatre to what we suppose to have been that of the theatre of the Greeks. The chorus was enabled to stand wholly aloof from the actors on the stage. On the other hand, on Tuesday last the many entrances and exits of the chorus had to be made, for lack of independent means of approach, just where the principal actors came and went. Thus the chorus was absorbed, so to speak, into the action of the play. They could not with any plausibility hold aloof from the

proceedings on the stage, and intervene only in a formal way by the utterances of their leader. Hence the chorus at the Theatre Royal recalled very often the conventional chorus of modern opera. To give one instance out of many: when *Œdipus*, not dreaming yet that *Laius* was his father, first fears that he may himself be the murderer, the leader of the chorus ends his comforting lines with the words, "Have hope." Last Tuesday the chorus in a body echoed these words, "Have hope." This was certainly effective, as were often the sympathetic gestures by which the chorus expressed their concern in the progress of the action. Their countermarchings, too, which accompanied the choral songs, were often very finely conceived, and always smoothly executed, but this, once and again, savored of the cut-and-dried machine emotion of the chorus in Italian opera.

As far as quality of voice and distinctness of musical enunciation go, the fifteen members of the chorus left little or nothing to be desired. Mr. Ottley of Trinity, their leader, had an exceptionally agreeable voice in the declamation which fell to his share. At the same time it was a blemish to one's enjoyment of the play that the chorus had always to stand half on the right and half on the left side of the front stage, and the leader's position, with the left half always, interfered sometimes with the best effect of his intervention in the dialogue.

As for the acting of the play in detail, *Œdipus* must be mentioned first because of the almost superhuman length and the quite superhuman difficulty of the part. Mr. Randolph of Trinity bravely undertook this arduous rôle, and he deserves many compliments. The first of them is not all his, for it belongs in part to his clothes. He looked as he entered "every inch a king." His acting, however, was not kingly through all the first part of the play, even up to the moment of *Jocasta's* first entrance. Neither did he bring out the darkest side of *Œdipus's* character. Sophocles endowed this King with a certain elemental truculence which does not forsake his *Œdipus* even at Colonus, when he is blinded and exiled in old age. This quality Mr. Randolph did not adequately bring out, either in the utterance of that fearful imprecation upon the unknown slayer of *Laius*, or in the violent altercation with *Tiresias*, or even in *Œdipus's* one-sided quarrel with *Creon*. But Mr. Randolph's acting certainly was admirable in its indication of the unconsciousness with which *Œdipus* first speaks of the murder of *Laius*, and in the scene in which he recounts to *Jocasta* his actual commission of that crime. Here Mr. Randolph's acting resembled nothing in the American play, and here it was truly excellent. At the climax, where *King Œdipus* disowns himself and breaks utterly beneath the weight of heaped-up misery, Mr. Randolph's manner and his voice fell far short of the tragic power which Mr. Riddle showed at this, one of the most thrilling points in the play.

If I had not seen Mr. Opdycke's *Jocasta* at Sanders Theatre, I should maintain that no amateur performance of the part could give as much satisfaction as that of Mr. Platts of Trinity gave last Tuesday. As it is, I will only record my delight in having seen the part twice acted, and each time so admirably. The two conceptions of the rôle were so different that there is no sufficient basis for comparison. Mr. Platts had perhaps the more adequate appreciation of *Jocasta's* religious awe and fervor at the point where she enters to make propitiatory offerings. Mr. Opdycke certainly was more dramatic at the desperate moment of *Jocasta's* final exit.