



# Flour with the Editor



## ENGLISH SOVEREIGNS

The death of Strafford was followed by an attempt by Edward Hyde, afterwards Lord Clarendon, to form a parliamentary party that would support the King. Hyde's idea was that the power of the King had been sufficiently restricted, and that the determination of the other leaders that Parliament should control administration as well as legislation was an unjust invasion of the prerogatives of the Crown. Pym saw danger ahead. The King had succeeded in making peace with his Scottish subjects, and there was great reason to fear that he proposed to use the military force to deprive Parliament of all its powers. Ireland was in revolt and the scenes of violence which that unhappy land witnessed were terrible beyond description. England seemed to realize that a political earthquake was at hand. Thousands of people took a solemn oath to defend with their lives the Protestant religion and the public liberties, and the Houses of Parliament passed a bill, to which the King gave his assent, declaring that it should never be dissolved without its consent. Pym prepared what was known as the Solemn Remonstrance, in which was set out in detail the condition of the nation, what Parliament had done for the protection of liberty and Protestantism and what dangers threatened from the policy which the King seemed resolved upon. The debate over this document was prolonged and intensely exciting. Towards its close the opposing parties stood in their places with their swords drawn and only the coolness of Hampden prevented the discussion from ending in bloodshed. It was in connection with this debate that Oliver Cromwell first came into prominence. The passage of this remonstrance created the greatest excitement throughout London and all the counties, and associations were formed of men who swore to defend Parliament by force of arms against any efforts that the King might make to deprive it of its powers. One of the efforts of the Commons was to deprive the bishops of a right to sit in the House of Lords, and a measure was passed by them for that purpose, but the Lords did not act on it. The bishops, who were prevented by the mob from attending the House, protested that laws passed in their absence were void, whereupon the Peers sent the protesting bishops to the Tower. Crowds gathered around the Parliament House, and brawls were frequent. The London apprentices were conspicuous and the supporters of the King dubbed them Roundheads; the apprentices retorted by calling their opponents Cavaliers, which was as much a term of contempt as the other, for it meant that they were mere soldiers of fortune ready to fight for any one who paid them for their services. The nicknames were afterwards adopted by the opposing parties themselves.

At this juncture the King, prompted by the Queen, resolved upon a step which brought matters to a crisis. He determined to seize five members of the Commons on a charge of high treason. They were Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Strode and Haselrig. Lord Kimbolton was included in the charges which he preferred. The King's attorney appeared at the Bar of the House of Peers to make accusation against these members. He presented a document drawn up it is said by the King's own hand, wherein seven accusations of a treasonable character were set forth. Lord Clarendon says: "The House of Peers was appalled at this alarm, but took time to consider of it until the next day, that they might see how their masters of the Commons would behave themselves; the Lord Kimbolton being present and making great protestations of his innocence, and no lord being so hardy to press for his commitment on behalf of the King." The King thereupon sent an officer to the Commons demanding the surrender of the members of that body, but the Commons was not easily overawed. It refused to give up the members, and passed a resolution declaring that if anyone should endeavor to take into his possession the persons or property of any members it should be lawful to resist with violence, and that those who might so attempt to interfere with the property and liberty of members should be taken into custody and held until the House should otherwise order. When news of this was brought to the King, he became infuriated, and the following day set out for the House of Commons with a guard. As he kissed the Queen good-bye, he said, "I shall return in an hour master of my kingdom." But he little knew the temper of the men whom he was about to confront. He entered the House and said to the Speaker, "I must borrow your chair for a short time," and having taken it he demanded the surrender of the five members. No answer being given he looked around the chamber and failing to see them asked of the Speaker where they had gone. The Speaker fell upon his knees and said, "I have neither eyes to see nor ears to hear save only as I am commanded by this House." Charles replied that he perceived the birds had flown, and he left the House directing that they should be sent to him immediately on their return. But the Commons declined to do as the King commanded, and as for the five members, they went to and took with scarcely an attempt at concealment. They were careful, however, to give the people of London to understand that they relied on them for protection. "Not," as Lord Clarendon says, "that any one durst attempt their arrest, but that the city might see that they relied upon that place as a sanctuary against oppression, and so might put on an early concernment for them." The citizens responded to

the trust reposed in them by arming themselves and remaining in the streets the whole night through, expecting momentarily that the Cavaliers, with the King at their head, would attempt to fire the city. The King went to Guildhall the next day and demanded the surrender of the five members, only to meet with a firm refusal. Thwarted in his aims, he resolved upon war with Parliament. He sent officers out into the counties to raise troops the Queen took the Crown jewels and went to the Continent to raise money on them, he himself went to Windsor, where the Cavaliers who had fled from him at Whitehall for fear of the populace, gathered around him. The London Trained Bands mustered and escorted the five members to their places in the House in triumph. The King seized some of the minor arsenals; the Commons took possession of the remainder. The House of Lords seemed paralysed by the rapid course of events, and were only stirred into activity when Pym declared the opinion of the Commons. He said, "The Commons will be glad to have your concurrence and help in saving the kingdom; but if they fail of it, it will not discourage them in doing their duty. And whether the kingdom be lost or saved, they will be sorry that the story of this present Parliament should tell posterity that in so great a danger and extremity the House of Commons should be enforced to save the kingdom alone." In response to this appeal the Lords passed the bill removing the bishops from the House of Peers, and the King thereupon gave his assent to it, which was the last occasion upon which he exercised this prerogative. But matters had gone too far. No compromise between the King and the Commons was possible. The King had gone to York in the hope that the people of the north would rally to his support. Here he was joined by thirty-two peers and sixty members of the Commons. With the departure of the Royalists the Commons grew determined. They prepared to meet force with force. The militia was enrolled, Lord Warwick was appointed admiral in command of the fleet; public subscriptions were opened, women gave their wedding rings to be melted down for purposes of coinage. But the Commons was loath to resort to arms against the King, and a last overture was made. They asked that their right to appoint and dismiss ministers should be conceded; that they should have the nomination of the guardians of the King's children, and that they should be given full control of civil administration, the army and navy and all religious matters. To this the King replied: "If I granted this request, I should be no more than the phantom of a king." It was evident now to all men that only the sword could decide the issue between the King and Parliament, and both sides prepared for the struggle. The great crisis in the affairs of Great Britain had come. From July 12th, 1642, when the Commons ordered that an army should be raised "for the defence of the King, the Parliament and the kingdom" until May 26th, 1660, Great Britain was without a reigning sovereign.

## NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Victor Neilson, in his history of Sweden, says, "there is absolutely no evidence to prove the antiquated theories of various immigration into Sweden by different races on different stages of civilization." He goes on to say: "On the contrary, the graves from the remotest times, through all successive periods, prove by the form of the skulls of those buried in them that Sweden has, through all ages, been inhabited by the same dolichocephalic, or long-headed, race which constitutes the overwhelming majority of her people today." He proceeds to trace these people through the Stone and Bronze Ages to the present time, and finds an unbroken continuity. If this is correct it explains the very strong racial characteristics of the Swedish people and the remarkable uniformity of type. Sigvart Sorensen, the Norwegian historian, says that antiquarians maintain that three populations have occupied the Scandinavian Peninsula, and claims that the Swedes and Norwegians are branches of the great family to which the Goths belonged. He says that investigators assign their origin to Western Asia, but this is, of course, only a surmise. But he also says that they occupied the Peninsula long before the historical period. The people of Denmark are assigned to the Celtic stock by some writers; others think they are of the same origin as the Swedes and Norwegians, being only different branches of the same family. But he thinks it may be the people of these lands have remained remarkably free from the infusion of alien blood, while they themselves have contributed not a little to the formation of the qualities of other nationalities. The reason is probably to be found in the fact that the pressure of the tribal movements, which characterized Europe during the Dark Ages and the centuries immediately preceding them, was southward, the northern regions having no attractions for the invaders. On the other hand the Northmen themselves sent many an expedition southward. They produced a profound impression upon the population of the British Isles and northern France, and it is only because their expeditions were not numerically very strong that they failed to leave the impress of their characteristics upon Spain and Italy.

Notwithstanding the now generally received opinion that the Swedes are aboriginal in the land they now occupy, there is reason to believe that Laplanders ante-dated them

and at one time occupied the whole Peninsula. According to the Sagas, the Lapps were an inferior race occupying both Norway and Sweden, and were driven northward by the god-like race, or the descendants of Odin, as the Swedes are said to be. Of course the Sagas are not history; they are only the folklore of the Northmen, but they have a certain basis in fact. The Lapps do not appear to have mingled to any appreciable degree with the Swedes, and they have had little or no influence in determining the characteristics of the race. The Finns seem related to the Lapps, and both of them are assigned to a stock known as the Ugrian. The Ugrians seem to have possessed all northern and a part of central Europe before our Teutonic ancestors invaded the country. They found them formidable foes, and their reputation is preserved to this day in the term "Ogre," which has so weird a significance in childish literature. The Magyars of Hungary also represent the Ugrian race. In general physical characteristics and to some extent in language the Lapps, Finns and Magyars, as well as some of the other people inhabiting Russia, resemble the Mongols, and hence it is customary to speak of them as Turanian origin, and to say that they came from the mountainous regions of Central Asia. Dr. Warren, at one time president of the Boston University, claimed that this resemblance between these European and Asiatic peoples was prima facie proof that they had a common origin in circum-polar regions in a former geological era, and were driven southward by climatic changes, the great majority of them finding their way into Asia. Until a little more than a thousand years ago, the Magyars lived on the slopes of the Ural Mountains, whence partly through a desire for a more hospitable home and partly through pressure from warlike tribes to the east of them, they migrated southward in a body and took up their homes in the very centre of Europe. Through intermarriage the Magyars have to some extent influenced the character of the people of Central Europe, but not to any marked degree. Racially the Lapps, Finns and Magyars more closely resemble the Turks than any other nationality, although the resemblance is not very great.

When we attempt to investigate the origin of the Russian people we are entangled in a mass of tradition, mythology and more or less accurate history from which it is next to impossible to spell out anything that can be called definite. The Greek colonists, who settled on the northern shore of the Black Sea, called the inhabitants Scythians, but this appears to have been a general name for a great variety of people. Herodotus is careful to warn his readers against believing that all the Scythians were of the same race, and he tells many weird stories of the different tribes, all of which must be accepted with a good deal of hesitation. For example, he speaks of the Neuri, who he says changed every year dead parents; of the Arimaspians, who were the offspring of the Amazons by Scythian fathers; of the Issedones, who devoured their dead parents; of the Arimaspians, who were an one-eyed race; of the Gryphons, whence we get our word griffin, who guarded untold treasure of gold. Efforts have been made to identify these races with some modern European peoples, but about the only conclusion that seems warranted is that the various races of Russia, although they have to a certain extent inter-married and thus have become somewhat blended, are the descendants of a great number of ancient tribes, who had little or nothing in common and that they preserve in some degree their distinctive characteristics even to the present time. Alfried Rambaud, in his history of Russia, says that some of the tribes on the head waters of the Volga yet retain much of their ancient paganism and can only by courtesy be called civilized. Indeed, we may also say that we see in Russia of today an illustration ethnologically of what Central Europe was fifteen centuries ago, before the various races had become blended into homogeneous nationalities, and when we come to consider the matter a little we see that this might very well be so, for the peoples of Central and Western Europe are the result of the amalgamation of many races, who crowded into the relatively narrow limits bounded by the Mediterranean, the south and the Baltic on the north, were compelled of necessity to coalesce, while on the broader regions embraced in Russia they had room to keep apart and to some extent to preserve their original distinction. As the population of Russia increases the internal pressure will become stronger and the result will be a complete fusion, and the development of what will be a new race.

## THE INFINITELY LITTLE

Theoretically nothing can be so small as to be indivisible. If a thing has any magnitude whatever, it must be that it is, say, four times as large as one quarter of its size, and each of those quarters must be four times as large as their quarters, and so on ad infinitum. Theoretically, therefore, there can be no limit to smallness. Likewise there can be no limit to greatness, for if we say there is a limit to the extension of space, we imply something beyond that limit. There are therefore two infinities, the infinitely small and the infinitely large. There must also be infinity of duration. The mind cannot grasp what these things mean.

A recent invention, known as the ultra-microscope, enables us to discern objects inconceivably more minute than has hitherto been supposed possible. The best microscope

of the ordinary type enables an observer to see something that is 1-7000th of a millimetre in diameter, or 1-175,000th part of an inch. This diameter is about one-half the length of a wave of light, and therefore anything smaller than this would be lost in the light waves, so says Robert Kennedy Duncan in Harper's Magazine. To see anything smaller than this it is necessary to make the bodies luminous, and for this purpose a device has been invented by which a whisp of very intense light can be concentrated upon an exceedingly small space, and the result is that "objects can be seen that are as small as the stars are distant." They lie, says the writer quoted, like stars in the depths of the infinitely small. They are so small, indeed, that their shape cannot be determined, and yet it is possible to measure them. We quote further: "Even though it is actually true that their forms may not be observed, their average size may nevertheless be calculated, not in terms of theory, but of fact. Thus, in examining the particles of gold in ruby glass, the area of the minute beam may be calculated, the number of particles of gold in this area may be counted, and since the weight of gold introduced into the glass and its specific gravity are both known, all the factors are provided for estimating their average size. So determined, the particles of gold in glass average six-millionths of a millimetre in diameter. The smallest particles estimable in a colloidal solution of gold measured 1.7 millionth of a millimetre. This means that in capacity for determining minute quantities of matter the ultra-microscope is thirty-seven trillion thirty-one billion times as powerful as the best modern spectro-scope." One seven-millionth of a millimetre is one 1-75,000,000th part of an inch. But the scientific imagination of investigators is not content with this. It has endeavored to distinguish even more minute subdivisions of matter, that is, to determine just what it is at its last analysis. To these subdivisions the name "molecule" has been given, and the difference in the solidity of bodies is supposed to be due to the density of the molecules. Dr. A. D. Risten estimates that in a cubic inch of gas there may be 100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 molecules, but he is careful to say that this is only the roughest kind of an approximation. In a liquid there would be necessarily many times this number, and in a solid the number would be so great that not the most imaginative of them all has undertaken to suggest how many there may be. But even this is not the limit of the suggested minuteness of the subdivision of matter, for Professor J. J. Thompson would have us go further and believe that molecules are made up of what he called electrons, and these are so small that in a cubic inch of gas there would be 100,000,000,000,000,000,000,000 of them, and in a cubic inch of gold at least two hundred times as many as this inconceivable number. This is as far in the direction of the infinitely small that investigators have ventured to go, and they ask us to believe that when matter is subdivided to this extent it is all alike, that is to say that there is no distinction between the 20,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000th part of a cubic inch of gold and the same proportionate part of a cubic inch of lead, the difference between gold and lead consisting of the way these electrons are put together, and Lord Kelvin has suggested that each of these electrons may be only a vortex of electricity, like a smoke ring on an inconceivably small scale. Hence it is suggested that all matter is made up of these inconceivably small vortices of electricity. Whence it follows that while the vortex may be the ultimate organic subdivision of matter, it may itself be infinitely subdivided. Therefore the visible Universe is at once infinitely great and infinitely small.

## Some Famous Dramatists and Their Master-Pieces

(N. de Bertrand Lagin)

### SOPHOCLES II.

Apart from its inestimable artistic value, the philosophical influence of Sophocles' work can scarcely be overestimated. He conveys to us, in the attitude of his heroes and heroines, over and over again, the sublime truth, that suffering, deprivation, torture, even death itself, while they may bend or break or kill the body, cannot overthrow the supreme majesty of invincible human will, a will that transcends the power of all accumulated misfortunes, because it springs from the Divine nature within us, which is incapable of subjection. For though Sophocles had no quarrel with Greek mythology, and accorded sufficient honor to the recognized deities, at the same time we recognize by his works, as we do by the works of his great contemporaries in relation to themselves that he, with them, was convinced of the existence of an unnameable wisdom and omnipotence, that ruled the universe and was as high above the petty human conception of gods and goddesses as the starry vault is above the tree-tops. Dramatic poetry of all time scarcely furnishes equals to the sublime characters he has drawn for us in Ajax, Philoctetes, Oedipus, Antigone and the rest. The same heroes and heroines have been treated with times-without number, but they have not been invested with such heroic or sympathy-compelling qualities as those with which Sophocles loves to portray them. He teaches us the worth of all that is best in human endeavor, not by showing us that it brings to him who strives any temporary gain or advantage; but simply how it ennobles the character even through

suffering, and exalts to the dignity of a god, though it bring death as a final blow. And what does Oedipus say of death when he meets it in the grove, and realizes that his sufferings are over, his long trial ended, his weariness and disappointment soon to become things of the past.

"One only friend he sees can help—  
A friend that shall come when dawns at last  
The day that knows not bridal song  
Nor lyre nor dance—that festal day  
Whose equal doom we all abide;  
Shall come kind Death, and make an end."

A horribly morbid theme has that play in which Oedipus figures. It is not probable that there lives a writer today who would dare to handle it. It shows the ruling of the cruel oracle all the way through. We have a man of noble qualities, doomed to make one horrible mistake after another until death brings his release. He slays an old man who has insulted him, not knowing him to be his own father, and later marries Laius' widowed queen, his own mother. The fact that he is in utter ignorance of his parentage is not allowed to mitigate his offence in the least and though he enjoys prosperity until his four daughters have grown to womanhood, such dreadful woes beset him then, and cause broadcast suffering, that poor Oedipus, beggared, blind, old and infirm becomes only an object of pity.

"O, my lord, Ajax, of all things most hard,  
Hardest is slavery for men to bear.  
And I was daughter of a sire freeborn,  
No Phrygian mightier, wealthier than he;  
But now I am a slave. For so the gods,  
And so thine arm had willed it. Therefore now—  
For I am thine, thy wife, and wish thee well—  
I charge thee now by Zeus who guards thy heart—  
And by that couch of thine which I have shared—  
Condemn me not, given over to their hands,  
To bear the cruel gibes thy foes would fling.  
Bethink thee on that day that thou shalt die.  
And by that death divorce me, violent hands  
On me the Greeks will lay, and we shall live  
Henceforth the life of slaves, thy child and I.  
And then at me shall some one of my lords  
Shoot out sharp words, 'Lo, ye, the concubine  
Of Ajax who was strongest of the Greeks—  
Fallen from what pride, unto what service  
bound.'"

So they will talk. And me such fate will plague:  
But shame such talk imports to thee and thine.  
Nay, but have pity, and leave not thou thy sire,  
So old, so grieved; pity thy mother too,  
Portion'd with many years, who night and day  
Prays to the gods to bring home alive;  
And have compassion on thy boy, O prince—  
Think, should he live, poor child, forlorn of thee.  
By unkind guardians of kind care deprived,  
What wrong thy death will do to him and me;  
Nothing have I to look to any more,  
When thou art gone. Thy spear laid waste my home;  
My mother too and father, Fate withal  
Brought low, in the dark house of death to dwell.  
What home then shall I find instead of thee—  
What wealth? My life hangs utterly on thee."

These are the pathetic words put into the mouth of the slave girl Tecmessa, who has served Ajax as servant and wife during his long absence in Troy, who has borne him a little son, and who bemoans the death about to befall her lord. The whole story is portrayed most pathetically. Ajax, from having been the strongest warrior of them all, becomes mad through disappointed ambition, and makes such dreadful mistakes as thinking that droves of sheep are the armies of his enemies, and falling upon them and slaughtering them. He is the laughing stock of the army. At length sanity returns, and appreciating the shameful spectacle he has made of himself, he resolves to commit suicide. This he does in spite of Tecmessa's prayers and entreaties, though he loves her and the child devotedly.

"Men must obey their rulers. Nay how else? Things most august and mightiest upon earth Bow to authority; the winter's storms Dense with their driven snow, give place at last  
To fruitful summer; and night's weary round Passes, and dawn's white steeds light up the day;  
And blasts of angry wind let sleep again  
The groaning sea; and tyrannous sleep withal Holds not his prey, but looses whom he binds.  
Then shall not we learn wisdom and submit."

The concluding words of J. P. Mahaffy's admirable criticism are a high eulogy to the great poet. "Nor is it likely that a time will ever come when future generations will have made such advances in art that the Oedipus of Sophocles, the Hermes of Praxiteles, the nameless tomb of the King of Sidon, the temples on the Acropolis at Athens will be superseded by greater models."

"Come in swimmin', I'll show you some new strokes."  
"Nope, last time I went dad showed me some new ones."