

faction, is a recognized leader in his country. Under Western influence he has modified his views as well as his Oriental garb, but he has not ceased to be a Hindu. It is by no means impossible that we shall have to greet him as the truest and best representative of the India of the future.—ED.]

EXPLORATION IN EGYPT.

AN AMERICAN SOCIETY TO DO THE WORK.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

In October 1902 a Boston committee was formed to conduct the affairs of the entire American Branch of the Egypt Exploration Fund. It has utterly failed to induce the subscribers as a body, and the eighty local secretaries, to renew subscriptions and to enlist any considerable support, notwithstanding paid advertising, the distribution of many circulars, and earnest personal work. At the annual meeting in November in London, lamentations went up over the enormous defection of American subscribers. Probably nine-tenths of the subscribers on the rolls of 1900-1902 failed to renew. Not willing to recognize the handwriting on the wall, this Boston Committee is now trying to form committees of its friends in a few large centers, who will solicit and forward funds for the work, not to London, but to Boston, which will credit them as by or through the Boston Committee and then forward the same to the London Committee. A New York circular being sent out reads as if its small local committee was directly connected with the London Committee, whereas its committee is created by that in Boston, to whom the funds collected are sent!

In view of these and other facts to be stated, the time is ripe for an American society which can manage its own affairs, select its agents for the field, and go ahead, without, however, any antagonism to any foreign society. The advantages are chiefly that to America would fall the glory of original discovery and work, and there would be no sharing of the "antiquities" taken from Egypt.

The other facts are these. In 1883 the American branch was founded by Rev. William Copley Winslow, Ph.D., LL.D., of Boston. He devoted himself to building up the society. Its receipts at times exceeded those of the English Committee from all over the Empire. He had suggested some sort of a committee to work with him. He had named eminent members in Chicago, New York, Philadelphia, Boston, who as a nucleus could by conferring with the local secretaries and other subscribers form a national and most representative committee. But what did the London Committee do and how did they do it? The Rev. Dr. E. P. Wright of Milwaukee stated in *The Living Church* these clearly established facts:

1. That the American Branch was reorganized by the London Committee without consulting the hundreds of members and eighty or more local secretaries, and against the protest of many of them.

2. That previous official assurances from London, such as that "in any reorganization of the American Branch the approval of American subscribers is essential," were violated.

3. That the London Committee, itself a body elected annually, probably exceeded its legal powers in *thus* forming, or causing to be formed, a committee to direct the affairs of a large portion of the entire society.

4. That the subsequent request, signed by eighty local secretaries, was shelved by the London Committee.

5. That Mr. Robinson, a non-subscriber and uninterested in the work, was *alone* asked by London to form a committee; that he informed Dr. Winslow that he had declined the appointment; and that, later, when Dr. Winslow, in his surprise, went to him, he said substantially that he had accepted the position "for the Museum's sake." That he formed a committee of seven, of whom three were officials of the Boston Museum, and one other devoted to its interests. That two of his Committee had emphatically disapproved of just such a reorganization previously, when they anticipated no appointment themselves on a committee.

6. That repeated efforts by subscribers to elicit any explanation or reasons for the extraordinary treatment of the American Branch have utterly failed.

7. That, apparently, only a portion of the London Committee attend the meetings; a small minority forming a quorum.

8. That such an act as that of Mr. Cotton, Honorary Secretary, in getting the Secretary in the Boston office placed upon the London Committee, reveals a state of affairs discreditable to any learned body. That if Miss Amelia B. Edwards and Dr. R. Stuart Poole were living, and on the Committee, the "reorganization" could not have occurred.

9. That the Committee of the Egypt Exploration Fund, whose work is partly Biblical, should include, like the Palestine Exploration Fund, a number of clergymen, whose presence at the meetings would ensure a better administration of affairs. That now the one "Rev." on the roll "seldom" goes to a meeting.

10. That the treatment of Dr. Winslow elicits from subscribers all over the land such words as, "If the London Committee were desirous of offending American subscribers they could hardly have chosen a more effective method. The subscribers generally should know the affront which has been put upon them in the indignity showed to you." Again: "You are insulted, the subscribers have been insulted, and the work has been stricken in the house of its friends."

11. That it is right and wise that subscribers and local secretaries have some choice in the selection of their officers.

12. That reorganization of some kind is now essential if those in Boston now managing the work, are to appeal justly, honorably, and *hopefully* to the American public for support. Under existing conditions, a well-known scholar of a New England university wrote to the new Committee: "Can you expect to command the confidence and further efforts of subscribers under such circumstances?"

"An enormous blunder," as Rev. Dr. Kittredge said, had been committed. At the height of prosperity, without giving reasons, or replying to many subsequent inquiries from eminent members, the affairs of the American Branch were overturned, and placed in the hands of a non-subscriber, uninterested in the work, to reorganize!

Dr. Winslow issued a pamphlet *The Truth about the Egypt Exploration Fund* (see *The Open Court*, July, 1904), and then a large circular of opinions about it from ninety-two eminent subscribers condemning the action of the London Committee in unqualified terms. The names represent the highest

Church officials, and some of the best known men in science, education, business, and professional life in America.

No wonder, therefore, that a Boston Committee thus established has not fulfilled its mission. It is really a local committee itself, and has added an eighth member also interested in the museum at Boston.

An "American Egyptological Society" seems to be the just, wise, logical outcome of what the London Committee foolishly attempted, the Boston Committee has signally failed to carry out, and of what we ought to have among our learned bodies as well as England, Germany, and France. Of great interest would be its annual meeting for reading of papers. It could raise much larger sums and from more subscribers than could a society directed by any foreign committee. The brilliant discoveries in Egypt by Americans well prophesy how richly rewarded an American Society would be in its explorations there.

NILUS.

April, 1905.

NEW FORMS OF MUSIC.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

Your "Musical Caprice" in the June number of *The Open Court* is most instructive, possesses also stimulating qualities which prompt me to offer the following comments:

You say in one part: "If mankind must needs have something new, why has there not yet appeared a composer whose endeavor would be to construct music based on absolutely correct mathematical relations?" This struck me as harboring possibilities fraught with much danger to the peace of mind of all music-loving people the world over. Let me attempt to prove the reasonable basis for my fears. Helmholtz, in his great scientific work on tone-sensation, tells of his practical experiments in the use of the just-tempered scales, by using a harmonium tuned scientifically exact through a limited number of keys. This instrument failed to serve his purpose satisfactorily, when modulations to near-by related keys were required. Helmholtz's translator and disciple, Mr. Alexander J. Ellis, went much further in elaborating a scientific formula, completing theoretically, the exact pitch for all the keys and modulations. His table of modulation divides the octave into 117 tones, whereas we use in our even-tempered scale only 12 semi-tones to the octave.

Mr. Ellis says regarding the practical value of this scientific performance: "Of course it is quite out of the question that any attempt should be made to deal with such numbers of tones, differing often by only two cents from each other. (Cent equals $\frac{1}{100}$ of an equal semitone.)

"No ear could appreciate the multitude of distinctions. No instrument, even if once correctly tuned, would keep its intonation sufficiently well to preserve such niceties. No keyboard could be invented for playing the notes, even if it could be tuned, although it is very easy to mark a piece of ordinary music so as to indicate the precise notes to be struck; hence some compromise is needed." (Helmholtz, English translation, p. 464.)

On the other hand, when dealing with our poverty-stricken system, containing only 12 equal semitones to the octave, Helmholtz finds certain disadvantages. His words may be considered as a scientific prophecy when we