

The Open Court.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

Devoted to the Work of Conciliating Religion with Science.

No. 187. (VOL. V.—5.)

CHICAGO, MARCH 26, 1891.

{ Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cts.

WOMAN EMANCIPATION.

ONE of the most important and at the same time noblest of our present ideals is the emancipation of woman. Woman is the weaker sex, because nature has destined her strength to be sacrificed for the perpetuation of the race. Woman represents the future of humanity; the immortality of mankind is entrusted to her. The burdens of life are upon the whole so divided that man must struggle with the adversities of conditions, while woman must suffer all the throes and woes which are the price of the continuance of human existence. He is the more active fighter, the worker, the hero; she is the passive endurer, the toiler, the martyr. He has under these conditions grown strong, physically and intellectually; she has grown noble. The activity of each being shapes its organization and models its character. Thus the virtues of man became daring courage, concentration of thought, and enterprising energy; the virtues of woman became abnegation of self, patience, and purity of heart.

Woman, being the weaker sex, has been and to a great extent is still held in subjection to the power and jurisdiction of the stronger sex. It is true that among cultured people the rudeness of this relation, has disappeared. The husband has ceased to be the tyrant of the household. He respects the independence of his wife and prefers to have in her a loving comrade rather than a pliant slave. Nevertheless progress is slow. It is perhaps not so much oppression by single persons as by traditional habits that is still weighing heavily upon woman, retarding the final emancipation of her sex.

Prof. E. D. Cope has written an article on the economical relation between the sexes* in which he emphasises woman's dependence on the support and protection of man. Professor Cope explains satisfactorily the present state of society, but he leaves out of sight the question whether this present state has to continue forever. His article is a scholarly investigation of existent conditions, but he does not touch the problem whether this is the only possible natural state or a special phase in the development of human sex-relations. We believe that the present phase is to be

followed by another phase securing to woman a better, nobler, and more dignified position.

It may be conceded, as a matter of historical statement, that in the struggle for life women had to depend upon men for protection and sustenance. Yet it must not be forgotten that men in their turn also had to depend upon women. What are men without mothers and wives? How helpless is an old widower, and in spite of his so-called liberty how poor is the life of an old bachelor.

Professor Cope does not overlook this point, yet he maintains that women as a rule cannot make a living; he maintains that whenever they do, it is an exception and this is the reason why they must look for sustenance and protection from the stronger sex. Granted that this has been so; also granted that many women had to marry for this sole reason, must we therefore conclude that this wretched state of things is to continue forever? It may be true that there was a time when serfdom was an unavoidable state for a certain class of people who in a state of liberty would not make a decent living for themselves; slavery perhaps was a greater blessing to them than to their masters. Would that be a reason for continuing slavery in a higher state of social conditions?

The woman question has originated through the very progress of civilisation. In order to make a living a human being has no longer to depend upon physical strength, but mostly upon mental capacities, nay, more so upon moral qualities. Sense of duty is more important than muscle power, and sometimes even than skill. The time has come that at least in many branches a well educated woman can do the same work as a man, and she is no more dependent upon man for sustenance and protection.

This fact will not alter the natural relation of sex. Our women will not cease to marry, to bear and to raise children. Yet it will alter their position in this relation. They will no longer marry for the mere sake of protection, but for love alone. They will then enter marriage on equal terms; and thus they will obtain a more dignified place in human society.

It cannot be denied that woman is different from man. The average man is superior in some respects, and the average woman is superior in other respects. Neither man nor woman is the perfect man. True

* *The Monist*, No. 1, p. 38.

humanity is not represented by either. True humanity consists in their union, and in the consequences of their union, namely in the family.

Woman's emancipation does not involve any deduction from man's rights or duties. Man will not suffer from it, on the contrary, he will profit. It will raise our family life upon a higher stage and man will be as much a gainer in this bargain as the slave-holder who can employ free labor easier and cheaper than keep slaves. As no one would wish to re-establish slavery now, so in a later period no man would ever care to have the old state recalled when women married mainly for the sake of sustenance and protection.

Let me add that woman emancipation is slowly but assuredly accomplished, not by acts of legislature, but by a natural growth which no conservatism can stop. Acts of legislature giving more liberty and chances of making a living to woman, will not be the cause, they will come in consequence of a true woman emancipation. There are many steps taken in a wrong direction. Efforts are wasted especially by some over-enthusiastic women in making women like men, instead of making men and women equal. These erroneous aspirations are injurious to the cause, yet after all they cannot ruin it. There is an ideal of a higher, more elevated and a better womanhood, and this ideal (although it is often misunderstood) will be accomplished without the destruction of the womanly in woman.

P. C.

MATERIAL RELATIONS OF SEX IN HUMAN SOCIETY.

BY E. D. COPE.

THE editorial notice of my article in No. 1 of *The Monist* on the "Material Relations of Sex in Human Society," requires the following remarks by way of further elucidation of the subject. It is evident that some men and women in common with the editor of *The Monist*, entertain the idea that an important change in the economical relations of the sexes is to occur, and that such change will be beneficial. They even use the term "slavery" in connection with the present general dependent relation of women to men. No doubt many men would be glad to have their wives support themselves, and even to support the entire family, but the aspirations of such men do not command our respect, unless their situation renders such assistance absolutely necessary. It is probable that the term "slavery" would be quite as appropriate to this state of affairs for women, as to its opposite. That women may and do often render important aid to the finances of a family, is right and proper, but it rarely extends to entire self-support and cannot be looked upon as evidence that women generally can be financially independent of men. The disabilities of married women are self-evident, and require no further

elucidation; every one is familiar with them and their effects in both domestic and business relations. The nature of the competition between men and women is well described in an editorial in the *Women's Tribune*, which commenting adversely on my article, affords unconsciously excellent support to my position. It says: "No man refrains from distancing a woman, whether it is in the race for a street car or a post office. In every sense of the word he is her competitor and antagonist in the industrial world. He only asks equal wages for her, when for her to be paid otherwise would make her a dangerous rival. This is not saying that many men are not just and chivalrous to women, but it is expressing the actual state of affairs as it exists today." As this is exactly the treatment which man gives his fellow-man in the working world, it is what woman has to expect so soon as she enters the field as his "competitor and antagonist." She cannot expect fairly anything else. The industrial pursuits of men have for their object in large part the support of a wife and children. And as between the woman who is not his wife, and the woman who is his wife, he will regard the latter before the former.

In the natural, i. e. matrimonial, relation between men and women, all this is changed. The man waits for the woman at the "horse car," "post office," etc., aids her to gain her desires, and gives her the first of everything. She is freer than the man, who is the "slave" to the economic and business relations of the time and place in which he lives. The supposition that man is "free" in business relations, is untrue; he is hedged about and under restraint in all directions. He is under the domination of the strongest muscle or brain, and the law of the extinction of the unfit, the reverse of the "survival of the fittest" has him in its iron grasp. That women should desire to enter this life in exchange for the comparatively mild restraints of the matrimonial relation is inconceivable, and is only to be explained on the supposition that they are ignorant of the facts. And to succeed in a matrimonial career it is only necessary to observe the principal conditions necessary to a man to success in business—personal civility and honesty.

RECOLLECTIONS OF HENRY SCHLIEMANN.

BY THEODORE STANTON.

IN July 1880 I went down from Berlin to Leipsic to attend the banquet given in honor of the Fourth by the United States Consul. I happened to stop at the same hotel where Dr. Schliemann and his family were staying, while he was busily engaged correcting the proofs of the book described in the following letter. I sat opposite him at table and conversed with him a great deal. Shortly afterwards he came up to Berlin, as will also be seen in one of the letters given below,

where I again met him. At Leipsic I also saw something of his wife and children. From this acquaintance sprang a correspondence. Looking over his letters the other day I found a few which seem to me to be of enough interest to make public, and I therefore lay them before your readers.

While at work correcting proofs, as already stated, Dr. Schliemann wrote me as follows from Leipsic, under date of July 12th, 1880, concerning his forthcoming volume :

"The new book, 'Ilios,' has not the form of a journal ; it is altogether a scientific work and the historical part of the excavations is, therefore, out of place in the text. But as it is of great interest, I have joined it to my autobiography with which I begin the book. I can assure you, however, that if I commence the book with the history of my life, it is not from any feeling of vanity, but from a desire to show how the work of my later life has been prompted by, and has been the natural consequence of, the impressions I received in my earliest childhood, and that, so to say, the pickaxe and spade for the excavation of Troy and the Royal *sepulchras* of Mycenæ were both forged and sharpened in the little village in Mecklenburg in which I passed eight years of my earliest childhood. I also found it necessary to relate how I obtained the means which enabled me, in the autumn of my life, to realise the gigantic projects I formed when I was a poor little boy. But I flatter myself that the manner in which I have employed my time, and the use I have made of wealth, will meet with universal approbation, and that my autobiography may aid in diffusing among the intelligent public of all countries a taste for the high and noble studies which have sustained my courage during the hard trials of my life, and which promise to sweeten the days yet left me to live.

"I have availed myself of the opportunity to dwell at some length on the erroneous method by which Greek is taught in America and England. In fact I think it a cruel injustice to inflict for eight years on an unhappy pupil a language of which, when he leaves college, as a general rule, he knows hardly more than when he first began to learn it. As causes of this miserable result I accuse, in the first place, the arbitrary and atrocious pronunciation of Greek usual in America and England ; and, in the second place, the erroneous method employed, according to which the pupils learn to disregard the accents entirely and to consider them as mere impediments, whereas the accents constitute a most important auxiliary in learning the language.

"What a happy effect could be produced on general education and what an enormous stimulus could be given to scientific pursuits, if intelligent youths could obtain in eighteen months not only a thorough

knowledge of modern Greek, but also a thorough knowledge of the most divine and most sonorous language which was spoken by Homer and Plato, and could learn the latter tongue as a living language so as never to forget it. And how easily, at how small an expense, could the change be made. A detailed account of the method I recommend, you find in my book. The idea was given to me by the examinations in the Merchant Tailor's College in London, to which I was invited. There were speeches in English, German, French, Latin, and Greek. All the speeches I understood, except those in Greek, nay, I did not understand a single word of them. I preach no idle theories, but stubborn facts, and ought, therefore, to be listened to."

Dr. Schliemann then goes on to give a *résumé* of the contents of his then forthcoming volume. As it concerns a most important archæological work, as it contains many curious facts, and as it comes from the author himself, I venture to give it in full, as follows :

"The order of my 'Ilios' is this: (1) My autobiography, containing a full description, as just mentioned, of the method by which any intelligent boy can master in eighteen months the difficulties of both modern and ancient Greek, learn both as living languages, understand all classics, and write with fluency dissertations in ancient Greek on any subject he is acquainted with ; further the history of my excavations at Troy and Ithaca. (2) A full description of the country of the Trojans, its mountains, promontories, rivers, valleys, its geology, botany, zoölogy, history, as well as its all-important ethnology and linguistics. (3) Criticism of all ancient and modern literature on Troy. (4) The first city of Troy, the ruins of which are on the rock Hissarlik at a depth of from forty-five to fifty-three feet below the surface. (5) The second city. Bronze was in both cities still unknown, but gold, silver, and copper, were known. In both cities were found five axes of jade (nephrite), which prove that the inhabitants had immigrated from the highlands of Asia. (6) The third or the burnt city, in which ten treasures were found. Here bronze as well as the art of soldering were known. The geology of the strata of *débris* of this most remarkable burnt city, as well as those of the two preceding and all the following cities, is minutely described by my excellent collaborator Prof. Rudolf Virchow, of Berlin, Emile Burwouf of Paris, and myself. Here were found five jade axes, and three more in the two following cities. (7) The fourth city. (8) The fifth city, which, as well as the four preceding cities, are prehistoric settlements. (9) The fifth is followed up in the sixth city by a Lydian settlement, all the pottery showing the very greatest resemblance to the most ancient pottery found in the *terra mare* between the trans-

Paduan district and the Abruzzi in Italy. (10) The seventh city, the Ilion of the Æolic colony. (11) The heroic tumuli of the Troad, of which I explored six.

"The book is illustrated among other things by about 2,000 different characteristic types of objects discovered in the seven cities. For the most part the Trojan antiquities are unique, but whenever there are *analoga* in other museums, these *analoga* are always carefully pointed out. All my arguments in the book are supported by quotations from ancient classics, and of such quotations there are, I think, more than five thousand in foot-notes, which greatly embellish the volume.

"If at present not all philologists believe that I discovered Troy in the third, the burnt city, on my death this discovery will be universally acknowledged, and, there being no second Troy to excavate, I venture to hope that my present work, which is the result of long years' hard labor, will be appreciated and will be considered for all coming ages very useful for reference."

When Dr. Schliemann died, surprise was expressed, even by some Americans, that the will of the great explorer revealed the fact that he was an American citizen. In my conversations with him he always referred to himself as an American, and his "we" and "us" always meant "we Americans" or "us Americans." The closing passage of the letter from which I have been quoting, and passages in other letters which will follow, show that Dr. Schliemann's American citizenship had, at least at this time, a strong hold on him. The letter closes with this paragraph:

"You asked me when I am going over to America. If this depended upon me, I would go over instantly and would never leave again the GREAT country. [The words are so written in the original.] But my days are counted and my minutes are precious. Besides, in America I cannot be of any use to science, whereas I may still be of great use to it by continuing my explorations in the Orient, where Sardis, in Asia Minor, Lycosara in Arcadia and Orchomenos in Bœotia, impatiently await their delivery by my pickaxe and spade. My fellow citizens are by far too intelligent not to understand all this, and I feel sure that they would applaud and hail with *far greater* enthusiasm any new, great archæological discovery I might make, than any lectures I could deliver to them personally on my old discoveries. Pray present my kindest regards to Dr. White. [Hon. Andrew D. White, then United States Minister to Germany.]"

In a brief note written on the same day as the foregoing letter, Dr. Schliemann said:

"I just learn from Professor Virchow that he has secured me the place of honor for the opening day of the Anthropological Congress (August 5) and that I have to lecture first. He adds that he has already

announced my name, and I see, therefore, no other alternative but to accept. I wrote to him to send tickets both to you and to our honorable minister, Dr. White."

I call attention to the "our" in the last phrase of this letter. In another letter he says: "On my first visit to Berlin I shall have very great pleasure in making the acquaintance of the honorable Dr. White, our United States Minister to the German Court. But after all I do not know yet whether I shall be able to attend in August the Anthropological Congress in Berlin, for the preparation of my lecture and my stay in Berlin would take up a whole week, whilst I have not a moment to spare."

But he did go up to the German capital, did have the place of honor, spoke in the presence of the then Crown Prince and Princess by whom he was highly complimented and was fêted in a grand way by all the German savants, as I saw with my own eyes during the sittings of the Congress. The effect of this changed sentiment in Germany in regard to Schliemann was very important. It evidently made Schliemann less of an American, or perhaps it would be more exact to say that it made him more of a German and secured for the Berlin Museum his valuable collections, which might otherwise have gone to the British Museum, or to New York.

The following letter, written from Leipsic after his return there, is dated August 31st, and reveals Schliemann's joy at the recognition of his labors by his native land. The opening passage refers to the banquet which closed the labors of the Anthropological Congress.

"By a strange accident I received only to day your very kind letter of the 10th inst., from which I am sorry to see that you missed that splendid festival of the 9th inst. at the Kaiserhof, for you would have enjoyed it very much indeed.

"Mind that both in America and in England my discoveries were acknowledged at once and all my theories and conclusions were almost universally accepted there, whilst in Germany they were subjects of universal laughter and derision. But now all at once they see in Germany that they are wrong and implicitly accept all my arguments. Though this acknowledgment in my native country comes late, it is highly agreeable to me, for I thought it would come only after my death. But that it would come one day, I was perfectly sure.

"In fact the acknowledgement of the German scientific world could not have been more manifestly symbolised than by the *menu* of the grand dinner, which is twelve inches long by nine in breadth, and represents on the right Nordenskjöld laboring hard on board his 'Vega' in front of a huge iceberg on

which the manifold victuals are written in Swedish. Below, to the right, is pictured an Esquimaux holding in his hand the map of the Arctic regions, while to the left is the City of Berlin symbolised by a polar bear which holds a laurel wreath in his mouth.

"On the left side of the beautiful card I am represented heroically, sitting on the great treasure symbolised by a safe with the legend *Ἀρτέμιο Πριάμοιο*. (Arnheim is the celebrated safe maker in this country.) In my right hand I hold an immense spade; on my left is standing the goddess Victory putting a laurel-crown on my head, while the City of Berlin, personified by a bear, puts another laurel wreath at my feet. Above my head is represented Troy with its huge walls and towers, with the legend *Ἰλιος ἰρή*. In front of me is the list of the dishes in Greek crowned by the Lion's Gate of Mycenæ, with the legend in Greek which translated reads: 'Banquet in honor of the great Schliemann.' Below all this are beautiful representations from the 'Iliad,' such as Hector taking leave of Andromache and Astyanax frightened at the sight of his father's helmet-crest.

"Who would have thought so rapid a change possible only a few years ago, when the whole German press was insulting me and throwing thunderbolts at me? Nay they pretended even that I had got fabricated all the Trojan and Mycenaean treasures at Athens to impose upon the credulous! But my collections have never been and never will be for sale.

"My kindest regards to you and to our learned ambassador, the Hon. Dr. White.

"I write in the utmost hurry and beg to be excused for slips of the pen."

The foregoing extracts show with what zeal Henry Schliemann bent to his work, reveal his strong American leaning, and prove once more how necessary applause and appreciation is to the happiness of a man of genius.

Paris, Feb., 1891.

CURRENT TOPICS.

LAST year, when the people of Kansas elected to the office of judge a citizen who was not a lawyer, some surprise was manifested, and the performance was regarded as a bit of lunacy peculiar to the inhabitants of that remote and sockless province; but the same eccentricity has been practiced in Chicago for many years without exciting comment. At this term of the appellate court forty-five judgments appealed from the lower courts were passed upon, and twenty-three of them reversed, leaving twenty-two affirmed, and these will very likely be reversed by the supreme court when they get up there. There are mechanics in Chicago, who for a hundred dollars or so, will make a wooden machine to decide law-suits, and will warrant that more of its judgments will be sustained by the higher courts, than of those rendered by the numerous judges innocent of law, who get seven thousand dollars a year each for deciding wrong. It has been candidly said in a book by one of the judges that the civil courts of Chicago, are practically closed against the poor. This is doubtless true, and

the exclusion is one of the incidents of poverty for which the poor man has reason to be grateful. "The law's delay" is among Hamlet's provocations to suicide, but in Chicago we have doubled this plague of life, for we have not only the law's delay, but at the end of that a reversal of the judgment. Happy is the man who is too poor to go to law.

* * *

While it is not necessary in Chicago, for a judge to be a lawyer, it is essential that he be a partisan branded "Republican" or "Democrat." This is the common law of the bench; and every candidate for judicial honors must be duly enlisted and mustered into a republican or a democratic battalion. Membership in any of the other political parties is a disqualification. A Coke or a Blackstone, a Kent or a Story, would not be eligible to a judgeship in Chicago until after he had obtained his diploma as a republican or a democrat. There are some good lawyers in Chicago who do not belong to any political party, and some who belong to one or other of the various heterodox parties, but never a man of them is eligible to the bench; and what is yet more curious, the judgeships must be equally divided between the orthodox partisans. Whenever a judicial vacancy occurs by reason of death or other accident, it must be filled, not for the public advantage, but according to the politics of the last incumbent. All this is delightfully stupid and conservative. It has in it the elements of that impartiality shown by old Squire Vinton, who was a justice of the peace in the western country several years ago. There were only two lawyers in the town, one of them a democrat, the other a republican, and consequently they had one side or the other of every case. One day the republican had a plain and very easy case, but was greatly astonished when the squire gave judgment against him. He remonstrated fervently, and showed how wrong the decision was, but the squire was firm, and said: "Mark, you won the last case, and it's Jimmy's turn to win this one, so judgment goes agin you, and squashes your declaration like a house fell on it." By this method of equity, the partisan division of the judgeships may be made logical, for unless the democratic judges decide in favor of democrats, and the republicans the other way, of what use is this partisan rule? The comedy of it does not become visible until we learn that the object of the rule is to protect us from the evils of a partisan judiciary.

* * *

Much inconvenience has been caused in genteel circles by the application to polite society of musty maxims to the effect that "all are equal before the law," that "there is only one code for the rich and poor alike," that "the law is no respecter of persons," and much fabulous tradition of a similar kind. Those doctrines when put into practice have given some annoyance to patrician suitors who have been compelled to accept juries composed of a miscellaneous mixture, drawn, as the legal jargon has it, "from the body of the county," rather than from a gilt edged catalogue. A change in this respect has been made in St. Louis, and no doubt it will be adopted by the courts of Chicago and other cities where high society is found. The new system of drawing special jurors, as adopted by the jury commissioners of St. Louis, is briefly this: By paying \$75.00 a man has the privilege of refusing to accept a jury drawn from the mixed rabble in the city directory, and may have his jury from the more select circle represented in Gould's Business Directory. The privilege is rather expensive, but we cannot expect to get aristocratic juries at democratic prices. After awhile juries will be classified into three grades according to quality, like the pews in the church, or the seats in the theatre. They hanged a lord in England once for ordinary murder, but they allowed him a silken rope because he claimed the luxury as due to his rank. His claim was conceded, provided he would pay for the rope, which he did. Had he lived in this more enlightened age,

he might by paying for it, have had a special jury to his liking, selected from "Gould's Business Directory."

* * *

Like a burlesque old wizard in a comic opera, the venerable Isaac Bassett, Assistant Something or other of the Senate, using his magic wand, put back the national clock three several times on the 4th of March, five minutes at a time, in order to lengthen the legislative day, and save the appropriation bills. At his command the sun went back fifteen minutes on the dial of Ahaz, and the proud noon retreated three times to accommodate the fifty-first congress. This puerile miracle is done at the close of every congress in the presence and with the approval of "potent, grave, and reverend" senators, who pretend that the term is just fifteen minutes too short for the work that congress has to do. A spectator looking on during the closing hours of congress would suppose that madness had taken possession of both houses; but never had madness more method in it,—nor more money. In the convivial tumult of the time conscience becomes drunken, and millions are squandered in appropriations not fit to be made. The president has no time to examine the bills he is required to sign, nor is it intended that he shall have any, for that might mean the saving of millions to the people, and the defeat of a hundred conspiracies against the treasury. It is the very stultification of a people that the late congress which pretended on the 4th of March, that it needed just fifteen minutes more, and employed a magician to get it, actually spent the first nine months of its term in idleness without even coming together; and the present congress which began to draw pay on the 4th of March, will spend the first nine months of its term in the same way, and at the end it will pretend that it needs just fifteen minutes more to complete its business, and will call upon the same old conjurer for it.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

GEORGE HENRY LEWES AND "THE OPEN COURT."

To the Editor of The Open Court:—

I AM an admirer of G. H. Lewes's philosophy, yet it has long been a matter of surprise to me that Lewes's work should be so little known, and should apparently have produced such a small effect. For several years now I have been looking out for evidences of his influence, and I have to confess, I have not seen many. It is true he is often referred to and quoted by authors as an authority, but his doctrine is, I believe, much misunderstood. I find too, occasionally, his thoughts appropriated without any acknowledgment, while I have seen him deliberately misquoted and misrepresented. Since I first began to read *The Open Court*, nearly two years ago, I have anxiously scanned its pages for evidences of Lewes's influence, but though I frequently discover coincidences of view, I have never yet been able to make up my mind whether Dr. Carus has read Lewes's works or not. If he has not done so, it is only one more indication of the fact, that what Lewes would call the "General Mind" is on the eve of making an important step in advance. Philosophic thought is spreading. Change is "in the air" and an advance is inevitable.

At the present time there are three special forms or phases of thought—more or less allied—seeking recognition. The Monism of *The Open Court*, the Hylo-Idealism of Dr. Lewins, and the Reasoned Realism of George Henry Lewes. It is true, that this last—strangely enough—seems to be out of the running altogether, and the reason for this is, I think, not far to seek. Lewes and Herbert Spencer each appeal to the philosophic world, and the Transfigured Realism of Spencer has proved to be—not more true but more popular than Lewes's Reasoned Realism. The fact is, that Spencer's philosophy with its "Unknowable Per-

sistent Force" seems admirably suited to answer as a cushion for such thinkers as have been compelled to relinquish their personal "Creator."

Hylo-Idealism is at present too shadowy and vague to meet with much acceptance, and unfortunately its originator has personally not been successful in placing his philosophy before the world; indeed his own exposition of it, seems to me to be little other than an alternate posing, first on the pedestal of Idealism and then on that of Materialism, and because this intellectual change of position is unconsciously accomplished Dr. Lewins believes he has reconciled them; nor can I—with all my admiration for Miss Constance Naden perceive that she has accomplished much more. The only other writer who has, just lately, been able to make a fair presentation of what Dr. Lewins has in his mind is Mr. McCrie. I refer to his article in *The Open Court*. But Mr. McCrie seems fully alive to the real outcome of Hylo-Idealism for he entitled his article "Positive Idealism."

With regard to the Monism of *The Open Court* I confess that notwithstanding I have read "Fundamental Problems," I am not yet able to say that I understand what Monism really means—hence I refrain from any criticism. I feel that it must be on the "right lines" or there could not be so many "coincidences" such as I have referred to.

Somewhat oddly,—notwithstanding my enthusiastic admiration for G. H. Lewes,—on one or two matters I do not agree with him. The oddness is not in the fact of my difference, but in the fact that on the points I refer to, Lewes and Dr. Carus are at one. It is not on points of doctrine, but of policy; perhaps if I quote the remarks from Lewes, you will better understand what I mean. In the first volume of his "Problems" (p. 2) he writes:

"There is a conspicuous effort to reconcile the aims and claims of Religion and Science—the two mightiest antagonists. The many and piteous complaints, old as Religion itself against the growing infidelity of the age might be disregarded were they not confirmed on all sides by evidence that Religion is rapidly tending to one of two issues, either towards extinction, or towards transformation. Some considerable thinkers regard the former alternative as the probable and desirable issue. They argue that Religion has played its part in the evolution of humanity—a noble part, yet only that of a provisional organ which in the course of development must be displaced by a final organ. Other thinkers—and I follow these—consider that Religion will continue to regulate the evolution; but that to do this in the coming ages, it must occupy a position similar to the one it occupied in the past and express the highest thought of the time as that thought widens with ever growing experience. . . . Those who entertain this hope and view of Religion founded on Science, believe—and I share the belief—that the present antagonism will rapidly merge in an energetic co-operation."

These are sentiments which I assume will be cordially agreed to by yourself, but for myself, I am unable so readily to shift the meaning of the term Religion. I am of opinion that the word has, and will ever retain, connotations which will render it a mischievous thing. Possibly in America where Religion is not state-endowed as it is with us, and where its dogmas have not become so much a part and parcel of the life of the people, and actually the means of livelihood to so many as it is in England, there might be some hopes of its dogmatic features being gradually relinquished, but here it must be destroyed, and for that which Lewes means by Religion, another name must be found. On somewhat similar grounds I object to the continued use of the word Soul, which Lewes also adheres to.

I now want to say a word or two on the subject of Ethics and Ethical Culture Societies. On the first proposition for the establishment of such a society in London, I admit I was not over enthusiastic; partly because, although it sounded very good and proper, I was not quite aware of the real aim, or what it was they hoped to reach. I soon began to perceive that it would hardly suit me. The objects of such societies may be useful as temporary expedients, but it is a case of applying remedies to symptoms, instead of striking at the disease. I have always strongly con-

tended that if the basis on which human conduct has hitherto been grounded, be taken away, it becomes absolutely essential that another foundation shall be prepared. If we take away Religion (i. e. the "Will of God") as a motive for right conduct, it is necessary to replace it by a philosophy which shall supply a more rational and consistent reason. I felt bound to cease my connection with one of such societies, especially when I found that while professing non-commitment to any philosophic basis, there was a decided antagonism to philosophic teachers who professed to be seeking such a basis. I may say that I agree almost entirely with your "Ethical Problem" lectures. And while writing I may say I cordially agree with your criticism of the word Agnosticism. It has seemed to me to be an utter absurdity to make a term which is simply an acknowledgment of ignorance as to a certain problem the title or the designation of a party—or of an individual. What a really good name would be I cannot pretend to say. I positively refuse to be called an Agnostic, and if people call me one I at once profess my preference for the title Atheist. I can afford to despise the opprobrium which is supposed to be attached to it. With regard to your own term "Monist" as I have already said, I don't quite see all its implications at present.

In *The Monist* Ernst Mach's article is excessively interesting to me, and it caused me considerable surprise to find that such notions had been "in the air" so long. I cannot agree with the article by Max Dessoir. However, there are many philosophic tastes and *The Monist* is a free platform.

Upper Tooting, London.

J. HARRISON ELLIS.

[Monism has been defined and expounded in different ways. I use the word simply in the sense of "a unitary conception of the world." There are unitary conceptions of the world of different types; there are, especially (1) spiritualistic and (2) materialistic monisms, and in addition to these extremes we have various monisms of purely speculative and even intuitive thought. Agnostic monism would be that view whose principle of unity is something unknowable. The monism defended by *The Open Court* is none of these monisms. Its idea is simpler than the principles of the other unitary world-conceptions. It is "positive Monism"; positive, because it takes its stand on the positive facts of experience, arranging them into a unitary system of knowledge.

[Positive monism is not a new philosophy or a peculiar system. It is the common principle of all sound philosophy. A reviewer of *The Monist* in *The Nation*, criticising our definition of monism says: "The search for a unitary conception of the world or for a unitary systematisation of science would be a good definition of philosophy, and with this good old word at hand we want no other." Let me repeat what I said in answer to this (*The Monist* p. 237): Call that which we call monism or a unitary systematisation of knowledge "philosophy"; we will not quarrel about names—*dammodo conveniantur in re*. We agree perfectly with our critic, for we also maintain that monism (at least what we consider monism) is philosophy; it is *the* philosophy. By calling our philosophy monism we wish to emphasise the importance of the agreement of all truths in one truth, for this agreement is the *sigillum veri*; it is the criterion of truth.

[The recognition of this agreement is a very fertile and important idea; it cannot be underrated. It destroys the supernatural and shows that dualism in any form is untenable. The entire cosmos is one indivisible whole. There is no duality of God and world, or of soul and world, or of spirit and matter. The soul is a part of the world; God is a special aspect of the cosmos, its laws being considered as the ultimate authority of moral conduct, as the basis of ethics; and spirit and matter are two abstracts representing different features of one and the same reality.

[Concerning G. H. Lewes, I have to state that—with the ex-

ception of Goethe's life—I am only superficially familiar with his works. Some years ago I read in his "Problems of Life and Mind" the chapters pertaining to causality, but did not find in that respect much agreement. In *The Index* of 1886, No. 37, N. S., I published an article on the subject stating my differences. The passage quoted by Mr. Ellis shows a strange coincidence with the object of *The Open Court*, which is "the conciliation of Religion with Science." (I take occasion to state here that this expression was formulated by Mr. Hegeler, who has read, if anything, even less of Mr. Lewes than I.) This, however, does not make the coincidence appear strange to me; since I myself can see that everywhere the effort of reconciling the aims and claims of Religion and Science are conspicuous, not only in America, but also in orthodox England. I need not refer to such names as Matthew Arnold and Seeley. The scientist may not be satisfied with their reconciliations; none the less there is the effort of accomplishing it. When I saw Professor Haeckel, he said among other things, that if his energies were not so completely taken up with his scientific work, he would gladly devote his life to elaborating and preaching the Religion of Science. Professor Haeckel is the son of earnest Christian parents, and he has preserved a truly religious spirit in the abandonment of dogmas no less than in the preservation of his faith in truth.

[Since I received Mr. Ellis's letter I have thought it advisable to place the works of Lewes in my library. I glanced over some of the volumes of "Problems of Life and Mind" and found many similarities, although even where I fully agree with Lewes, I should have expressed myself differently. They are also to me a proof that human thought "is on the verge of making an important step in advance." I will confess here that I have been much more struck by the similarities of my own convictions with W. K. Clifford's views. When I had settled several problems to my own satisfaction, I was not as yet familiar with Professor Clifford's solutions. I read his essays on "Cosmic Emotion" and on "The Nature of Things in Themselves" with an unusual delight. I could not accept Clifford's presentation *in toto*, but there were striking agreements. My article "Feeling as a Physiological Process" was written as it now stands, but I re-wrote the article "Feeling and Motion," adopting the expression "the elements of feeling" from Clifford. That in spite of important similarities there are also important differences, is a matter of course and has been pointed out in my article "Feeling and Motion."

[Concerning the name "atheist," I confess that it is more definite than "agnostic." But is it not also a mere negation of theism? Does it not also lack the positive element which makes a name valuable? If a new word is needed, I should suggest in the place of atheism the term "cosmism," as expressive of the belief in a cosmos, that is an impersonal non-theistic universe, the laws of which are explained as dependent upon its intrinsic and immanent order. P. c.]

BOOK REVIEWS.

NORTHERN STUDIES. By *Edmund Gosse*. London: Walter Scott.

This is a plainly but very tastefully gotten up book of 268 pages issued in the Camelot Series. This excellent series is edited by Mr. Ernest Rhys, and offers at the remarkably low price of one shilling (in America forty cents), a large number of select classical productions, which "aim rather at providing companions for street and field than scholars' texts." The present work is a reprint, with additions, of a part of the "Studies in the Literature of Northern Europe"; and at the present time when so much interest is taken in Ibsen and other fellow-authors of his it is peculiarly welcome. "If," says the editor, "only the pages that 'follow helped us to refer such a striking figure as Ibsen to his 'national antecedents, and to relate him (à la M. Taine) to 'his 'race, the milieu, and the moment,' their addition to the docu-

"ments of European literary interest would be notable. But they "do this, not only for Ibsen, but for other and different figures—"so different as Björnson and Böttcher, Runeberg, and our beloved Hans Andersen, and offer again suggestions of curious interest, for the dramatic critic in their account of the happily "conditioned National Theatre of Denmark." Mr. Gosse's book treats of (1) Norway, (2) Sweden, (3) Denmark; and is divided into the divisions "Norwegian Poetry since 1814," "Henrik Ibsen," "The Lofoden Islands," "Runeberg," "The Danish National Theatre," "From Danish Poets," and an "Appendix" with poems in the originals. These essays are delightful reading and the editor is to be congratulated in his having been able to put them before the public in so attractive and cheap a form. *μικρο.*

METHODS OF TEACHING PATRIOTISM. By Col. Geo. T. Balch. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.

Col. Balch's method of teaching patriotism, or "emotional patriotism" as he calls it, is as follows: The material symbols of the nation, its flags, its seals, its coats of arms, etc., are, as the incarnation of the national spirit and achievement, to be brought by exercises into daily contact with the thought and conduct of our children; each school is to have a flag to be presented to that class which attains the highest standard of punctuality and excellence, and every morning the flag and its guard are to parade before the school, and the school are to salute the flag; medals are to be struck with the national coat of arms, the national flag, etc., on their face, and to be granted to scholars as rewards for good conduct; and various other ritualistic practices are to be introduced. The children of the nation are thus to be enrolled in a grand American Legion of Honor, a miniature G. A. R.

A certain amount of this sort of thing, say a few times a year, on fête occasions might, we think, have a beneficial effect; but to have it every day, as Col. Balch proposes, for eight or nine years, the term of our public-school courses, would degenerate into the silliest chauvinism in the case of constitutions that could stand it that long, and into aversion and a welcome tedium vitæ academicae in the case of the more sensitively organized. This is true fetishism—so much of it. We think much more highly of the plan adopted in some of our schools, of devoting the afternoons of Friday to national studies and patriotic literary exercises. This is better than waving flags and blowing trumpets. To know "The Ride of Paul Revere" or "Old Ironsides" by heart, to have read the "Spy" or the "The Pilot" will instil more patriotism in the hearts of children than years of saluting flags and wearing flag-embazoned medals.

But why "teach" patriotism at all? Has patriotism ever been "taught" among the nations and in the epochs that have exhibited this virtue in the grandest forms and on the grandest occasions? One would think that patriotism were a hot-house plant that would thrive by the careful cultivation of gardeners and the sprinkling of water-pots, and not a sturdy oak that has its roots in a nation's soil and is nourished by storms and blasts. If we wish to preserve this oak we must cultivate the soil from which it grew,—the mind of the nation,—and not the acorns that it bears; for often in national as in natural life they are hollow. Enthusiasm for the past is praiseworthy and noble; but it should never sentimentally take the place of preparation for the future. The thought precedes the deed. Homer, not Miltiades, won at Marathon; the English Bible, not Cromwell, at Marston Moor; Luther, Lessing, Kant, and not Von Moltke, at Sadowa and Sedan. Our greatest care should be that the nation and its children should produce and learn to appreciate what is great, both in word and deed; and the love of it,—patriotism,—will surely follow. Men never refuse to fight for treasures,—especially of the higher kind which, as the Bible says, "neither moth nor rust doth corrupt." *μικρο.*

NOTES.

Prof. Max Müller says in one of his Gifford lectures: "How the peculiar character of a language may influence even religious expressions, I had occasion to notice in an intercourse with a young Mohawk. 'In Mohawk,' he said, 'we cannot say father, mother, child, nor the father, the mother, the child. We must always say my father, or thy mother, or his child.' Once when I asked him to translate the Apostles' Creed for me, he translated, 'I believe in our God, our Father, and his Son.' But when he came to the Holy Ghost, he asked, 'Is it *their* or *his* Holy Ghost.' I told him that there was a difference of opinion on that point between two great divisions of the Christian church, and he then shook his head and declared that he could not translate the creed until that point had been settled."

"When our thoughts are found to be so dependent upon the habits of our language," Prof. Max Müller adds, "shall we not allow a greater freedom in the interpretation of the letter?"

JUST PUBLISHED!

THE SOUL OF MAN.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE FACTS

PHYSIOLOGICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By DR. PAUL CARUS.

480 Pages, with 152 Illustrative Cuts and Diagrams. PRICE \$3.00.

Printed on Extra-fine Paper, Handsomely Bound in Cloth.

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY,
169-175 La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois.

THE OPEN COURT.

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND TASMANIA, \$2.50 PER YEAR.

All communications should be addressed to

THE OPEN COURT,

(Nixon Building, 175 La Salle Street.)

P. O. DRAWER F.

CHICAGO, ILL.

CONTENTS OF NO. 187.

WOMAN EMANCIPATION.....	2747
MATERIAL RELATIONS OF SEX IN HUMAN SOCIETY. PROF. E. D. COPE.....	2748
RECOLLECTIONS OF HENRY SCHLIEMANN. With unpublished letters concerning his great work on Troy. THEODORE STANTON.....	2748
CURRENT TOPICS. The Bench and Party Politics. The Closing of Congress. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	2751
CORRESPONDENCE.	
George Henry Lewes and "The Open Court." J. HARRISON ELLIS.....	2752
BOOK REVIEWS.....	2753
NOTES.....	2754