

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 345. (VOL. VIII.—14.)

CHICAGO, APRIL 5, 1894.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cents.

COPYRIGHT BY THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING Co.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to Author and Publisher.

THE DISEASES OF THE WILL.

THE REALM OF CAPRICES.

BY TH. RIBOT.

TO WILL is to choose in order to act; such is for us the formula of the normal will. The anomalies studied in my book¹ reduce themselves to two great groups: either the impulse is lacking, and no tendency to action is produced (abulia); or a too rapid or too intense impulse prevents a choice. Before examining the cases of obliteration of the will, that is to say, those in which there is neither choice nor acts, we will study a type of character in which the will does not constitute itself at all or does so only in a wavering, unsteady and inefficacious form. The best example of it that can be given is the hysterical character. Properly speaking we encounter here not so much a disorder as a constitutional state. The simple irresistible impulse is like an acute disease; the permanent and invincible impulses resemble a chronic disease; the hysterical character is a diathesis. It is a state in which the conditions of the existence of the will are nearly always lacking.

I borrow from the picture of the character of hysterics that Dr. Huchard has recently drawn, the features which relate to our subject: "A primary trait of their character is mobility. From day to day, from hour to hour, from minute to minute, they pass with an incredible rapidity from joy to sadness, from laughter to tears; versatile, fantastic or capricious, they speak at certain moments with an astonishing loquacity, while at others they become gloomy and taciturn, keep a complete silence, or remain plunged in a state of reverie or of mental depression; they are then seized with a vague and indefinable feeling of sadness, with a sensation of pressure in the throat, of a rising ball, or of epigastric oppression; they burst into sobs, or they go to hide their tears in solitude, which they crave and seek; at other times, on the contrary, they begin to laugh in an immoderate manner without serious motives. 'They behave,' says Ch. Richet, 'like children that one sets to laughing with noises when they still have on their cheeks the tears that they have just shed.'

¹The Diseases of the Will, from which this article is extracted. New authorised translation to appear in a fortnight. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.

"Their character changes like the figures of a kaleidoscope, which has led Sydenham to say with reason that the most constant thing about them is their inconstancy. Yesterday they were lively, amiable and gracious; to-day they are ill-humored, susceptible and irascible, vexed at everything and at nothing, capriciously disagreeable and sulky, discontented with their lot; nothing interests them, they are wearied with everything. They experience a very great antipathy toward a person whom yesterday they loved and esteemed, or, on the contrary, show an incomprehensible sympathy for some one else; so they follow certain persons with their hatred with as much bitterness as they had formerly had persistence in surrounding them with affection. . . .

"Sometimes their sensibility is exalted by the most trivial motives when it is hardly touched by the greatest emotions; they remain almost indifferent, impassible even, at the announcement of a real misfortune, and they shed tears abundantly and abandon themselves to the profoundest despair on account of a simple word falsely interpreted, and transform into an offence the lightest pleasantry. This sort of *moral ataxia* is observed even in regard to their dearest interests: one has the most complete indifference towards the misconduct of her husband; another remains cold before danger which menaces her fortune. In turn gentle and passionate, says Moreau (of Tours), kind and cruel, impressionable to excess, rarely mistresses of their first movements, incapable of offering resistance to impulses of the most opposite nature, presenting a lack of equilibrium between the superior moral faculties, will and conscience, and the inferior faculties, the instincts, passions, and desires.

"This extreme mobility in their state of mind and their affective dispositions, this instability of character, this lack of fixity, this absence of stability in their ideas and their volitions, explain the incapacity which they experience of giving their attention very long to reading, study, or any kind of work.

"All these changes follow each other with the greatest rapidity. In this class of patients the impulses are not, as in the case of epileptics, absolutely uncontrolled by the intellect, but they are rapidly followed by action. This is the explanation of those

sudden movements of anger and indignation, those headlong enthusiasms, those fits of despair, those explosions of mad gaiety, those great bursts of affection, those quick accessions of tenderness, or those sudden transports during which, acting like spoiled children, they stamp with their feet, break furniture, feel an irresistible need of striking something. . . .

"Hysterical patients act as they are led by their passions. Almost all the various inconstancies of their character, of their mental state, can be summed up in these words: they do not know how to use their will, they cannot and will not do it. It is, indeed, because their will is always unsteady and faltering, because it is unceasingly in a state of unstable equilibrium, because it turns at the least wind like the weather-vane on our roofs; it is for all these reasons that hysterical patients have such mobility, such inconstancy, and such changeableness in their desires, their ideas, and their affections."¹

This portrait is so complete that we need not prolong our comments. It has put before the readers' eyes that state of incoördination, of broken equilibrium, of anarchy, of "moral ataxia"; but we have yet to justify the statement that we made at the outset: that there is here a constitutional impotence of the will; that it cannot arise because the conditions of its existence are lacking. For the sake of clearness I will anticipate what is to be established with more details and proofs at the close of this work.

If we take an adult person, endowed with an average will, we shall observe that his activity (that is to say, his power of producing acts) forms in general three planes: on the lowest are the automatic acts, simple or composite reflexes, habits; above are acts produced by the feelings, emotions, and passions; higher still are rational acts. This last stage presupposes the other two, rests on them, and consequently depends upon them, although it gives them co-ordination and unity. The capricious characters of which the hysteric is the type have only the two lower forms; the third is, as it were, atrophied. By nature, save in rare exceptions, the rational activity is always the least strong. It obtains the mastery only on the condition that the ideas awaken certain feelings which are much more apt than they to express themselves in acts. We have seen that the more abstract ideas are, the weaker their motory tendencies. In hysterical patients the regulative ideas do not arise or remain sterile. It is because certain notions of the rational order (utility, propriety, duty, etc.) remain in the state of mere conceptions, because they are not *felt* by the individual, because they produce in him no affective response, do not enter into his substance, but remain like something

brought in from outside; it is on these accounts that they are without action and for all practical purposes as if they did not exist. The power of individual action is maimed and incomplete. The tendency of the feelings and passions to show themselves in acts is doubly strong, both in itself and because there is nothing above it which checks and counterbalances it; and as it is a characteristic of the feelings to go straight to the goal, after the manner of reflexes, to have an adaptation in one single direction, unilateral (just the contrary to rational adaptation, which is multilateral), the desires, born quickly and immediately satisfied, leave free room for others, analogous or opposed, according to the perpetual variations of the individual. There exist only caprices, at most desires, a rough outline of volition.¹

This fact, that desire goes in a single direction and tends to expend itself without delay, does not, however, explain the instability of the hysteric, nor his absence of will. If a desire always satisfied springs up again continually, there is stability. The predominance of the affective life does not necessarily exclude the will: an intense, stable, permitted passion is the very basis of all energetic wills. It is found in the great men of ambition, in the martyr unshaken in his faith, in the red-skin bidding defiance to his enemies in the midst of torments. It is necessary, then, to seek more deeply the cause of this instability in the hysteric, and this cause can be nothing else than a state of the individuality, that is to say, in the final reckoning, of the organism. We call that will strong whose end, whatever be its nature, is fixed. When circumstances change, means are changed; there take place successive adaptations to the new environment, but the centre towards which all converges does not change. Its stability expresses the permanency of character in the individual. If the same end continues to be chosen, approved, it is because that at bottom the individual remains the same. Let us suppose, on the contrary, an organism with unstable functions, whose unity—which is only a consensus—is continually dissolved and reconstituted on a new plan, according to the sudden variation of the functions that make it up; it is clear that in such a case choice can hardly arise, cannot last, and there remain only whims and caprices. This is what takes place in the hysteric. The instability is a fact. Its very probable cause is in functional disorders. Anæsthesia of special senses or of the general sensibility, hyperæsthesia in its various forms, motor disorders, contractures, convulsions, paralyse, derangements of the organic functions, vaso-motor, secretory, etc., occurring successively or simul-

¹ Let us note in passing how necessary it is in psychology to take account of the ascending gradation of phenomena. Volition is not a clear and well-defined state which either exists or does not exist; there are sketches and attempts.

¹ Axenfeld and Huchard, *Traité des névroses* (second edition, 1883), pp. 958-971.

taneously, keep the organism in a perpetual state of unstable equilibrium,¹ and the character, which is only the psychic expression of the organism, correspondingly varies. A stable character upon such an unsteady foundation would be a miracle. We find, therefore, the true cause of impotence of will to be here, and this impotence is, as we have said, constitutional.

Some facts contradictory in appearance really confirm this thesis. Hysterical patients are sometimes possessed by a *fixed* idea, which cannot be conquered. One refuses to eat, another to speak, another to see, because the labor of digestion, or the exercise of the voice or the sight would bring about, as they suppose, some suffering. One meets more frequently with that kind of paralysis which has been called "psychic" or "ideal." The hysteric stays in bed for weeks, months, and even years, believing herself unable to stand up or to walk. A moral shock, or the mere influence of some one who gains her confidence or acts with authority effects a cure. One begins to walk at the announcement of a fire, another gets up and goes to meet a long-absent brother, another decides to eat out of fear of the physician. Briquet, in his "*Traité de l'hystérie*," reports several cases of women whom he healed by inspiring them with faith in their recovery. There might also be mentioned a good number of those cures called miraculous which have attracted the public curiosity from the time of the deacon Paris to our own day.

The physiological causes of these paralyzes are much in dispute. In the psychological order we observe the existence of a fixed idea the result of which is an inhibition. As an idea does not exist by itself and without certain cerebral conditions, as it is only a part of a psycho-physiological whole—the conscious part—it must be admitted that it corresponds to an abnormal state of the organism, perhaps of the motor centres, and that it draws thence its origin. However that may be, it is not, as certain medical men have persistently maintained, an "exaltation" of the will; it is, on the contrary, its absence. We are recurring to a morbid type already studied, which differs from irresistible impulses only in form; it is inhibitory. But there is no direct reaction against the fixed idea on the individual's own part. It is an influence from without which imposes itself and produces a contrary state of consciousness, with the concomitant feelings and physiological states. There results from this a powerful impulse to action, which suppresses and replaces the inhibitory state; but it is hardly a volition; at best it is a volition with another's aid.

This group of facts brings us, then, to the same conclusion: an impotence of the will to form itself.²

¹ For the details of the facts see the work cited, pp. 97-103.

² For the facts see Briquet, *Traité de l'hystérie*, chap. x; Axenfeld and Huchard, op. cit., pp. 967-1012; Cruveilhier, *Anatomie pathologique*, book xxxv, p. 4; Macario, *Annales medico-psychologiques*, vol. iii, p. 62; Ch. Richet,

CHAPTERS FROM THE NEW APOCRYPHA.

THE SPIRIT HID WITH CHRIST.

BY HUDOR GENONE.

Now, it was in the winter, while Jesus journeyed in the hill country beyond the Jordan with one of his disciples.

And certain elders of the church came and joined themselves unto him.

And one of these was a Pharisee, and another a Saducee.

And as they journeyed, they disputed among themselves concerning the commandments of the law of Moses, and concerning the mystery of the Kingdom of Heaven.

For he that was a Pharisee said, that the body should rise again at the last day;

But the Saducee denied with an oath, saying, What saith the Preacher?—The body shall return to the earth as it was. As the prophet Sadoc saith, there is no resurrection.

And Jesus heard them, and sorrowed in his heart, and saith unto them, Why is it ye have no understanding?

And he stooped down and took a clod of earth from the wayside, and he showed it unto the Pharisee.

And saith unto him, Verily, I say unto you, thy body is even as this clod.

But as the brickmaker cometh and taketh the clay and fashioneth it, and burneth it in the furnace to make bricks;

And the builder buildeth of the bricks an habitation, Even so out of the clods of the earth in his own way man fashioneth himself and buildeth an habitation, even a temple for the spirit.

For which is more excellent, the temple, or the altar for which the temple was builded?

Or which is the holier, the altar, or the burnt offering that is offered upon the altar?

Or which is the greater, the burnt offering, or the priest that offereth the burnt offering?

Then Jesus saith unto the Saducee, Verily, the Preacher saith, the body shall return to the earth as it was, but the spirit shall return to God, who gave it.

Now, both the Pharisee and the Saducee were amazed at his doctrine, and with one accord they say unto him, Master, what is spirit?

And Jesus answered and saith unto them, This thing God hath hid from the wise and prudent, but hath revealed it unto babes.

It is heat out of cold; it is light out of darkness; it is wisdom out of folly.

But they said, Lo! now thou speakest in parables.

And yet thou sayest, we have no understanding. Make thy meaning plain.

And Jesus saith unto them, I will. All power is given unto me of the Father to discern the hidden things; behold yonder black stone.

And they looked and beheld the black stone.

And Jesus saith again, Behold this morsel of ice.

And as he spake, he stooped down and took the morsel of ice in his hand. And he moulded it, and fashioned it, till it was like in shape unto an eye.

And he looked up to Heaven, and cried aloud, saying, Thou hast given unto me, O Father, to discern the hidden things that are hid in the earth, even the things that thou didst hide in the days of old.

Bring forth now thy power and manifest thy glory, —the glory that was hid before the mountains were brought forth.

And Jesus held up the morsel of ice betwixt his fingers. And God caused his sun to shine, and the might thereof shone down and touched the morsel of ice. And the sun was changed by the morsel of ice.

In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, behold the changed sunlight fell upon the black stone, and it became red with fervent heat.

And the Pharisee and the Saducee ran and touched their fingers unto the stone, and the stone burned them.

And they fell down at the feet of Jesus for to worship him, saying, Truly thou, even thou art the Son of God. Thou, even thou, art worthy of glory and honor.

For thou hast indeed made our folly to be wisdom.

But Jesus saith unto them, Call no man worthy. There is none that is worthy save God, and the spirit that is hid in me with God.

"SENATORIAL REFORM."

BY E. P. POWELL.

IT SEEMS to me an anomaly in literature that as able a thinker as Mr. Conway should have written the assault on the American Senate contained in *The Open Court* for March 15. In the first place it is pure assumption to assert that the leaders in forming the American Constitution: Jefferson, Madison, Adams, Franklin, Mason, Randolph, were the victims of an immature system of petty despotisms. The words of the Constitutional convention are supported by the private correspondence of all those men showing that no feature of the Constitution seemed to them more happily devised than that creating a Senate of the States. But the curious part of Mr. Conway's argument appears when he goes on to show the steady lapse of direct popular representation, "It is notorious that in democratic countries the ablest and best men shrink from vulgar competition—the enlargement of the franchise in England has been accompanied by a marked decline in the character of the Parliament." Here then the House of Representatives is swept away virtually as well as the Senate: the first as representing "Rotten boroughs" on petty jealousies constituting States; and the latter as a democracy that in its nature is degenerative. We are prepared for cyclic periods of destructiveness; but for one I was not prepared to see Mr. Conway heading the movement in America. There is certainly no pretence to argument in the sup-

position that the Constitution-makers' ghosts would now inform Mr. Wallace that they have changed their minds—would he only consult them. Mr. Wallace is certainly entitled to entire courtesy both as a spiritualist and a scientist.

Having shown the utter worthlessness of the existing form or forms of democracy, Mr. Conway furnishes us with a panacea; and this is the most curious part of his paper. It is the introduction of "secret ballot" into Congress. "The people would then have to choose the wisest and best man, knowing that they could have no control over his vote." On the contrary, would they not, if desirous of corrupt legislation, select men whose principles they would not fear. Imagine a corrupt gang of voters, such as Mr. Conway suggests as now sending their tools to Congress, sitting down to the desperate necessity of picking out saints, because they could not be sure how the fellows would vote. The logic would be something of this sort, "We can't tell what our representatives will do, because they will vote in secret: therefore let us send those whom we are *sure* will not do what we wish and who do not in any sense represent such a constituency as we compose." The value of the secret ballot as opposed to the open ballot would be a theme by itself; but as a panacea against the fact that democracy tends to grade downwards its governing bodies, it is impossible and absurd.

The panacea for the Senate is a different affair altogether. Despairing of quite abolishing the Senate, Mr. Conway would take away its power as an equal legislature. Then follows this Parisian concoction; "One of the two senators of each State might be chosen by the alumni of its colleges and learned societies" (turning them from top to bottom into political bodies; and making our college presidents very quickly of different material) "placing in the revising council the Republic of Letters." The other senator he thinks might be left as now to selection by the Legislature. Probably when the Senate is thus recast there will be at least one million American citizens and English neighbors to suggest each an independent plan. We have never yet in the world's history got rid of human nature; nor in any form of government are we liable now or hereafter to secure rulers much unlike ourselves. A popular governing body will stand for the people about as they are; and the system of checks and counter-checks devised by Jefferson, Madison, and Washington is about as much as is needed, and probably quite as efficient as that which is by Mr. Conway suggested. I will add, however, that if we are to have one senator selected by academic associations and college boys, the other might as well be passed over to the churches. These two bodies at present probably contain as much of the survival of mediæval spirit as any that can be suggested. If our very rottenest boroughs with secret ballot in vogue, will turn to the selection of the most eminently virtuous men for representatives, the Church can perhaps be trusted as well as the colleges to match these with senators of the same sort. I have as much faith in this plan as I have in reforming our nation by the plan of Mr. Morse, that is by placing the words God and Christ in the Constitution.

But the real gist and heart of this subject is not touched. Waiving the evils of that democracy, which was by no means a new idea devised by our fathers; let us see that the one great stride ahead in the way of government and society devised by them was "Federal Union"; the alliance and federative co-operation of distinct and independent States. This idea was never before broached or conceived by Aryan diplomats and nation makers. I have no room here to show its historic relation to other political ideas; and how it is a legitimate evolution of popular government from the primitive township. I wish only to dwell on it long enough to show that in it lay the possibility of covering a continent with a single nation, instead of a jealous group of States like those of Europe. It has taken America into the bond; and added over thirty new States to the original thirteen. It has reached the

Pacific. It is fraternising to North and to South. It has begun the recreation of the opposite shore of Asia. The fraternity of nations is before us; as also the fellowship of religions. Canada and Mexico are not the only ones that anticipate Union. Never before was there an idea that permitted of the abolition of standing armies; and the mutual good will of peoples three thousand miles apart. And this is *not* democracy merely; it is the *federal union of States*; States that Mr. Conway denounces as "survivals of the basest characteristics of the reactionary reign of George III." These States exist in our Senate; abolish that and you have struck out the very life of our Constitution; you have undone all that our fathers devised. The one institution of America to be jealously guarded is the Senate. We might even dispense with an executive chief; but when the Senate is gone you have only a democracy. Never in the world's history could a democracy cover a large territory; the smaller the safer. But the federal union of independent States is safer the larger it grows. Abolish the Senate and you abolish the States. Even Hamilton late in life became a convert to the integral necessity of States. Instead of throwing a half of the Senate to the colleges; let us at once complete the sublime scheme of education planned by Jefferson: common schools everywhere, centering in State universities; and State universities graduating into a great national university at Washington. In this way we have, what we ever should have in popular government, two coextensive collateral forces, the educative and the legislative.

"THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES."

BY HORACE P. BIDDLE.

I have read the several articles published in *The Open Court*, attacking the Senate of the United States. It seems to me that they do not correctly represent the organisation and the purpose of the Senate.

The Constitution of the United States was formed by the people of all the States, not as one mass representing a single interest, but by each State representing the people and the autonomy of the State, in the interest of a common union of the States, as sovereign equals, and the equal rights of all the people. In Congress the House represents the people of the United States by States; the Senate represents the sovereignty of the States without reference to the number of people in the separate States. The President represents the people of the United States equally, and the equal sovereignty of all the States. If the Senators and Representatives sat in the same chamber and voted equally as one body, then the objections taken to the Senate would lie, but as it is, they do not. The House cannot invade the sovereignty of the States, the Senate cannot invade the rights of the people. It is immaterial whether each State has two or twenty Senators, or whether its people are many or few, the representation is the same—that is, equal between the States which the Senate represents. Shall a small State not have the same rights as a large State? Shall a weak State not have the same rights as a strong State? Shall a State with but few people not have the same rights as a State with many people? To further illustrate the principle, shall a small, weak man not have the same civil rights as a large, strong man?

It is impossible for the Congress to pass a law, constitutionally, that does not represent all the people of the United States equally; and the sovereignty of all the States equally, without a possible invasion of the rights of the people or the States; and should the Congress pass a law, unconstitutionally, that invades the rights of the people, or of the States, yet, beyond the legislative and executive power stands the judiciary to correct the error, and preserve the Constitution intact. Can any government be more fair, more just, more equal, or more secure?

Abolish the Senate and take away the equal representation of the States in their autonomy, and there would be nothing left to

prevent Congress, by the power of the larger States, from oppressing the smaller States, and consolidating them all into one massive empire, as one State ruled by a single power. History reads us many lessons as to what, then, would be the fate of human liberty.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THAT excellent English paper, *The Newcastle Weekly Chronicle*, fears the importation of American political methods into England, and it starts with justifiable alarm at the prospect of a Tammany Hall in London. In the *Chronicle* of March 17 I find these words of warning: "It has already been pointed out that the formation of a society of political agents is bringing us nearer and nearer to that system of machine politics which has produced so much corruption in the United States. As matters look at present, it will probably not be long before we shall have a Tammany Hall in England—an institution which will make the ballot a fraud and popular government a scandal." The diagnosis is correct, but in the language of a famous chief of Tammany, "What are you going to do about it?" Tammany is a product, as a toadstool is; and if ever a population like that of New York shall get control of London through the ballot-box, Tammany will spring up in England as naturally as a weed springs out of the ground. Newcastle will have one, and Leeds, and Birmingham, and every other town where the conditions that make Tammanies happen to be. It will not be known by the name of Tammany, for that would awaken suspicion and arouse hostility; but the machinery will be set up, the engineers will go to work, and the looting of the cities will be done in the manner and style of Tammany.

* * *

From a careful reading of the *Newcastle Chronicle* I am of opinion that the scouts of Tammany have already invaded England under the name of "Election agents," and that they are smuggling American election machines into that country in a small way, and showing the natives of that benighted island how to use them so as to cheat, and bamboozle, and bribe. The *Chronicle* is properly shocked, because "one of the questions which the election agents are asked to answer is this:—'What form of words would you advise for the use of a candidate anxious to pledge himself to the Temperance party without losing the support of the liquor interest?'" This may look like a hard problem to an Englishman, but an American politician worthy to be a coal-heaver for the engineer who runs the machine could give the correct solution in two minutes. In our political arithmetic such a problem as that is merely a sum in simple addition. I know hundreds of men of all official grades, from senators to constables, who have triumphantly answered it. What does the *Chronicle* think of the following "form of words" as an answer by a candidate, say for mayor of a city, where there are laws requiring liquor-shops to be closed on Sundays, on election days, and at certain hours of the night? The candidate wants to please the Temperance party without offending the liquor interest, and he says:

"That while all ordinances should be enforced, with the view to the suppression of vice, the executive department should construe the laws in the spirit of tolerance, with due regard to the cosmopolitan character of the population, so that the customs and habits of the various peoples be not interfered with, nor their personal liberty and individual rights impaired."

* * *

What does the *Chronicle* think of that as a duplex machine-made contradiction? That specimen is official; it is not the product of a reckless imagination, but it is exactly the "form of words" employed by a last year's candidate for the mayoralty of Chicago. I have no copyright on it, and I am perfectly willing to have it used in England. This formula, however, is too easy to be thought worthy of a place in the political algebra that our skillful statesmen use when they advocate a tariff for revenue only, levied in such a way as to protect American industry; and when

they declare for gold, silver, and paper legal-tender dollars of unequal value and equal purchasing power according to the single standard of the markets of the world, regulated with a bi-metallic balance-wheel, so constructed as to prevent the money-kings of Great Britain from dictating the financial policy of America; a firm and stable gold medium of exchange made flexible and elastic by the free coinage of silver at a ratio of sixteen to one. If there is any question of English policy disputed by two contradictory parties, the English politicians need no longer be baffled by consistency. Let them send their orders over here, and we will agree to furnish a "form of words" that will enable them to pledge themselves to one party without losing the support of the other.

* * *

Speaking of elections and the practices of Tammany, reminds us that Chicago is in "the throes and convulsions" of an election contest now. Next week we elect aldermen, assessors, and some other officers to domineer over us and misgovern the city. The tournament is animated, for the prizes and the perquisites are large; unlawful, if you please, and even criminal, but the contestants care nothing for that; the plunder is close at hand, while the prison is far away. Passionate appeals are made, and the good citizens are called upon to turn out and vote for the best men; but our masters laugh at the exhortations, and, shaking their brass knuckles in the faces of the people, say to them, "You may vote, but we will count; see!" Here is a description which I find in the *Chicago Herald* of some of the "judges" appointed to superintend the polling, and to receive and count the ballots. Introducing one of the candidates to its readers, the *Herald* says, "Among the men he has selected to act as judges and clerks of election in the Sixth Ward—his stronghold—are one pickpocket, one indicted ballot-box stuffer, one dive-keeper, one professional thug, one horse-thief, one burglar, one highway robber, and one man charged with arson. The returns are not all in yet, but it will doubtless be found that the full list will comprise men who are guilty of every crime on the statute books and several that have not been classified." These are the potentates who appoint legislative officers and administrative agents for one of the great cities of the world. This is the dark side of it, but there is a brighter side. There are many judges of election in Chicago who are absolutely honest and incorruptible; and there are candidates, too, whose fingers never were and never will be "contaminated with base bribes," and one of them is an independent candidate for alderman in my own ward. I shall enjoy the luxury of giving him a vote, although I really do not know whether he is a Republican or a Democrat; but whether my vote will be counted for him or not is one of the occult mysteries of the ballot-box. After I have dropped it into the box it will be no longer in my care; it will then be at the mercy of the "judges."

* * *

I do not know whether the story is true or not, but it is in the newspaper correspondence from Washington that, "The President lost his temper yesterday while a party of Western and Southern congressmen were trying to persuade him to sign the Silver Bill, and he gave them rather a stiff talking to." It was not the Bill they cared about, in fact they had rather a contemptuous opinion of it, but as many of their constituents were silver plated, those honorable members were fearful of the political consequences that might follow should the President veto the Bill. They cared nothing for the country, but they did care for themselves. The country was reasonably safe, but they were not; in fact some of them said that if the Silver Bill failed they could not possibly be re-elected, and that would be a tragedy for the Democratic party. Instead of rushing to the rescue of the party, the President gave to his visitors a very improving lecture on political morality, holding up to scorn "those members of Congress who pandered to the delusions of the people and voted for all sorts of legislation in order to keep

themselves in office." The President also said that he had "a decided contempt for any one who would ask him to aid in such legislation for such a reason." Leaving out of the question the merits or the deficiencies of the Silver Bill, the lecture was a good one, and will apply to all the time-serving policies of all the demagogues who "pander to popular delusions in order to keep themselves in office."

* * *

I forgot to mention in the preceding paragraph that the disappointed congressmen after leaving the White House explained that the warmth of the reception given them by the President was due to some bodily pain that made him irritable and cross. They said that the reprimand he gave them was due to "an attack of the gout in the President's left foot, and that the agony of it made him ill-natured." If this is true the gout is a useful moralist and the source of some good political doctrine. I hope it will become prevalent in all the high places in this land; and I trust that it will become epidemic in Congress. I am told that the gout is a very painful disease, but I can bear it patiently in the left foot of the President, for the sake of the public welfare, and therefore I pray that he may not get rid of it until after the adjournment of the present Congress.

M. M. TRUMBULL.

A NEW DICTIONARY.¹

WITHIN four years from the date of its inception the Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have presented to the English-speaking public the first of the two volumes of their new Standard Dictionary, which in simplicity and economy of design, and in scope and magnitude of purpose stands almost unrivalled even in this prolific age of great lexicographical works. The commendable celerity with which this great task has been brought to completion is characteristic of American methods, which have marked the work with more than one of our national peculiarities. We cannot feel too much indebted to the zeal and enterprise of the gentlemen who projected and achieved in so short a time this great task; for it is rarely that a generation who seers a great dictionary begun, sees it finished.

The great German work by Grimm, begun in 1838, had in 1886 not yet completed the letter G. Renan, the story goes, once calculated that the new monster dictionary of the French language would be completed somewhere about the close of the twenty-second century. "Sweet Monsieur Renan!" replied one of his friends, "he tells us this simply to keep up our spirits!" The project of the New English Dictionary, on historical principles, was formed by Archbishop Trench in 1857, and just lately its editor, Dr. Murray, gives the part which almost completes the Dictionary to the letter F. We need not mention Dr. Strong's famous Dictionary of Greek Roots, which "on the Doctor's plan and at the Doctor's rate of going" was to take "one thousand six hundred and forty-nine years, counting from the Doctor's last or sixty-second birthday." But if we reflect that the great "botanical" work of Dr. Strong was a one-man dictionary, while our modern lexicons are the joint work usually of *hundreds* of minds, we shall recognise that the calculation of David Copperfield's friend was

¹ A Standard Dictionary of the English Language Upon Original Plans, Designed to Give, in Complete and Accurate Statement, in the Light of the Most Recent Advances in Knowledge, and in the Readiest Form for Popular Use, the Meaning, Orthography, Pronunciation, and Etymology of All the Words and the Idiomatic Phrases in the Speech and Literature of the English-speaking Peoples. Prepared by more than two hundred specialists and other scholars, under the supervision of Isaac K. Funk, D. D., Editor-in-Chief; Francis A. March, LL. D., L. H. D., Consulting Editor; Daniel S. Gregory, D. D., Managing Editor. *Sold only by subscription.* Prices: Single volume edition—Half Russia, \$12.00; Full Russia, \$14.00; Full Morocco, \$18.00. Two-volume edition—Half Russia, per volume, \$7.50; Full Russia, per volume, \$8.50; Full Morocco, per volume, \$11.00. All forms have Denison's Patent Reference Index. New York, London, and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1893.

not far from right.¹ Only three great dictionaries, the *Imperial*, the *Century*, and the *Standard* have been completed within a reasonable time after their commencement, although this merit perhaps belongs more especially to the *Century* than any other.

In criticising the *Standard Dictionary*, its purpose must be carefully borne in mind. It is not intended, as the *Century*, to be an "encyclopedic dictionary of the English language, nor as the new English Dictionary of Dr. Murray, to be a self-verifying history of the English tongue, but, as its title states, it is "designed to give, in complete and accurate statement, in the light of the most recent advances in knowledge, and in the readiest form for popular use, the meaning, orthography, pronunciation, and etymology of all the words and the idiomatic phrases in the speech and literature of the English-speaking peoples." At the same time it claims that its vocabulary is extraordinarily rich and full, and that by the economy and simplicity of its plan of arrangement it has been able with all due exclusiveness to comprehend some 280,000 words in a compass of two volumes of not much more than one thousand pages each. Its merits will best be seen by an enumeration of its distinctive features.

It is pre-eminently a work for the people; but a work by scholars for the people. In conformity with its plan of being a useful handbook for the people, that definition which gives the most common meaning of the words of the language is placed first—a feature in which this dictionary differs from all others, where the historical order is followed—and the etymology is placed at the end. Etymologies are given in the simplest form possible. The usefulness of the book is not impaired by exuberant philological jingles, which hide from the reader the matter he really seeks. In giving the pronunciation of words, the scientific alphabet, prepared and recommended by The American Philological Association, and also supposed to be in harmony with the principles accepted by the Philological Society of England, is used. This is an excellent feature of the Dictionary, and even if the new orthography proposed by the Association is never adopted, the use of it for the indication of pronunciation will greatly help to bring order into the chaos which now exists in our schools. All the improved spellings recommended by the Philological Association, or suggested by their plan, are put in their regular alphabetical place in the Dictionary, seemingly without a great increase of the size of the work. In spelling, the effort has been towards simplification. Weight has been accorded to the canon "write as you speak." But it is a pleasure to note that contrary to the usage of our old lexicographers, in the *Standard* all variant forms are given.

The idea which has controlled the inclusion or exclusion of words is as follows. A dictionary must tell us what words and phrases mean as used by representative writers and speakers of the language. The question is not, should the word be in the English language, but *is* it. Helpfulness should be the ideal of a dictionary. Obsolete, foreign, dialectic, and slang words are given places only if likely to be sought for in a general English dictionary. A living dictionary should not be a museum of dead words; therefore, only such obsolete words as are found in old authors still extensively read, such as Chaucer, Spenser, Milton, Shakespeare, and so forth, are incorporated in the *Standard's* vocabulary. Self-explanatory phrases and compounds are omitted. New literary terms were subjected to a committee on new words, consisting of some of our most competent judges. Unimportant technical terms are omitted; not all that have been invented but only such as are accepted have found a place. Provincialisms of ex-

tensive local usage, of course, are registered, as are also handicraft terms.

With respect to definitions the *Standard Dictionary* claims exceptional excellence. The aim here has been economy and precision. Illustrative quotations are very sparingly employed. The quotations used to verify or illustrate the meanings of words are supplied not only with the name of the author, but also with the page and edition from which the quotation has been taken. "Stock" dictionary quotations, those which are seen in nearly all dictionaries, have been avoided and new ones sought—a work accomplished by nearly a thousand readers from the great living books of English literature, but chiefly from recent authors. The definitions have been constructed by specialists or by members of the trade to which the term belongs, they being supposed to know more about such terms than persons unconnected with the branches. This also has been done with respect to the forms of words.

The principle, of course, is the proper one, although it must not be carried too far, as one could hardly say that a farmer was the best fitted person to define the meanings of agricultural terms, or to decide their forms or proper pronunciations. An instance of this is the decision of the Dictionary with regard to the form of the word *aluminium*. Here the form *aluminum* is preferred, as we see from the quotations, because manufacturers and dealers in chemicals use *aluminum*. This was the form first given by its discoverer, Sir Humphrey Davy, but it was at once changed by scientific writers to *aluminium* to make it agree with the general form of the elements, *sodium*, *lithium*, etc. Now the same tendency which induced the Dictionary to be "aggressively positive" along lines of reform agreed upon by eminent philologists and to adopt forms of words conforming to analogy, whether originally accepted in the literature of the language or not, should have determined them in the present case to give the preference to the scientific form, instead of accepting the dictum of some commercial firm in Pittsburg who write that "the way of pronouncing and spelling the name in this country is entirely aluminium!"

To revert to orthography and orthoëpy again, in the spelling of chemical terms the rules of the Chemical Section of the American Association for the Advancement of Science have been preferred, according to which chloride, sulphide, bromine, morphine, are spelled chlorid, sulphid, bromin, and morphin. This changes the pronunciation of common chemical words, which is unnecessary, and which if any usage exists on the matter will scarcely be adopted; while with respect to the pronunciation of *new* scientific words, no uniformity of usage ever will obtain, because the inventors of the terms themselves rarely have any idea of how they ought to be pronounced, and individual scientists usually pronounce them according to their own ideas. Dr. Murray says he was once present at the meeting of a learned Society in London where the word *gaseous* was systematically pronounced in six different ways by as many eminent physicists, and adds, that if it is possible that a word which though comparatively new was even then sufficiently popular to have attained some standard pronunciation, how much more is it so with the words that have no popular currency, and which were made not to be spoken but to be used in books.

The editors of the Dictionary recognise that it is the chief function of a dictionary to record usage, not, except in a limited degree, to seek to create it; and in general we may say that on all moot points their professed attitude, which is that of unprejudiced statement and not advocacy, has been steadily preserved. They claim they have been very careful in their preferences, where custom or usage varies, to give their sanction to the *best* form or tendencies. But in all cases, all forms are given. Their decision was simply which should have the preference.

But just here is an illimitable field for discussion, and even difficulties may arise. We shall make but one remark, relative to

¹ But that great Arabian scholar, *Ibn Manzur* (A. D. 1311), wrote, single-handed, a dictionary larger than the largest of our many-men dictionaries, the *Century* (over seven thousand large folio pages); and so did *Sayyid Murtada* (1790). Both these lexicons are in the Müller Semitic Library, recently purchased for the Hartford Theological Seminary.

the diphthongs *æ*, *a*, etc., and the digraphs *ph*, etc., in words where these are transliterations of Greek diphthongs and digraphs. Where such words are firmly established no objection is to be made to the simplification, as in *enigma* and *fancy* for example; but where recent or scientific words are used, the letters of the original should be as strictly adhered to as possible, because usually the scientist has no means of knowing the meaning of a new word except by his knowledge of the roots, which if the transliteration is tampered with, may conflict. For example: if the Greek *koinos*, common, and *kainos*, new, are both transliterated, in English compounds, by *cno*, and not by *cano* and *cano*, then, not only are new derivatives from *kenos*, empty, likely to be confounded with them, but both are apt to be confounded with each other. And such is actually the case. Suppose a student of science, meeting in the works of F. Müller the word *cenogenesis*, should look that word up in some of our dictionaries; he would find that it meant both what *cœnogenesis* means and what *cenogenesis* means, which conceivably might have *different meanings*.¹

In the etymologies, foreign words, such as Greek, are transliterated, which helps immeasurably people ignorant of foreign tongues. It also seems that that definition of radical words which is the most common is given in preference to the root meanings first; for example, in the definition of the word *aboulia*, where the word is derived from *a*, privative, and *boule*, advice. Now, although the common meaning of *boule* is advice, its root meaning is *will*, from *boulemai*, to will. And this is exactly the meaning which explains the present scientific significance of the word, namely, absence of will-power.

Some idea of the extent to which the terminologies of the special sciences have increased the bulk of our dictionaries may be gained from the fact that in the *Standard* there are about four thousand terms that refer to electricity or its various applications. Probably the number in the biological sciences is much greater.

Strongly commendable features of the Dictionary are the omission of the diæresis, its system of compounding words, and its system of syllabication, subjects of extraordinary confusion in literary and lexicographical usage. But an enumeration of all its mechanical advantages is out of the question. In economy of form and in the logical and systematic execution of its fundamental ideas, it is superior to any of its rivals. The treatment of synonyms and antonyms is unique. The pictorial illustrations are appropriate and well made; in fact, almost gorgeous. For example, the illustrations of coins, gems, flags, etc. An important feature is the exact definition of the six primary colors of the spectrum with an analysis of all known shades and tints. The plates for this department were made by Messrs. Prang & Co., Boston.

There were engaged in the production of this dictionary two hundred and forty-seven office editors and specialists together with nearly five hundred special readers for quotations. Hundreds of other men and women rendered service in various ways in the defining of words or classes of words. The specialists engaged in the work were the most eminent men of their departments in the English-speaking world. It was only by the help of such a num-

ber of men that so great a labor could be completed. It is, thus, in the fullest sense of the expression, says the Editor-in-Chief, an intellectual collaboration; and is accordingly called the "Standard" in just recognition of the expert knowledge and authoritative scholarship of the editors of the various departments.

THOMAS J. McCORMACK.

NOTES.

We are in receipt of the first number of a new periodical, *Die Religion des Geistes*, edited by Dr. Eugen Heinrich Schmitt. It represents a new religious movement, which, in a postscript on page 32, it declares to be the same as the Religion of Science, represented in *The Open Court* and *The Monist*. The present number of the new periodical contains the following articles: (1) "What the Religion of Spirit Proposes?"; (2) "Our Programme"; (3) "Why Is a Religious Movement a Necessity? A Word Addressed to the Societies for Ethical Culture"; (4) "To the Freemasons"; (5) "The Religious Movement of the Present Time." The second article, "Our Programme," begins as follows: "We represent the freest, the most radical, and at the same time the most positive and deeply religious thought. Our programme is independence of all authoritative creed, and at the same time a spiritualisation of the holy symbols of all religions. We have come not to destroy but to fulfil." The editor rejects the proposition to teach ethical culture without a religious basis, declaring that man is a unity and cannot be split in twain; that our world-conception is too intimately connected with our moral ideals; that a separation of religion and ethics would tend to veil the errors of our time, which ought to be exposed. The style of the various articles is rhetorical, rather than explanatory, and we cannot find a calm statement of the aims of the Religion of Spirit. Several names of the promoters and allies of the movement (e. g. Hübbschleiden, Editor of the *Sphinx*) seem to indicate a spiritualistic tendency, but the first number of the new periodical contains no traces of it. The periodical is published at Leipsic, Johannissgasse 4, by Alfred Janssen. Dr. Schmitt's address is I Festung, Herrngasse 58, Budapest, Hungary.

THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGLER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

CONTENTS OF NO. 345.

THE DISEASES OF THE WILL. The Realm of Caprices. TH. RIBOT.....	4031
CHAPTERS FROM THE NEW APOCRYPHA. The Spirit Hid with Christ. HUDOR GENONE.....	4033
"SENATORIAL REFORM." E. P. POWELL.....	4034
"THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES." H. P. BIDDLE.....	4035
CURRENT TOPICS: Tammany in England. Mr. Facing-both-ways. "You May Vote, But We Will Count." Save Me and the Party. GEN. M. M. TRUMBULL.....	4035
A NEW DICTIONARY. THOMAS J. McCORMACK.....	4036
NOTES.....	4038

¹The first users of *cenogenesis* in English, sensible, perhaps, of the confusion likely to arise from the presence of an already established word of the same form, transliterated the Greek word with a *k* making it *kenogenesis*. In this form it appears in the new dictionaries, contrary to their usual rule of making a Greek *k*, *c*. We also notice that the *Standard* gives *kainos*, new, as the root of this word, which, if it would make any difference, seems to be correct, although in the German works in which the word first occurs, it is written with an *e* and is always associated with such words as *Verfälschung*, *Fälschung*, meaning *vitiolation*, all of which epithets, perhaps, prompted the usual derivation of the word from *kenos*. But the meaning of the word being established, its derivation is wholly indifferent, and this discussion may seem somewhat pedantic. But it involves a point which as this example well shows is not originally unimportant; because if the principles suggested were adhered to, and when adhered to noticed, we should never have witnessed the sad spectacle of an etymology being lost with the man who invented it.