

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 364. (VOL. VIII.—33.)

CHICAGO, AUGUST 16, 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.

BUDDHISM IN JAPAN.

I. THE RELIGIOUS COMPOUND IN JAPAN.

BY NOBUTA KISHIMOTO, M. A.

SOME fourteen centuries ago when Buddhism was first introduced to Japan, it met with strong opposition, mainly on the ground that the natives of Japan ought to worship their own gods and ought not to adopt a foreign religion. It is a strange fact that at the present time there are many Japanese Buddhists who use just the same kind of argument against the introduction of Christianity. They say that the Japanese must adhere to their old religions and must not adopt Christianity—a foreign religion. They seem to forget the fact that Buddhism itself is as much a foreign religion as Christianity is, or else they seem to ignore the fact purposely in order to oppose the spread of Christianity. Once it was the followers of Shintoism that opposed the entrance of Buddhism into Japan, and now it is mainly the adherents of Buddhism that oppose the introduction of Christianity.

This is a strange fact indeed, but this fact shows at once the extent and strength of the influence of Buddhism among the present Japanese. Japan is often spoken of as a Buddhist country, and its whole population is counted among the Buddhist believers. In one sense this is true, but in another sense it is not. With the exception of some extreme cases, there will be found few Japanese who are *exclusive* Buddhists, that is, who believe in Buddhism alone, to the entire exclusion of Shintoism and Confucianism. Indeed even among monks and priests there are not a few who worship the gods of Shintoism. Thus on the one hand the Japanese nation, as a whole, cannot be regarded as belonging to Buddhism, if by this it is meant that all Japanese are exclusive believers in Buddhism; but on the other hand, the greatest majority of the Japanese people can safely be regarded as Buddhists, or at least Buddhistic, so far as the general influence of Buddhism is concerned.

To make this point more intelligible, I must say a few words about the different systems of religion and morality which exist together in modern Japan and their attitude towards one another. There are three different systems of religion and morality in Japan,

Shintoism, Confucianism, and Buddhism. Shintoism consists of the worship of the powers of nature, under the different forms of Ancestor-worship, Heaven-worship, Nature-worship, Fetish-worship, and so forth. From another point of view it is a religion of purity and gayety. This is the native religion, and no doubt it is as old as the nation itself. Then Confucianism made its way to Japan from the Asiatic continent some sixteen centuries ago, and it was welcomed because it inculcated nothing incompatible with Shintoism, its essential teaching being obedience and faithfulness, justice and mercy.

In Japan Confucianism was never understood as a religion. It simply supplied the rules of life. While the integration of these two systems was going on, Buddhism was introduced in the middle of the sixth century of the Christian era, that is about three hundred years after the introduction of Confucianism. At first it met with pronounced opposition, owing to the strong national feeling against foreign religions. But in the course of time its real nature became gradually known. Men came to realise the truth of the teaching of the misery of the present world and the consequent need of salvation. Thus once despised Buddhism became at last a popular religion of Japan. But in this it did not drive out Shintoism and Confucianism. Shintoism supplied the objects of worship; Confucianism furnished the rules of life; while Buddhism pointed out the way of salvation. Severally these three systems were defective, each representing, as it were, only one of the three corners of a triangle. But together, they were able for the first time to satisfy all the religious and moral wants of our countrymen. Thus when we say there are three systems of religion and morality in Japan, this does not mean that each one has its own distinct and exclusive body of believers. On the contrary, the tenets of the adherents of these three different systems so frequently overlap that, generally speaking, one and the same Japanese plays in his religious life a *triple* part, worshipping the Shinto gods, adopting the Confucian rules of life, and believing in the Buddhist salvation in the blessed Nirvāna.

If one asks, *Which* of these three elements, that together form what I have elsewhere called the Jap-

anese *religious compound*, is the most influential and most important, there can be but one answer. Buddhism has been and is the most influential and the most important. One or two facts will indicate how much influence was exerted by Buddhism in moulding Japanese thought and life. One striking evidence of the influence of Buddhism is the almost complete abolition of animal food, not only among the Buddhist monks and priests, the majority of whom are strict vegetarians, but also among the people of Japan in general. In our early ages animal food seems to have been very common. Even in the Shinto rituals collected in the tenth century of the Christian era, there is mention of "the things rough of hair and the things soft of hair,"* that is, animals, among the offerings made to the Shinto gods. We have, too, evidence that at that time animal milk also was used. Compare this with the present state of things. We look in vain for the explanation of such a great change in the principal food of the Japanese people, in anything else than in the deep religious influence of Buddhism.

Additional proof is found also, in the fact that Buddhism pessimised Japan, although it is true, on the other hand, that Japan optimised Buddhism. As far as the evidences go, the early Japanese must have been of a merry temperament. They seem to have lived mainly in the present. To live happily with their gods and fellowmen seems to have been the end of their life. Their religion was nothing but the means of enjoying their present life to its utmost extent. This primitive temperament of the early Japanese still lingers to some extent with the present Japanese. But in spite of this, the deep and general pessimistic tendency is also plainly recognisable. Take almost any novel of Japan to-day. You will find in it a great deal of Buddhistic phraseology and a certain melancholy running throughout the work.

You might ask why such a pessimistic religion as Buddhism became so prevalent in Japan as almost to overwhelm the original joyous character of the people? I think there are three things at least in Buddhism which made it prevail. First, Buddhism appeals to the consciousness of sin and to the misery of this world. The consciousness of sin is found in one form or another among all the peoples of the world. It was found, too, among the early Japanese. Hence Shintoism has certain forms for the purification of sin. But Shintoism is a primitive religion, very simple and very crude. It has no satisfactory way of meeting or removing this consciousness of sin, nor does it offer an explanation of the misery of the present world. Whereas, Buddhism explains the misery of the present world, tracing its cause to our sin, our sin to our desire, and our desire to our ignorance. Secondly, Buddhism emphasises very vividly the rewards and pun-

ishments of the future world. Both Shintoism and Confucianism either ignore or are ignorant of a future existence. This is one of the reasons why neither of these two systems has a strong influence upon the minds of men. Buddhism, on the contrary, teaches not only the future but also the past existence. When human intelligence makes some progress, the first question, at least one of the first questions, which arrest man's attention, is the problem of death and the condition after death. It is quite natural that this problem was one of the centres around which superstitions arose and grew almost everywhere. The early Japanese were in such a condition when they came in contact with the Buddhistic doctrines of paradise and hell and of the transmigration of the soul. Thirdly, Buddhism offers the way of salvation. Even though we know both the cause of the misery of the present world and the existence of future life, happy or miserable, yet if we were not supplied with the way to escape from this world of sin and secure the future happiness, this knowledge would be worse than none. Buddhism supplies both this knowledge and also the way of salvation.

As to the nature of this way of salvation, the different sects of Buddhism differ in their opinions, as we shall see in a subsequent paper, some ascribing salvation to the merit of our own discipline, others to the saving mercy of the Amitabha Buddha. But whatever these differences may be, these sects all agree in offering *some* way of salvation, the essence of which consists in the liberation of man from the misery of the present life and also from the weary circuits of birth and death, and in the final attainment of the blessed Nirvâna.

These three, in brief, are the reasons, so far as I can see, which made Buddhism the most important and the most influential element of our religious compound. It is all the more interesting to know that just these were the points which were most strange and repugnant to the Japanese mind when Buddhism first entered Japan.

HUMANITY'S TANGLED STRANDS.

BY IRENE A. SAFFORD.

It is impossible to help feeling that in some way the ends of Providence in creating man "male and female" have been defeated. It is beyond credence that it was ever intended to pit the two halves of the human race against each other in such a way that, even in our enlightened nineteenth century, no subject, however grave or general, can quite escape the fire of their artillery, nor any living creature flee from that apparition of "the coming woman," or "the passing man," which, in one form or another, haunts every stage of life and literature. No one who believes in the benefi-

cent ends of life can possibly suppose that, for beings of the same interests and destiny, there was meant to be "the man's age" and "the woman's age" and the long centuries clashing over the rights of one and the wrongs of the other.

It is difficult to tell when in the cycles of time—in what matriarchal or patriarchal period—the trouble began, or from what gardens of peace and innocence it expelled its first victims. It is certain, however, that it must have taken more than one bite of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge to make man and woman so painfully conscious that they were man and woman as to set up that black wrangle over the matter that has followed them down the ages; and it is one of the curious things in the subsequent history of that knowledge, that, despite the trouble of it, man has in no wise been invited to forget it or leave it to the gentle gods of love and nature, to whom it was first committed, but rather encouraged by the "higher lights" of society to tangle it up with every remotest question of law, politics, or religion. Thus grave legislators and Christian teachers, instead of devoting themselves to fundamental principles of truth and justice, have turned aside to declare upon what days a man might kiss his wife, or what covering a woman should wear on her head. And, in one way or another, the profane work has gone on, till truths and relations that should be sacred to the highest gods have become the sport of political campaigns, the planks in party platforms.

The old Greeks, who touch the key note in about everything, gave us the droll comedy wherein men and women were in the beginning literally and physically one. And it was only when, in the whirl of life, they were torn apart from each other that the trouble began in the efforts of the two halves to come together again and getting hopelessly mixed up in the operation.

Whether the point of the satire was meant to touch the general or domestic relations of mankind, it certainly contained a primal truth in regard to the whole case, and that is, that it is not in their divided but united capacity that men and women are to conserve the peaceful ends of life and find the "harmony that dwells in immortal souls." And hence, any cause which presents itself as the cause of one, or the cause of the other, instead of the cause of humanity, weakens its best claims. It may be with some comprehension of this truth that politicians attempt to throw the odium of the "woman question, or the "female suffrage movement," upon matters which should be only question of popular government and general weal, and it is strange enough that woman herself has fallen into the snare and will rise up at national celebrations and religious congresses, where questions of eternal truth and import are before the meeting, and express her

pleasure that "women are allowed a place on the platform," and proceed to set forth their individual claims and achievements. The earnest colored woman who at the late Parliament of Religions spoke for her benighted race, as "we, the colored people of America," without an intimation that there was any distinction of male or female, bond or free, in the great tribunal of souls to which she appealed, could have taught her white sisters some wholesome lessons on the subject.

"Do you believe in the higher education for woman?" asks the complaisant youth. "Oh, yes, and even for man," replies the sarcastic maiden, and if all women would treat the troublous question in that neat fashion, the difficulty in the case might sooner be adjusted.

It is the eternal posing as the man or woman in the play that keeps the grand drama of humanity from moving on to its full action. When all parties recognize that any advance step must be general and can in no sense include one sex without the other they will cease to talk of "progressive woman" or "aggressive man," and turn their attention to the progressive civilisation and on-marching truth which are surely bringing the spirit forces to the front and resolving the battle to whomsoever holds them. The degrees of goodness and spirituality are as marked between man and man as between man and woman, and whoever possesses the higher degree in any case has the angelic privilege of helping the one of lower up to it, whether as the waiting Mary or the beloved John in the kingdom of righteousness. The higher either sex can climb in that direction the better it will be for the other, for it is certain that, with all the ado that has been made about it, there is nothing to fear from the superiority of either but much every way from the inferiority. As stated, however, it does not seem to be the economy of nature to grade its saints and sinners in that way. There are good men and bad men, good women and bad women, and the attempt to fling the distinction of sex into the question is altogether an unnatural and injurious one. So is it, too, with the virtues which go to make up good men and good women. It is not necessary to run the sex line into them for any purpose whatever, and wherever it is done it proves a mistake. Everybody knows the havoc that has been made with all standards of right and wrong in this way, and it is not difficult to discern that even the gentler graces and courtesies of life have been turned astray by it. The kindly consideration, due everywhere from one human being to another, the help that should be given everywhere, where it is needed, have been made matters of gallantry or social etiquette, depending mainly upon well-preserved lines of demarcation between man and woman, so that, by the nice

logic of the position, if one woman in Kansas began, as a Western editor classically puts it, to "whoop it up" for feminine rights and equality, another woman in Illinois, just off a sick-bed perhaps, might find herself compelled to stand for weary miles in a street-car, while stalwart men held the seats, the natural and kindly principle of giving the seat to the one who needed it most, whether man or woman, having become so hopelessly lost in the obnoxious question as to whether the frail creature in the case "wanted to be man or woman."

Now if only society, politics, and religion would entrust the "man and woman" part of life's problem more to sweet nature's care and turn their attention to the establishment of those principles of truth, righteousness, and love which are at the heart of all life it may be that the clash of arms would cease and any distinguishing qualities of grace or gentleness, strength or skill in either sex find their true place in ministering to the exaltation of both.

Certainly the wretched spectacle of women "going up and down the land, clamoring for their rights," as the newspapers have it, and Christian ministers and lawyers rising up and calling them "Andro-maniacs" and "howling dervishes" for doing it, could no longer disgrace humanity and, in the calmer atmosphere, it might be possible for mankind to discern some really sweet and beneficent ends for which they were made man and woman, and cease to twist the double strand into unnecessary knots and tangles.

THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMAN FROM WOMAN.

BY WILLIAM SCHUYLER.

IN MANY things the emancipation of women is now complete—at least in America and in some European countries—although the most essential thing is not yet achieved. Our women are no longer locked up and guarded by slaves. They are free to go and come as they please, to dress as they please, and, as far as men are concerned, to talk as they please. The laws that concern property are notoriously in women's favor. They may also undertake any form of work they desire—they may be lawyers, doctors, preachers, or journalists; they may and do displace men in any position where they are willing to take lower wages. Even the ballot is in their power, whenever a sufficient majority of the women really want it, and in several places they have already obtained it; though what they will do with it, without the physical force to put the laws they vote for into execution, passes my comprehension. In short, women can get from the men whatever they want—that is, if their minds are fully made up as to what they wish, and they go about it the right way.

This is no new idea. The truth of it has been recognised by thinking men for ages. The old Roman

orator, Hortensius, is reported to have said: "It is utterly impossible to get along with women, and as utterly impossible to get along without them." And the Athenian, Aristophanes, in his inimitable "Lysistrata," has drawn a broadly comic, but altogether probable picture of how the males could be quickly brought to terms by a well-conducted strike of the females. For man has always felt his incompleteness without his feminine complement—it is only the women who believe that they can get on without the males. The mystic, Swedenborg, put the case neatly, when he said that in Heaven it takes two persons of opposite sex to make one angel. In short, from the earliest days of creation it has been admitted that "it is not good for man to live alone." And the poor male has done everything in his power to make his necessary female complement satisfied and agreeable.

And yet woman is enslaved. To be sure, a large majority of the male sex, even in civilised countries, are also still enslaved in various ways; yet there is no doubt that male beings are, as a whole, much freer than the female portion of humanity. There is no doubt, also, that woman needs emancipation—but not from men's tyranny. What she needs is emancipation from women.

In all parts of the world she is held in a more or less grinding slavery, but it is the women who do most to check her rising aspirations. Travellers tell us that in Mohammedan countries the women are the strongest supporters of the harem. A wife of a well-to-do Mussulman would think that her husband did not value her sufficiently, unless he locked her up and placed a guard of eunuchs over her. In Nubia, young girls are subjected to unnamable atrocities in order to preserve their virtue intact, but the awful torments are inflicted entirely by feminine hands. A writer in *The Monist* says: "In New Caledonia, when the men wish to punish a woman, they turn her over to her companions, who inflict upon her horrible tortures. Sitting on her body, they cut her flesh with sharpened stones." In our country a similar practice prevails. Here also the women sit upon an unfortunate sister, only, our females being much more intelligent, have discovered that the tongue is by all odds the sharpest weapon.

And this weapon is used to enforce the most grinding oppression—a chain of rigid conventions, which hold poor woman fast in cringing terror. Who have made them? Women say, the men; but certainly it is not the men who enforce them. Who has ever heard of a *Mr.* Grundy? But where is the woman who has not at some time quailed before the terrible tongue of the redoubtable *Mrs.* Grundy?

It will not do to say that women do these dreadful things because they are forced to do so by the men, for this would be a confession of essential inferiority,

which no woman clamoring for emancipation should allow herself to make. To be sure, some women do say so, but it is not true.

Let us look at the matter somewhat in detail.

To begin with the important matter of dress. Women do not dress for men. Few men notice the details of a woman's dress, and in their case it is the result of feminine training. Most males are impressed by the *tout ensemble*. If a woman is neatly and tastefully attired, they care little about the material or the style. While men ruled the world, woman's attire was simple and tasteful, and styles changed gradually with the centuries. Now that woman's day has come, we have new and utterly opposed fashions every season, each one more senseless, more bizarre than the other. Only one thing has remained for the most part unchanged—the corset. Men's bodies have always remained free and untrammelled as Nature made them; but women's fragile forms are forced into unyielding stays to remould them into woman's idea of the human figure, far removed from the model furnished by Mother Nature. And not only is their bodily freedom destroyed by these contrivances; but their mental and moral freedom is cramped by the strait-laced corsets of conventionality, warping and stunting woman's life in almost every phase.

In her special business of housekeeping, woman is also enslaved by women. Few men notice "good housekeeping." Give them a good dinner, a cosy room, an easy chair, and a smiling bit of femininity, and the low fellows are content. But the moment a woman enters the house of one of her friends, she peers about to see if there is dust in the corners, if a book or a cushion is misplaced, if—any one of the infinite and infinitesimal details of "good housekeeping" is neglected. And her unfortunate hostess immediately feels that all her trifling shortcomings are deadly sins.

An honest woman once said to me, "I don't mind how often my husband brings his bachelor friends to dinner. They seem perfectly satisfied with what is set before them, and with the way it is served, if only they get enough to eat, and have a good place to smoke in after dinner. But to invite one of my women friends—that is an altogether different matter."

Then, too, in their conversation, women talk for women. For their life they dare not say what will bring down upon them the disapproval of their sex. This has been my experience, even with women of most advanced ideas. To me, in *lête-à-lête*, after having assured themselves of my discretion, they would talk in the frankest and most emancipated manner; but let a woman come in, all liberty of thought and expression would vanish in an instant, and the conversation would take a strictly proper and conventional turn.

Women are the unscientific sex. For though many

women are fond of a certain superficial knowledge of popular science, yet—with very few exceptions—they lack the genuine scientific spirit which ever follows the truth, no matter where it may lead. It is utterly impossible, where several women are present, to discuss many subjects completely—especially if the line of thought tends to enter certain highways of physiology tabooed by womankind, which are, however, absolutely essential to any really scientific discussion of anthropological and sociological subjects—above all essential to this very subject of woman's proper place in human society.

So, women dress for women, keep house for women, talk for women, live for women, and wear themselves out for women—to the endless discomfort of the men. And what makes this all the more exasperating, is that these same women allow many things to men, especially if they happen to like them, which they will not endure in each other. A woman will lean on the shoulder of a man who is strongly perfumed with tobacco, and even bring him a match for his horrid pipe or cigar. But let her once see another woman light a dainty cigarette, and she is filled with horror and loathing. If a man, as is often the case with this imperfect being, makes a slip or falls, there is nearly always some good woman to help him up, and stand by him till he gets a firm foothold again. But let some sister woman deviate a hair's breadth from the strict rules of Mrs. Grundy; and this tender, yielding, compassionate being becomes as hard as steel and as relentless as death.

I know of a case where an innocent girl was basely slandered, and, of course, was given no opportunity of justifying herself, but was summarily dropped by all the virtuous members of her sex who knew her—by all except one, a marvellous exception, her intimate friend, who, happening to be thoroughly acquainted with all the facts in the case, and besides having a deep affection for her friend, still stood by her. But this staunch friend was also finally dropped by the paragons of virtue, because she refused to treat an innocent woman as if she were a hardened and unrepentant sinner. And, as everybody knows, this case is by no means an exceptional one.

Let a woman once try to be really emancipated, to make her own way in the world, and whom must she fear, the men or the women? I can but give the answer by quoting from an article written by a woman, Mrs. Amelia C. Barr, which is an excellent statement of woman's attitude in such cases:

"Society has laid down positive rules regarding the modesty of a woman, and, apart from these rules it is hard to believe that modesty can exist. For all conventional laws are founded on principles of good morals and good sense, and to violate these destroys nicety of feeling, sweetness of mind, and self-respect."

Now, what is this modesty? Physical as well as moral modesty is the product of circumstances which change with every age, with every clime, and are generally founded on some irrational basis, some antiquated tradition. In one country it is immodest to uncover the face in public, in another, the leg. In our enlightened land, let a woman put on a short skirt or kilt for comfortable walking, and who would object? Certainly not the men—if she were pretty.

Let a woman try to be free and equal with men, to have no nonsense, but only a frank comradeship, such as men have with each other, and what would be the result? Here again I let Mrs. Barr speak the woman's view:

"In all stations of society, it is a dangerous thing for two people of the opposite sex to chant together the litany of Plato. Those who enter into 'friendships' of this kind with what they think are the most innocent intentions, should sharply arrest themselves as soon as they are talked about. For in social judgements, the doctrine that, 'people talked about generally get what they deserve,' is true, however unjust it may appear to be."

In the last lines of the above quotation we have the gist of the whole matter, the cause of woman's enslavement by women. Women, as a class, do not know what justice is. You may expect kindness, pity, or mercy from woman, but never justice.

Yet justice is the basis of all true freedom, and women can never be really emancipated till she learns to be just.

But what is the cause of this injustice from which all women suffer? Injustice always arises from a feeling of caste, from the idea of one class of human beings that it is essentially superior to another. A good example of this was the kind but unjust slaveholder of *ante bellum* days. It is true that for the most part he treated his slaves very well, and that they had under him far more comfort than most of them now enjoy. They experienced kindness and consideration; but not justice, for justice meant emancipation.

And the trouble with woman is that she considers herself a superior being. In that farrago, "The Heavenly Twins," a certain Ideala says, "The Spirit of God, it is in us women." A woman once quoted to me with evident appreciation the words of a little girl, "The worstest woman is better than the bestest man." And lately, another told me of a little girl who asked her mother, "What good are boys for anyway?" Before her mother could answer, her brother entered, carrying an armful of wood and a pail of water. "Oh," said the little girl, "I know. Boys are good to bring in wood and water." And it must be admitted that this is the idea which many women have of the function of the male sex.

It is a sad truth that women believe that though they may be a little lower than the angels, yet *morally*

they are vastly superior to men. It is probably on account of this belief that they are so cruel to any woman who may happen to fall from this lofty position.

But is this correct? Is it not rather that each sex is about equal morally, each with its own special virtues and its own pet vices. To be sure women as a rule are chaster than men, as is natural from their physical constitution, and then they do not allow themselves many indulgences that men give way to. But are they more honest, more just, more charitable?

It is well known that men get along with each other much better than women do. The inside history of any woman's club will testify to this.

Man's life in the world continually calls for the exercise of the virtue of charity. In order to live at all in the world of business he must pass by many things which he cannot indorse. Daily he is called upon to make compromises, and to say, "Let him who is without sin first cast a stone." A man, in order to be himself free, must allow liberty to others. But woman, on the contrary, is absolute mistress of her domain, the household. Her children and servants obey her implicitly. So it is very hard for her to give way to the rights of others, to allow to her sister women the same liberty which men every day must accord to their fellows.

If rigidity is morality, then women are far more moral than men; and I fear that this is woman's conception of morality.

In talking over this point with a bright woman once, when I asked her why women did not treat each other as men did, she replied with great disdain, "Would you have us come down to your level?"

But why not come up—or rather come *out*—come out from the narrow bonds in which woman has been held for so many centuries, and be really equal and free?

For all progress has been in the direction of equality, in the wiping out of class-distinctions, that is, in the diminution of injustice. And only in that way can any real advance be made. Let women learn to understand freedom, that is, equality. Let them learn to bear with each other, to pardon each other, to endure cheerfully what they cannot change, even if they do not agree with it. Let them learn to discuss freely and thoroughly every question, even if it should lie in the domain of physiology. Let them learn to be just.

Woman's chief difficulty is that she is not generally willing to see *all* things as they really are, and so try to understand them thoroughly. Too many important subjects are forbidden to her—bidden by her own sex. And above all, she has so high a consideration for the Ideal Woman, that she has no room left for sympathy with the individual woman who may need her aid.

What use would the ballot be in the hands of those who understand not freedom, who understand not equality, who understand not justice? How can woman be emancipated from man's control before she emancipates herself from herself? She must learn that

"They are slaves, who dare not be
In the right with two or three."

But the day of woman's real freedom is dawning—though it will not come by way of the ballot-box. The desire for freedom is here. The actuality must follow. For woman has ever had what she really wanted—from the apple in the Garden of Eden to the ballot in the State of Wyoming.

And the true path to woman's liberty has naturally been pointed out by men. For it is through men that women have always achieved their desires. Auerbach, in "On the Heights," signalises Irma's emancipation by this entry in her journal:

"What will people say? In these words lies the tyranny of the world. This question makes the mind homeless. Do right and fear no one. Rest assured that with all thy consideration for the world thou wilt never satisfy the world. But if thou goest on thine own way, never heeding the friendly or unfriendly glances of mankind, thou hast conquered the world. But when thou regardest the words, 'What will people say?' then thou hast become subject to the world."

And Ibsen, that mighty champion of the true rights of women, has pointed out the same road to freedom. In "The Doll's House," Nora announces to her husband her emancipation in these words:

"I think that before all else I am a human being, just as much as you are—or, at least, I will try to become one. I know that most people agree with you; but henceforth I cannot be satisfied with what most people say. I must think things out for myself, and try to get clear about them."

And then comes the ringing defiance of the truly emancipated woman. When her husband says, "You talk like a child, Nora. You don't understand the society in which you live," Nora replies, "No, I don't. But I shall try to. *I must make up my mind which is right—Society or I.*"

SCIENCE AND REFORM.

DEFINITIONS OF LIBERTY.

THE manager of a Yankee settlement in northern Mexico gives an amusing account of his experience with the caprices of the would-be colonists. They found fault with the color of the water and the dress of the natives, and a farmer from North Carolina announced his intention to leave because the soil proved unsuitable to the production of a kind of tobacco known as Durham Bull Broadleaf. "Won't you try some other crop before leaving this land of genial sunshine?" asked the manager. "What's the use of the sun if you can't raise Bull tabacker?" was the indignant reply. That view of the solar system is rivalled by many current definitions of liberty. About a week ago the Polish and Bohemian

miners of Connellsville, Pa., took out a young woman and beat her within an inch of her life for having encouraged the attentions of an unorthodox snitor. The American residents of the place put the matter in the hands of a detective, and the friends of the indicted Slavs convoked another indignation meeting. "What's the use of a free country," exclaimed one of their orators, "if we cannot enforce morality according to our own customs!" "That's what those wretches call freedom," shrieked Herr Most, when the police adjourned one of his instructive lectures on the manufacture of dynamite bombs, and the opponents of the A. P. A. scream themselves hoarse because their Jesuitical machinations have provoked counter-intrigues: "What's the use of freedom if we can't enforce Papal bulls!"

MONGOL MANHUNTERS.

The revival of Napoleon-worship has crowded the art-shops of Paris with battle-pictures, but a moral apologist of the "Satanic Corsican" demonstrates that the diatribes against his unprecedented thirst of conquest were not warranted by statistical facts. The territory ravaged by the hordes of Attila was eleven times larger than the scene of all the Napoleonic wars from Lodi to Waterloo, and Timur the Tartar in the course of his forty years' manhunts fought more battles than all the French marshals of the nineteenth century. In his zigzag gallopade from China to Syria he demolished nearly three thousand cities and diminished the population of the earth about 5,500,000. The aggregate of his conquests was more than 3,000,000 square miles to 240,000 which the victories of Bonaparte subjected to the direct or indirect sway of France.

MORAL ASSASSINS.

It has often been observed that the failure of an attentate upon the life of a ruler tends to strengthen his power, and a similar result often follows the attempt to injure the cause of a political or religious party by falsehood and slander. Signor Crispi probably owes his present prestige to the reaction against the cowardly calumnies of his opponents, and it may be questioned if all the oratorical efforts of Charles Bradlaugh have done as much to promote the cause of free thought in Old England as a little pamphlet published a year ago by the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, and pretending to record the deathbed conversion of an "Atheistical Shoemaker." The sensational episodes, the quotations, the entire biographical framework of the story were exposed as fictions of the St. Jerome and St. Gregory type. A tract-form publication of the pious fraud had been spread far and wide as a campaign argument, and could not be retracted in time, and boomeranged back with disastrous effectiveness. The title of Mr. Foote's counter pamphlet, "A Lie in Two Chapters," became a cuckoo-call all over Great Britain and was soon taken up by the mocking-birds of the satirical press, till the clerical journals in stress of better means of retaliation, had to resort to the risky expedient of personal abuse. "The record of the author is a sufficient refutation," said the *Mona Herald*; "he is a convicted blasphemer and we defy him to deny it." "I never proposed to deny it," replied Mr. Foote; "it is as true as a bigot judge and a packed jury could make it."

PRECURSORS OF SCHOPENHAUER.

The grim champion of modern pessimism spent years in collecting the literary analogies of his tenets, but died too soon to enjoy the discovery of a precursor in far-off Syria. Six years ago Professor Ackermann of the Vienna Philological Society called attention to fragments of a Turkish manuscript, the original version of it has since been added to the Arabian library of the British Museum. The work in question was first published A. D. 998, under the title *Sikta-es-Zend*, the "Tinder-Spark" and would

certainly have kindled an auto-da-fe blaze of the first magnitude if the Eastern Chalifs had been as intolerant as their trinitarian contemporaries. The author, Abu-il-Ala, was not only a sceptic but a pessimist of the most radical type and explains the universal belief in the existence of a better hereafter by the wretched condition of the present world—"just as paupers console themselves with day-dreams of golden times to come." "What belongs to the body," he writes, "returns to dust; but no one can tell us where souls go." True-believers bewailed the popularity of his poems, but never persecuted him in the inquisitorial sense of the word. "You need not dread their wrath," said his fellow-poet, Al Manazi, "what can they do to one who has already renounced both earth and heaven?" Like Schopenhauer, he remained unmarried, and prepared for his last resting-place a rock-tomb with the characteristic inscription: "To my father I owed the sorrows of an existence which no one owes to me."

THE KORAN FETICH.

Abu-il-Ala also denied the inspiration of the prophet, and ridiculed the argument founded on the alleged preternatural literary merits of the Koran. "I can write better myself," said he, "and admire the perseverance rather than the good taste of the men who have read that book to the end. The endeavor to imitate their example has made me very weary." In a stronghold of Islam an admission of that sort must have required the courage of Sidney Smith's "literary desperado who in the presence of witnesses confessed that he preferred Byron to Shakespeare."

OUR DAILY RICE.

Bread, as a daily article of food, is used by only about one third of the fifteen hundred millions that constitute the present population of the earth. In the coast-districts of Spanish America the staff of life is the banana, on the Pampas dried beef, and in Eastern Asia rice, either in the form of a soup or a thick gruel. "He has eaten his last rice," say the Chinese in anticipation of a funeral.

TESTS OF CIVILISATION.

The sales of soap and printing-paper are usually considered the chief criteria of culture, but a still higher type of civilisation appears to be indicated by the demand for railway passes. Previous to the recent invasion of North American tourists, ninety-five per cent. of travellers on the Mexican railroads were primitive enough to pay their own fares. FELIX L. OSWALD.

SONNET.

BY MARY MORGAN (GOWAN LEA).

O let me to the sound of music die!
To one grand strain may life's sweet spark go out!
Not as with trembling fear, nor e'en with doubt,
But as a soldier walks triumphantly

From one achievement to another; still
Fresh courage gathering as he onward moves;
Naught seeing but the ideal which he loves;
Believing Time shall somewhere all fulfil.

But oh, most solemn hour, come not to-day!
For love's alluring voice is whispering low,
Commanding reverently, "Thou must not go!"

Whilst friendship nigh divine binds me so fast
(Clasping a future hope to a loved past),
O Death, whatever you may be, delay.

Catalogue of Publications

OF THE
OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO.

F. MAX MÜLLER.
THREE INTRODUCTORY LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF THOUGHT.
Correspondence on "Thought Without Words," between F. Max Müller and Francis Galton, the Duke of Argyll, George J. Romanes and others. 138 pp. Cloth, 75c.
THREE LECTURES ON THE SCIENCE OF LANGUAGE.
The Oxford University Extension Lectures, with a Supplement, "My Predecessors," an essay on the genesis of "The Science of Thought." 118 pp. Cloth, 75c.

GEORGE JOHN ROMANES.
DARWIN AND AFTER DARWIN.
An Exposition of the Darwinian Theory and a Discussion of Post-Darwinian Questions.
1. *The Darwinian Theory.* 160 pp., 125 Illustrations. Cloth, \$2.00.
2. *Post-Darwinian Questions.* (In preparation.)

AN EXAMINATION OF WEISMANNISM. 236 pp. Cloth, \$1.00.

ERNST MACH.
THE SCIENCE OF MECHANICS.
A Critical and Historical Exposition of Its Principles. Translated from the second German edition by *Thomas F. McCormack*, with 250 cuts and illustrations, marginal analyses, and a complete index. 518 pp. Half morocco, gilt top. Price, \$5.50.

POPULAR SCIENTIFIC LECTURES. (In preparation.)

ALFRED BINET.
THE PSYCHIC LIFE OF MICRO-ORGANISMS.
Authorised translation. 135 pp. Cloth, 75c; Paper, 50c.

ON DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS.
New Studies in Experimental Psychology. 93 pp. Paper, 50c.

RICHARD GARBE.
THE REDEMPTION OF THE BRAHMIN.
A Tale of Hindu Life. Laid paper. Vg. parch. binding, gilt top. 56 pp. Price, 75c.

M. M. TRUMBULL.
THE FREE TRADE STRUGGLE IN ENGLAND.
Second edition, revised and enlarged. 296 pp. Cloth, 75c; paper, 25c.

WHEELBARROW. Articles and Discussions on the Labor Question.
With portrait of the author. 300 pp. Cloth, \$1.00; paper, 50c.

EARL GREY ON RECIPROCITY AND CIVIL SERVICE REFORM.
With Comments by Gen. M. M. Trumbull. Price, 15c.

TH. RIBOT.
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF ATTENTION.
Authorised translation. 121 pp. Cloth, 75c.
THE DISEASES OF PERSONALITY.
Authorised translation. 175 pp. Cloth, 75c.
THE DISEASES OF THE WILL.
Authorised translation. 134 pp. Cloth, 75c.
Complete Set, \$1.75.

GUSTAV FREYTAG.
THE LOST MANUSCRIPT.
A Novel. Authorised translation from the sixteenth German edition. Two volumes, 953 pp., extra cloth, gilt top, \$1.00. The same in one volume, cloth, \$1.00; paper, 75c.

PAUL CARUS.
THE ETHICAL PROBLEM.
Three lectures delivered before the Society for Ethical Culture of Chicago, in June, 1890. 59 pp. Cloth, 50c; paper, 35c.

FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS.
The Method of Philosophy as a Systematic Arrangement of Knowledge. Second, edition, enlarged and revised. 372 pp. Cloth, \$1.50.

HOMILIES OF SCIENCE.
340 pages. Cloth, gilt top, \$1.50.

THE IDEA OF GOD.
A disquisition upon the development of the idea of God. 3d edition. 32 pp. Paper, 15c.

THE SOUL OF MAN.
An Investigation of the Facts of Physiological and Experimental Psychology. With 152 cuts and diagrams. 458 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

TRUTH IN FICTION. TWELVE TALES WITH A MORAL.
Laid paper, white and gold binding, gilt edges, 128 pp. Price, \$1.00.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.
Extra edition. Price, 50c.

PRIMER OF PHILOSOPHY.
A popular exposition of the fundamental notions of philosophy. 245 pp. Cloth, \$1.00.

THE GOSPEL OF BUDDHA.
(In preparation.)

Epitomes of Three Sciences.
1. **COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY; THE STORY OF SANSKRIT.**
By *Prof. H. Oldenberg*, of the University of Kiel.

2. **EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY.**
By *Prof. Joseph Jastrow*, of the University of Wisconsin.

3. **OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY; OR, THE RISE OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.**
By *Prof. C. H. Cornill*, of the University of Königsberg, with especial introductions by Professors Oldenberg and Cornill and preface remarks by the Editor of *The Open Court*. 140 pp. Cloth, 75c.

THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:
\$2.00 PER YEAR. \$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

CONTENTS OF NO. 364.

BUDDHISM IN JAPAN. NOBUTA KISHIMOTO 4183
 HUMANITY'S TANGLED STRANDS. IRENE A. SAFFORD 4184
 THE EMANCIPATION OF WOMAN FROM WOMAN. WILLIAM SCHUYLER 4186
 SCIENCE AND REFORM: Definitions of Liberty. Mongol Manhunters. Moral Assassins. Precursors of Schopenhauer. The Koran Fetich. Our Daily Rice. Tests of Civilisation. FELIX L. OSWALD. 4189
 POETRY.
 Sonnet. MARY MORGAN (GOWAN LEA). 4190