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UNFURL THE FLAG.

Unfurl the flag in colors gay,
   The stripes and the stars of our banner, '
Unfurl the flag, and forever and aye
   The world shall do it honor.
Unfurl the flag in spite of the gale,
   Let it flutter from ocean to ocean.
While its folds in the wind are waving, we hail
   Old Glory with rapturous devotion.
      O dauntless flag of the brave and the free,
   Remain thou the symbol of Liberty.
   Proud banner of our Republic,
   We greet thee loyally!

Refrain—Rally, Columbia's sons!
    Rally round the flag!
Mindful of her laws,
   Faithful to her cause,
Struggling with might for our country's expanse,
   Anxious its weal and renown to enhance,
Jubilant o'er its triumphal advance,
      Rally, Columbia's sons!
    Rally round the flag!

In stripes alternately white and red
   The spirit appears of the nation,
Whose liberty to law is wed
   In glorious combination.
The Northern snow and the Southern fire,
   So brightly blend together.
Joint love to friends, to foes joint ire,
   Thus braves our flag all weather.
Securest refuge in distress,
   Thou symbol of true manliness,
Proud banner of our Republic,
   Bold emblem of success!
Refrain—Rally, Columbia's sons!
Rally round the flag!
Mindful of her laws,
Faithful to her cause,
Struggling with might for our country's expanse,
Anxious its weal and renown to enhance,
Jubilant o'er its triumphant advance,
Rally, Columbia's sons!
Rally round the flag!

What means the blue of the starry field?
The blue is a vision of heaven.
To genuine faith which in deeds is revealed,
The promised land is given.
And the silvery stars in the fields of blue,
Like the stars in the sky that are real,
Are our trusting hopes, our guides so true,
Our aspirations ideal.
These stars shall unto humanity
A new and a higher covenant be,
Proud banner of our Republic,
Where is a flag like thee?

Refrain—Rally, Columbia's sons!
Rally round the flag!
Mindful of her laws,
Faithful to her cause,
Struggling with might for our country's expanse,
Anxious its weal and renown to enhance,
Jubilant o'er its triumphant advance,
Rally, Columbia's sons!
Rally round the flag!

'Tis under our flag at the present day,
That the bliss of futurity resteth.
We cherish its gallant and beauteous display,
And love dearly the thoughts it suggesteth.
Our flag uniteth the life of the past,
Old foes exchange now greetings,
And reconciled are their contentions at last,
In hearts that are higher beating.
New covenant thou of humanity,
O symbol of noble fraternity,
Proud banner of our Republic,
We greet thee loyally.

Refrain—Rally, Columbia's sons!
Rally round the flag!
Mindful of her laws,
Faithful to her cause,
Struggling with might for our country's expanse,
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Anxious its weal and renown to enhance,
Jubilant o'er its triumphal advance,
Rally, Columbia's sons!
Rally round the flag!

THE ANGLO-SAXON ALLIANCE.

Old England and the United States,
The freedom-loving nations,
Have a common aim that consecrates
Their labor and plodding patience.
The Union Jack and the Stripes and Stars
Can bid the world defiance
Be they united in peace and in wars
In brotherly sacred alliance!

Hurrah for the people of Saxon speech,
Who laws of freedom practise and preach!
Join hands, and the
O'er all the world shall reach.

REFRAIN—Join, Columbia's sons!
Greater Britain join!

Never were better allies,
Never more sacred ties:
Kindred in race and in language the same,
Wedded in purpose, both bent on the aim
Good-will and peace upon earth to proclaim.
Join, Columbia's sons!
Greater Britain join!

AGNOSTICISM IN VERSE.

To the Editor of The Open Court:

I do not remember seeing more than one poetic article in your columns for two or three years; so I conclude you do not “run to poetry” much.

But I have written something which certainly is not appropriate for any magazine or publication that I know of, unless it is The Open Court. So I drop it into the hopper—wondering whether, like “bread cast upon the waters,” there is any possibility of its returning after many days.

J. L. McCrery.

MY PHILOSOPHY.

I have been young, and now am old:
And slowly I have builded me
A system of philosophy
To all of which I firmly hold.

Certain I am that I am right:
But now the structure is complete,
And ready all assaults to meet,
This truth dawns slowly on my sight:
'Tis part of the eternal plan,
Escape from which there cannot be—
That every man's philosophy
Is fruit and outgrowth of the man.
The fountain cannot count for naught:
The bee its healthful sweets distils:
The snake its fangs with venom fills;
And as the man is, is his thought.

As I my theory rehearse
So might a silkworm self-commune,
And fondly deem its own cocoon
The model of the Universe.

So my illusions fade and fall;
My perfect philosophic scheme
Is but a self-begotten dream,
And I know nothing after all.

[Agnosticism has rarely found so logical and typical an expression as in Mr. J L. McCreery's poem "My Philosophy," voicing the deep-felt conviction of the poet, who here in a few strong outlines sketches the summary of his life's experience And what is the lesson he teaches us? He says:

"My perfect philosophic scheme
Is but a self-begotten dream
And I know nothing after all."

The argument of this sad conclusion is based upon the theory "that every man's philosophy is fruit and outgrowth of the man." This is true; at least the idea that underlies the proposition. But it would be more correct to say that "the philosophy of the man characterises the man; it is part of him; in fact the most important part of his mind. But what does it prove? Mr. McCreery derives from it a rigid subjectivism, denying any and all objective validity to the make-up of the character of thought, and his argument is given in allegories. The bee distils honey, the snake venom, and thus the poet's thoughts are not a reflection of the universe, but of his own subjectivity. He says:

"As I my theory rehearse
So might a silkworm self-commune,
And fondly deem its own cocoon
The model of the universe."

Granting this view to be true, would not the subjectivity of all creatures be an unfathomable mystery? So it is, says the agnostic, and joins hands with the mystic. But is this true? Is not the doctrine of evolution, so eagerly accepted by the inconsistent agnostics, a solution of the problem of the divergence of character discovered among the various beings. Every creature is the product of its antecedents. The silkworm in the cocoon is not an unaccountable subjectivity, but the result of the peculiar activity of its ancestors which are a special part of the
display of life in the universe. The cocoon has been modelled by the universe, and if we knew the cocoon perfectly in all its relations and conditions we should know, as Tennyson says, "what God and man is." The venom of the snake, the honey of the bee, the thought of man, are but so many expressions of the character of the universe.

Among all the expressions of the universe, there is none like man's thought, because man's thoughts alone transcend the limits of subjectivity and comprehend the nature of universal law that in the manner of uniformities permeates the whole sphere of objective existence. The sense-element of man's mental images is purely subjective, but the thought-element, which is based upon purely formal calculations, attains to objectively valid statements of fact. We can by the usual methods of science state what things are, independently of our sensations of them. The rainbow image in the beauty of color is a subjective representation of a natural phenomenon, but the physicist's description of it, based upon mathematical calculations, is de facto an interpretation which elucidates the character of the rainbow as it is in itself.

Philosophy has long followed the practice of purely subjective, and therefore vain, speculations. The old methods lead either to worthless vagaries or to agnosticism or to mysticism. What we need is a philosophy of science. This is a slower and more difficult task than the metaphysical plan of taking the heaven of knowledge by storm; but then while the metaphysical thinker rises into cloudland, or, if he be sober, must confess that he found nothing but vacancy, the philosophy of science will progress slowly but steadily. New problems will turn up with every solution of an old problem; we shall never reach the end. But this is no cause for despair, for posterity, too, is anxious to do something and to advance into the new fields of inquiry. Let us be satisfied with life and these conditions of existence which after all are a preference, not a drawback, for they show life's unlimited potentialities and are a reflection of the infinity of the universe.—P. C.]

SOLOMONIC LITERATURE.

Dr. Moncure D. Conway's article on Solomonic Literature in the present *Open Court* is of special interest and deserves a careful perusal on account of the many analogies which it indicates between the wisdom literature of the Jews and the sacred books of the Avesta. But it seems to us that he goes too far in assuming the existence of an anti-Jahvistic party in Israel, which expressed its sentiment in this Solomonic wisdom so called. We do not deny that there is a contrast between the philosophical background of the Jewish wisdom literature and the spirit of Judaism. Nor do we deny that the Solomonic wisdom literature originated through foreign influence, which, however, was by no means limited to Persia; but we regard it as more than doubtful that the Jewish literature was intended to oppose the national religion of the Jews and the worship of Jahveh. On the contrary, we read the various passages which Dr. Conway quotes as indicating that some pious Jew, who has imbibed foreign philosophy, is endeavoring to introduce the wisdom of the Gentiles and to give it a Jewish interpretation. A religious Jew saw no contradiction in such contrasts as these: "By kindness and truth iniquity is atoned for;" and "By the fear of Jahveh men turn away from evil." Or, to take another example, "The virtuous man has an everlasting foundation;" and "The fear of Jahveh prolongeth days." Far from finding an anti-Jahvism in Solomonic literature,
we should characterise this spirit as a cosmopolitanism. The author has drunk at the fountains of some foreign philosophy; he has possibly used some lost book of foreign origin, with the thoughts of which he was anxious to enrich his nation.

The book Ecclesiastes (Kohlieth) is supposed to have been written, according to Hitzig, in the year 204. The language, according to Delitzsch, unmistakably betrays the approach of the atmosphere of the Mishna. And Cornill says that although Hitzig’s arguments may not be altogether sound, he appears to have placed the book at the right time. But we cannot go down to the times of the Maccabees when foreign philosophy and Jewish piety began to be regarded as contradictions. The spirit of the age of the later Maccabees down to the destruction of Jerusalem characterises the narrow Jahvism of which Dr. Conway speaks. And yet even during this time there were outside of Judea many Jews who very well understood how to reconcile foreign philosophies with their religious traditions, the most glorious example of which is the famous philosopher Philo. The whole Wisdom literature has grown up on this soil of a reconciliation between Jewish piety and foreign philosophies, some of which actually stand in glaring contradiction to the spirit of any religion, for they preach a dreary materialism and the vanity of all things, declaring that there is nothing good for man except that he eat and drink and be as happy as possible in his misery. The uncanonical Solomonic literature entitled the Wisdom of Solomon was not even written in Hebrew but is in the Greek of the Diaspora, probably written during the first century B.C. in Alexandria.

BOOK-REVIEWS AND NOTES.

The Macmillan Company have begun issuing a little series of Economic Classics, which is intended to comprise the chief fundamental works on Political Economy. We have before us Turgot’s Reflections on the Formation and the Distribution of Riches, which was published in 1770, six years before the appearance of Adam Smith’s great work, The Wealth of Nations. As in many other departments—it will be remembered that Turgot was the first to enunciate in its essential form Comte’s law of the three stages,—so here the great French statesman gave in a brief compass the germs of a valuable economic theory and a wise economic policy. The volumes which have already been published in the Economic Classics are: Thomas Mun: England’s Treasure by Foreign Trade (1664); Adam Smith: Select Chapters and Passages from the Wealth of Nations (1776); Malthus: Parallel Chapters from the 1st and 2d Editions of the Essay on Population (1798); Ricardo: First Six Chapters of the Principles of Political Economy (1817); Richard Jones: Peasant Rents (1831); Augustin Cournot: Mathematical Principles of the Theory of Wealth (1838); and Gustav Schmoller: Mercantile System (1884). (Price 75 cents.)

Few people are aware of the value of the Annual Reports of the Smithsonian Institution. These volumes being bound in the style of the Patent Reports and other national documents, have a very dismal and unprepossessing appearance, and so share in the general prejudice which exists against the literature published by the Government,—a literature which is usually rated at its coefficient of combustibility. But the Smithsonian Reports,—after deducting the necessary introductory matter, which treats of the condition of the Institution, its museums, ac
cessions, and general business,—contain a vast amount of original scientific