



**The UNIVERSITY  
OF TORONTO  
QUARTERLY**



**CONTENTS.**

	PAGE.
Recent Labor Troubles in America....ARTHUR R. CLUTE, '96	165
The Ancestry of the Vertebrates .....R.S.LILLIE, '96	181
The Relation of Philosophy to Religion..... A. McVICAR, '96	196
Goethe's Love Affairs..... JESSIE ORR WRIGHT, '96	206
Ralph Waldo Emerson..... W. K. STEWART, '97	215
On Translating Homer..... BERNARD K. SANDWELL, '97	227

---

*Conducted by Undergraduate Societies of the University of Toronto.*

---

\$1.00 Per Annum.

Single Copies 35 Cents

TORONTO:

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, PRINTER.

1896.

. . . Editorial Board . . .



**CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION.**

J. H. BROWN, B.A.  
E. D. CARDER, '96.  
W. W. EDGAR, '97.

**MODERN LANGUAGE CLUB.**

W. J. ALEXANDER, B.A., Ph.D.  
MISS RIDDELL, '96.  
W. B. WEIDENHAMMER, '96.

**MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SOCIETY.**

A. T. DELURY, B.A.  
A. MEIGHEN, '96.  
W. W. NICHOL, '96.

**NATURAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.**

W. A. PARKS, B.A.  
C. C. BELL, '96.  
A. COSENS, '97.

**PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY.**

F. TRACY, B.A., Ph.D.  
J. G. TAYLOR, '97.  
M. A. SHAW, '96.

**POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.**

J. A. COOPER, B.A.  
A. F. BARR, '96.  
H. H. NARRAWAY, '97.

---

W. W. EDGAR, *Editor-in-Chief.*  
H. H. NARRAWAY *Secretary.*  
E. D. CARDER *Treasurer.*

THE

# University of Toronto Quarterly

Vol. II.

TORONTO, MARCH, 1896.

No. 3.

## RECENT LABOR TROUBLES IN AMERICA.

BY ARTHUR R. CLUTE, '96.

[Read before the Political Science Association.]

THE title of this essay is, to a certain extent, pretentious: for since consenting to write a paper on this subject I have found not only that it would require far more space than is at my disposal, but also that in several cases the official documents which would necessarily form the basis of it are either not available or as yet unpublished. I have concluded, therefore, to give a very brief outline of the growth of labor organizations in the United States, which, in all recent troubles, have played such a conspicuous part, and to conclude my paper with an account of the Homestead Strike of 1892, and in more detail of the American Railroad Union Strike at Chicago in 1894.

Down to the beginning of this century there were, in the modern sense of the term, no labor organizations in the United States. The reasons for this are two-fold. In the first place agriculture continued to absorb the energies of the people, as during the colonial period.\* There was no great concentration of population in the towns, where what little industry there was carried on was purely domestic in character. Under this system there was no occasion for organization, for, as a general rule, the condition of the journeyman was merely temporary,

\* Rabbeno—American Commercial Policy—Essay II., Ch. 1, Sec. 7, and Ch. 2 Sec. 16.

the ultimate and nominal status of the worker being that of independent producer.\* In the second place—and this fact accounts also in part for the slow growth of labor organizations down at least to 1842—the English Common Law brought to America treated as indictable conspiracy the combination of laborers, and the promoters and members of labor organizations were liable to prosecution accordingly. Until 1825 the Unions were merely local and tentative. There was no attempt to unite with organizations whose members worked at other callings or in other places; nor was there at this time any particular necessity for such a step, for competition among laborers was at its minimum both on account of the difficulty of mobilizing or importing labor, and on account of the fact that the highly specialized individual skill required by the more complicated operations—to simplify which minute division of labor and the use of automatic machinery had not been introduced—made very difficult a diversion of labor from one trade to another. The first instance, probably, of a strike in the United States is that of the sailors of New York, who, in 1802, struck to enforce their demand for an increase in wages from \$10 to \$14 per month. The combination and conspiracy laws, however, enabled the authorities to arrest and imprison the leader of the strike, which then came to an end. Until 1822 there were no unions outside the state of New York; but in that year a Society of Shipwrights and Caulkers was formed at Boston and incorporated in 1823, whose avowed object was that of a benefit society.

After 1825, the wage-earners began to regard themselves as a distinct class, whose interests were in many respects not identical with those of the rest of the population. This belief having impressed itself upon them, it was natural that class action should strongly recommend itself. As an advocate of their views appeared, about 1825, the *Workingman's Advocate*, the first labor journal in the United States, and, during the years 1829-1841, the Labor party having joined forces with the Democrats, exercised a potent influence on politics, and were even able to elect a representative to Congress. About this time central unions were organized, including all workmen within a certain locality. The earliest of such organizations was that of the General Trades'

---

\* Ely—Labor Movement in America, Ch. 3.

Union of the City of New York, established in 1833, the objects of which were declared to be "to guard against the encroachments of aristocracy, to preserve our natural and political rights, to elevate our moral and intellectual condition, to promote our pecuniary interests, to narrow the line of distinction between the journeyman and employer, to establish the honor and safety of our respective vocations upon a more secure and permanent basis, and to alleviate the distresses of those suffering from want of employment.\* A vigorous protest was uttered against the old combination laws, and universal education was the remedy prescribed by the labor press, and, indeed, by all early labor agitators, as a panacea for existing evils. Down to 1842 the struggle of the unions was for the mere right to exist, for employers, generally bitterly hostile, used vigorous efforts to suppress them. But in that year the legality of labor organizations was finally established, by the decision in the Journeyman Bootmakers' case. Then came to the front a question, which, from the inception of labor organization, had been more or less mooted, viz., the question as to the length of the normal working-day. The general demand was that there should be a shortening of the working-day of from twelve to sixteen hours to ten hours; and this was gradually effected—sometimes peaceably, sometimes by means of a strike. The eight-hour movement began somewhat later, between 1865 and 1870, and has not yet, as we know, entirely achieved its object.

During the decade preceding the Civil War it became apparent that, owing to improvement in the means of communication and transportation, local unions and even General Trades' Unions were no longer adequate to protect members against the competition of outside laborers. In consequence of this, by 1860, about twenty-six trades unions had been organized on a national basis. It is hardly necessary to say that until after the Civil War there were and could be no labor organizations in the South. This event, however, together with the progressive concentration of the laboring classes in large industrial centres, the fact that riches and poverty stood contrasted more sharply than ever before, and that foreign labor, which had replaced native labor to a considerable extent during the war, introduced a racial element to

\* Ely, p. 44.

widen the breach between capital and labor—these causes gave a great impetus to the formation of labor organizations. As improvements in the means of communication and transportation operated to transform local into national unions, so now, again, further improvements tended to hasten the formation of international unions.

Lack of space prevents mention of the many important unions formed; but before passing on to the next branch of the subject, I must advert to the organization known as the Knights of Labor. This was inaugurated in 1869, by U. S. Stevens, a tailor of Philadelphia, and introduced one significant innovation. It was intended by its originator to embrace within its ranks unskilled as well as skilled labor. This step was necessary in order to strengthen labor in disputes with capital; for, on account of improvements in technical processes and extreme division of labor special skill counted for very little except in a few cases, and it was, therefore, an easy matter for an employer to fill the place of a recalcitrant workman from the ranks of unskilled labor. It was estimated in 1886 that the membership of the Order ranged from 300,000 to 500,000. It has always exerted its efforts to ameliorate the condition of the working-men as well as men, and has frequently been the instrument of settling disputes between employers and employed.

Having thus presented as succinctly as possible the salient features in the development of one of the forces engaged in the momentous industrial struggle, I shall ask you to consider for a moment a contest actually in progress, one which was waged with the most determined obstinacy throughout the summer of 1892.

The town of Homestead, a suburb of Pittsburg, was chosen about fifteen years ago by the Carnegie Iron & Steel Manufacturing Company as the site of one of their extensive works. At the time of the strike the population of the town amounted to 10,000 or 12,000 inhabitants, of whom 3,800 found employment in the works, where was carried on almost exclusively the manufacture of steel building materials. The other establishments of the company were situated in and about Pittsburg; and the total number of employees on the pay rolls (including those at Homestead) was about 13,000. The dominant labor organization, known as the Amalgamated Iron and Steel Association, was one of the

oldest of American trades unions, having been founded in 1858 under the name of the Sons of Vulcan; which, in 1876, amalgamated with two other unions, thus forming the present association.\*

To get at the root of the trouble which occurred in 1892, we shall have to go back to the year 1889.† In that year a strike had taken place at Homestead, and, the men being successful, had compelled the company to accept an arrangement running for three years, according to which wages were to be regulated by a sliding scale, based upon the number of tons produced by each man, and varying with the price per ton of steel billets (the crudest article produced), the minimum price, below which there was to be no corresponding decline in wages, being fixed at \$25 per ton. During the interval between 1889 and 1892 such improvements were made in the process of manufacture that it became possible for the men to turn out larger quantities of material per day than formerly, and, consequently, to earn very high wages. At the same time there had been a steady decline in the price of steel billets. Early in 1892, therefore, the company intimated that it desired a rearrangement of the scale, and a month prior to the expiration of the then existing agreement, viz., on May 30th, communicated through the superintendent of the works its ultimatum to the men. The terms offered were: (1) A lowering of the tonnage rate of wages, (2) a reduction of the minimum price to \$22 per ton, and (3) an agreement to the termination of the arrangement on Jan. 1st, 1894. The reasonableness of the first two propositions was generally admitted by the men, but the last one aroused suspicion and vigorous opposition; seemingly not without cause, for the men derived an advantage from the termination of the arrangement in summer, since, owing to the nature of the business, that was the busy season, while termination in mid-winter would be a deterrent to opposition on the part of employees to future proposals and plans of the management. The manager at this time was Mr. H. C. Frick, a man who, prior to his connection with the Carnegie Company, had defeated a strike of his own employees. His reputation among the

---

\* Ely, p. 64.

† See an article on the Homestead Strike by Taussig in the *Economic Journal*, Vol. III.

men and his determined and uncompromising nature poorly qualified him to bring about a reconciliation. The Amalgamated Association, it should be remarked, was itself of a militant character, for its rules provided for strike pay, while no provision was made for sick pay or out-of-work pay. Of the 3,800 men employed at Homestead only 800 were union men, and of this number only 330 were affected by the reductions. Nevertheless, upon the men failing to accede to the terms submitted, a lock-out was declared July 1st. Even before the answer of the men had been received preparations had been made by the company for a struggle. The works were surrounded by a high board fence, electric lights put in, and an agreement made with the Pinkerton National Detective Agency, by which 300 armed men were to be furnished to guard the works and enable them to be re-opened on July 6th. The hiring of these private mercenaries was resolved upon because, during the strike of 1889, the men got and kept possession of the works, and the ordinary civil authorities showed themselves quite incapable of protecting the property and rights of the company.

Upon the declaration of the lock-out, the Amalgamated Association on its part appointed an Advisory Committee, which directed the strikers and practically controlled the works and the town, whose inhabitants, including the mayor, were in complete sympathy with the locked-out employees. The works were regularly "picketed," no damage was done and no attempt made to enter them, the sole object being to prevent the introduction of non-union or outside laborers. A sheriff's posse, sent to look after the company's interests, was summarily driven out of the town; and on July 6th the squad of Pinkerton men, conveyed from Pittsburg to the works on barges, were compelled, after a sharp and sanguinary fight, to surrender their arms and persons to the strikers. After some rather rough treatment at the hands of the infuriated mob, who regarded them as little less than cut-throats and murderers, the wretched prisoners were sent back by special train to the place whence they came; and the Advisory Committee, redoubling its vigilance, strictly maintained order in the town. It not only prevented depredations on the company's property, but repaired the damage done to the fence during the fight.

At this juncture the sheriff applied to the Governor to have the state militia called out, which, after some hesitation and delay,



was done. On July 12th, 6,000 troops entered and took possession of the town and works, and for the remainder of the summer the place assumed the appearance of a military camp. The resort to the militia was disastrous to the success of the strikers, who, up to this time, seemed to be almost certain of ultimate victory. Non-union men were gradually introduced; department after department was re-opened; the strikers themselves, seeing that defeat was inevitable and that in the meantime their places were being filled by outsiders, became disaffected, until, finally, on the 20th of Nov., the strike (originally proclaimed a lock-out merely to forestall the union) was declared off, and the men individually came to terms and signed agreements with the company on the basis of its proposals submitted in May. No pledge, however, was required as to membership in labor organizations.

This strike, remarkable for the pertinacity with which it was conducted until further resistance became hopeless, and for the bitter resentment aroused by the extraordinary method adopted in the first instance to suppress it, was marked by two egregious incidents. On July 23rd Mr. Frick was shot by a New York anarchist, but the strikers were in no way connected with this outrage. Unfortunately, certain prominent strikers could not be absolved from complicity in an attempt made during the summer to poison men inside the works, but that they acted entirely without the knowledge and sympathy of the great body of strikers is all but certain.

Notwithstanding the slight decline in the price of steel, there is no doubt that the company was making enormous profits (the result partly of highly improved methods and machinery, and partly of high protective duties); but, as compared with other employments, the workmen were also receiving high wages, and wages, as usual, had to bear the first brunt of a fall in price—an instance substantiating the principle that wages are determined by and do not determine price.\*

We must now pass to the third topic—the great strike of 1894 †—which, according to Bradstreet, involved directly and indirectly a total loss of \$80,000,000. This strike differs from

\* Smart, Introduction to the Theory of Value, Ch. 14.

† The principal authorities on this branch of the essay are: The Report of the United States Strike Commission and the Official Statements of the Pullman Company.

the one just dealt with in one very important particular: it was essentially a sympathetic strike; \* that is, the majority of strikers were not employees of the corporation against which the strike was directed. Another point of difference which might be noted is that the companies involved in the Chicago strike were quasi-public corporations, their charters having been granted by the state. The trouble arose between the Pullman Company and its employees, but was, in the end, fought out by the American Railroad Union and the General Managers' Association, an organization formed in 1886, representing the 24 railroads terminating or centering in Chicago. That the nature of the dispute may be fully comprehended, it must be explained that the business of the Pullman Company consisted ' (1) of the operation of its sleeping cars on about 125,000 miles of railway, (2) of the manufacture and repair of such cars, (3) of the manufacture of cars of all kinds for the general market, and (4) of the care and management as owner and landlord of the town of Pullman.' The first branch of the business was started in 1867, the third and fourth branches not until 1880-81.

On July 31st, 1893, there were on the pay-rolls of the company the names of 4,497 employees, seventy per cent. of whom depended for employment upon contract work. Having anticipated a large increase of traffic owing to the World's Fair, the Pullman Company had built about four hundred extra cars, which, with the return of normal traffic, being unneeded, had to be stored. Consequently the company ceased building cars for itself. Contract work likewise fell off, for two reasons— (1) Many railroads had greatly increased their rolling stock in order to be able to handle the World's Fair business; (2) Those roads which had not done so were unable, on account of the general depression, to place new orders. During the summer of 1893 its Detroit car works had been closed by the company and its business concentrated at Pullman. But, notwithstanding this, there was still insufficient work for all, and by Nov. 1 (1893) there were only 1,100 men in all departments. Strenuous efforts were made to procure work, and by reducing wages, and with a lower price on all materials, the company succeeded by April, 1894, in trebling its force. It claims that during the period from

---

\* *Vide* article by T. M. Cooley, *Forum*, Vol. 18, pp. 1-19.

Aug. 1st, 1893, to May 1st, 1894, its net loss on accepted bids was over \$52,000; and that these contracts were undertaken, though at a loss, in order to procure work for the men. These purely altruistic motives were impugned by the commission, which points out that the company's interests demanded the keeping open of the shops in order to keep its plant from rusting, to hold its own against competitors, and to continue to receive a revenue from its tenements. Two-thirds of the employees were tenants or lodgers, and though they were less able to pay, because working at reduced wages and at less than full time, the Pullman Company made no reductions in rents, which were from 20% to 25% higher than in Chicago or surrounding towns for similar accommodations, if the aesthetic and sanitary features of Pullman were left out of consideration. While the company never required from its employees any agreement to occupy its houses, it was perfectly understood that tenants were given a preference over non-tenants when work was slack. And, though the company undoubtedly had the legal right to maintain the high rate of rent regardless of the reduction in wages, such course does not seem to have been altogether equitable. At least, the absurdity of arbitration of the question was not, as Mr. Ashley points out,\* so self-evident as the company assumed. There was, during the depression, no reduction in the salaries of officers, managers, or superintendents. Nor was there any considerable decrease in receipts from the sleeping-car business. The company based its reason for the 25% reduction of wages entirely on the fact that one branch of the business was yielding no profit, but, nevertheless, reduced wages all round for the alleged reason that they must be kept uniform. The whole system in vogue at Pullman was one of paternalism. "The conditions created at Pullman," runs the report, "enable the management at all times to assert with great vigor its assumed right to fix wages and rents absolutely, and to repress that sort of independence which leads to labor organizations and their attempts at mediation, arbitration, strikes, etc."†

Such was the position of affairs for the nine or ten months prior to the strike. Discontent was rife among the men during

\* The Church Social Union, Series B, No. 1, Analysis of the Issues of the Railroad Strike of 1894, by Prof. W. G. Ashley, p. 11.

† Report, p. 23.

the winter of 1893-94, and in March large numbers of them joined the American Railway Union.

It will be convenient at this point to mention a few facts anent this union.\* It was organized in Chicago in June, 1893, and had at the time of the strike a membership of 150,000, all white persons engaged in railway service being eligible as members. The American Railway Union consists of local unions and a general union; the minimum number of persons necessary to constitute the former being ten, while the latter is composed of representatives from the local unions. The general union elects every four years a board of nine directors, whose duty it is to take measures necessary to effect the objects of the organization. The chairmen of the local boards of mediation form the general board of mediation for a given system of railroads. No strike can be declared except by order of a majority of the men involved; but, when once resolved upon, the direction of it is assumed by the Board of Directors. The object of the American Railway Union, as stated in its constitution, is to protect and promote the interests of its members as wage-earners through organization and legitimate co-operation." Its principles are confessedly based on justice, conservatism and moderation. But the omission of any provision in the constitution for the punishment by expulsion or disqualification of persons who commit or incite to violence was strongly censured by the commission; which, moreover, considered a very unwise stretch of the constitution the action of the American Railway Union in admitting into the union as "persons employed in railway service" Pullman shop-employees—a mistake which, perhaps, was realized by the officers, since, though opposed to the strike, they were dragged into it by the Pullman members.

But, as at this juncture we are concerned less with what ought to have been done than with what actually occurred, I shall recount in chronological order the events which took place. On May 7th, and again on May 9th, a committee of forty-three of the men met Mr. Wickes, the second vice-president of the company, to request a restoration of the wages paid during the first half of the preceding year. He explained the position of affairs, maintaining that under the circumstances an increase

---

\* Report, pp. 23 and 24.

in wages was out of the question, but promised a thorough investigation into certain shop abuses alleged to exist. The commission held that while the men were unreasonable in demanding the former high wages, the company was not less so in the extent to which it carried reduction. At first the men were inclined to accept the situation; but, at a local meeting of the American Railway Union, held the evening of May 10th, a strike was declared, and next day 2,500 of the men went out, leaving only 600, most of whom were unskilled. These the company 'laid off' and closed the shops. The crisis was probably precipitated by the dismissal of three of the committeemen, notwithstanding a promise that their presence on the committee should not affect them. Throughout the trouble the Pullman Company absolutely refused to arbitrate the dispute, though repeatedly exhorted to do so by the Common Council of Chicago, the Civic Federation of Chicago, the mayors of fifty of the large cities, its own employees, and the American Railway Union. A request for arbitration made by the American Railway Union on June 15th having been contemptuously ignored by the company, a second demand was made on June 22nd, this time accompanied with the threat, in case of refusal, of a boycott to stop the running of Pullman cars to go into operation June 26th. The company still remaining obdurate, the American Railway Union proceeded on that date to put its threat into execution.

From this time to the end of the struggle the Pullman Company and its employees play a subordinate part, the contest now being between the American Railway Union and the General Managers' Association. According to the statement of Mr. Wickes (p. 13) there was from the beginning to the end of the strike no concerted action between the Pullman Company and the General Managers' Association. On June 25th, the latter met and resolved on vigorous action against the boycotters. This association,\* inaugurated in 1886, began its "active life" in 1892; but until 1893 was chiefly concerned in regulating freight rates. It then began to take measures to equalize wages on the lines embraced in the association; and established agencies to secure men to replace strikers should a contingency arise. The action of the association has admittedly had great

\* Report, pp. 29-31.

weight with outside lines, and has tended to establish a uniform scale of wages throughout the country. The commission found that the railways forming the General Managers' Association, in having combined to fix the rates for services and wages, had exceeded the powers conferred upon them by their charters. "In theory," it says, "corporations are limited by the powers granted either directly or by clear inference.\* We do not think the power has been granted in either way in this case." Such combinations, the report declares, are dangerous to the liberties of the people, and, if unchecked, will result in government ownership. If large combinations of men are to be condemned, the General Managers' Association, not the American Railway Union, is in this case the more reprehensible, since by it the example was set.

The result of the boycott was a general dislocation of commerce and traffic. Throughout the trouble no injury was done the Pullman shops or plant; and, until July 3rd, the police force of Chicago, numbering 3,100 men, and United States deputy-marshals (armed and paid by the General Managers' Association) succeeded in restraining serious violence or destruction. After that the officers of the American Railway Union were impotent to control the strikers, and mob-rule prevailed; but the outrages which ensued were for the most part perpetrated by the large criminal and foreign class, then augmented by vagabonds whom the exposition had attracted to Chicago. To give an idea of the disorders, it will be necessary merely to mention the crimes for which arrests were made. These were murder, arson, burglary, assault, intimidation, riot, inciting to riot, and lesser crimes. The federal and state troops were called out; these, together with police, deputy-sheriffs and deputy-marshals, making a force of 14,186 men. As in the case of the Homestead strike, so here military intervention proved fatal to the strikers. On July 13th, disturbances having been quelled, the American Railway Union, on the advice of representatives of national and international labor unions, and partly because, by committal for contempt, the courts had deprived it of leaders, decided to declare the strike "off." It made a proposal to this effect to the General Managers' Association, "provided the men were restored to their former positions without prejudice, except in cases where they had been

\* *Vide* Holland's Elements of Jurisprudence, p. 302.

convicted of crime;" but the communication was arrogantly returned unanswered. On July 18th the Pullman Company posted a notice, stating that as soon as there was a sufficient force of operatives the shops would be opened. The first opened were the repair shops on August 2nd. By August 24th 2,337 men were enrolled, of whom 1,778 were former employees. The Pullman Company had always declined to confer with its men as members of unions;\* and, now that the strike was over, withdrawal from the American Railway Union was made the indispensable condition of obtaining employment.

The losses sustained by the parties immediately connected with the strike amounted to \$7,097,367, apportioned somewhat as follows: Loss incurred by the railways comprising the General Managers' Association through loss of earnings, destruction of property, etc., \$5,358,224; loss to Pullman employees in wages, \$350,000; and to the 100,000 railroad employees affected by the strike, \$1,389,143. Besides these there were enormous losses sustained by shippers and the public in general.

On July 26th (1894) President Cleveland, under the provisions of Sec. 6 of Ch. 1,063 of the laws of the United States, passed Oct. 1st, 1888, appointed a board of three commissioners (of which the Hon. C. D. Wright, commissioner of the United States Labor Department, was *ex-officio* chairman) to investigate the trouble at Chicago. This was the first instance in which the law of 1888 had been applied.† In the case of the Homestead strike, committees of enquiry had been appointed by the Houses of Congress. The board was solely a court of enquiry, and was appointed to examine, not to arbitrate, the difficulties. As the result of its labors, in the course of which it examined 109 witnesses and several written statements, the commission presented to the President a report, containing, in addition to a lengthy review of the case, certain recommendations.

Along with these recommendations, I shall, in closing, mention a few of the many points upon which this momentous event has evoked discussion. The recommendations are on three lines, viz.: (1) For Congressional action, (2) for state action, (3) for the action of corporations and labor organizations. I. The commission recommends the appointment of a permanent United

\* Report pp. 25 and 26. † *Forum*, Vol. 18, p. 708.

States Strike Commission of three members, with powers and duties of investigation between railroads and their employees, and that the United States courts be empowered to compel railroads to obey the decision of the commission; that national trades unions be required to provide in their articles of incorporation, or in their constitutions, that a person instigating or participating in violence or intimidation shall cease to be a member. II. The commission recommends that boards of arbitration and conciliation be constituted by the states, with power to investigate all strikes, whether requested to do so or not; and that contracts requiring men to agree not to belong to labor organizations as conditions of employment be made illegal in those states where they are not already so. III. Finally, the commission recommends that employers recognize and deal with labor organizations with special reference to conciliation and arbitration; that employers everywhere endeavor to act in concert with labor; and that wages be voluntarily raised when economic conditions warrant it, and reasons be assigned for reduction when such is deemed necessary.

The literature on this subject has been enhanced by Mr. T. M. Cooley, the distinguished American jurist, in a discussion of certain points raised or suggested by the controversy.\* He emphasizes the fact that the railway companies, against which the American Railway Union admittedly had no grievances, were attacked simply because they refused to discontinue hauling the cars of a company which declined to submit to arbitration a dispute between it and its own employees. The union practically demanded that the railroad companies should violate existing contracts, which, had they attempted to do, the courts could have forbidden, and even had no contracts existed they could have compelled the railroad companies, as common carriers, to cease discriminating against the Pullman Company. The same view is taken by another writer,† who reduces the action of the boycotters, in attempting to prevent the doing of an act whose performance the law would have enforced, to a defiance of the law.

---

\* *Forum*, Vol. 18, pp. 1-19.

† *Forum*, Vol. 17, pp. 633-643, article by D. McG. Means.



The constitutionality of the action of the President in sending troops to Chicago was disputed by the Governor of Illinois, on the ground that the federal authorities could interfere to suppress domestic disorder only upon the request of the state legislature or executive. His position, however, has been declared quite untenable. The President dispatched the troops for four purposes, viz.: (1) To protect federal property, (2) to prevent obstruction of the mails, (3) to prevent interference with inter-state commerce, and (4) to maintain national law and the authority of the federal courts. Under Secs. 5,298 and 5,299 of the Revised Statutes of the United States he is not only empowered, but enjoined, to take the course he did.\*

The question of compulsory arbitration is also dealt with by Mr. Cooley. Arbitration, he holds, is essentially voluntary, and any attempt at coercion must be futile. The matters submitted to a board of arbitration are moral duties or questions of expediency. Legal duties the courts have power to enforce in the ordinary way. Since, then, duties not legal in character cannot be enforced by law, the consent to arbitration of the parties involved is indispensable; for such consent is the sole sanction of the arbitrators' decision.

The legality of the action of the courts in issuing an injunction prohibiting the leaders of the American Railway Union from inducing railroad employees to strike, and attaching them for contempt of court in disobeying it, has been seriously questioned. The writer of an article in the *American Law Review* † maintains that the application of an injunction, a purely civil process, to prevent acts criminal in their nature, which, therefore, *per se* would render the offender punishable, was a useless and unwise proceeding. For not only was a court acting in an equitable capacity called upon to punish crimes—an anomaly unknown in English law for the last five hundred years—but civil liberty was threatened, since the remedy by injunction was invoked in order that the concomitant summary power of punishment for contempt (precluding, as it does, trial by jury, review by another court, and the right to be heard through counsel) might be exercised. The writer argues that the attempts of cor-

\* *Vide* Report, p. 20, and the articles by Cooley and Means above mentioned.

† *American Law Review*, Vol. 28, "Injunction and Organized Labor."

porations in this direction are in direct contravention of article 6 of the Bill of Rights.\*

The question has been asked,† “ Shall the undivided surplus products of labor be drawn upon to sustain it in times of adversity, while the undivided surplus profits of capital remain practically intact ? ” And it is contended that, while the undivided surplus profits of capital are necessary to replace machinery and improve methods, the labor reserves (represented by savings banks deposits) are equally essential to render labor efficient by making provision against sickness, old age and other contingencies : and that, therefore, while from an ethical point of view it is unjust that in times of depression the reserves of labor should be drawn upon and often exhausted before either dividends or the reserve of capital are diminished, such a state of matters is, from an economic standpoint, inexpedient, since capital and labor are inter-dependent so far as the productiveness of their forces is concerned.

If the trend of the many suggestions‡ received by the commission investigating the Chicago difficulty, and the tenor of the many articles written since then, are indicative of public opinion, there seems to be a strong tendency towards a considerable extension of the functions of the state. It is urged by some that legislation should be enacted unquestionably establishing the public character of railway companies and their employees.§ Others go a step further, holding that when men employ many laborers, their business (no matter what) ceases to be a purely private affair, and concerns the state, to the extent that in case of trouble arbitration becomes obligatory.|| Others, again, go the whole length and advocate the nationalization of the railways and such other concerns as, by their character, are quasi-public. Legislation, at all events, seems to be proceeding more and more on lines which it is customary to term socialistic ; of which statement a reference to the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, the Act creating Boards of Arbitration of 1888, and the Pooling Bill before the American Congress last year affords sufficient confirmation.¶

\* *Vide* Bryce's "American Commonwealth" (2nd edition), Vol. 1, p. 679.

† *Forum*, Vol. 18, pp. 425-432, article by the Hon. C. D. Wright.

‡ Report, p. 48.

§ *Forum*, Vol. 18, pp. 704-713, "Steps Towards the Control of Railroads."

|| *Cosmopolitan*, Vol. 13, p. 575.

¶ For a general discussion of the subject of the tendency towards the extension of state functions, see Mr. Herbert Spencer's "The Man versus The State."

THE ANCESTRY OF THE VERTEBRATES.

BY R. S. LILLIE, '96.

[Read before the Natural Science Association.]

EVER since the general acceptance of the theory of descent, which maintains that the various groups of the animal kingdom are genetically related to one another, there has been abundance of speculation as to the exact nature of that relationship in the different cases. The problems of phylogenesis which have thus arisen are of course as numerous as are these groups themselves, and are of varying degrees of importance and interest. Among them the problem of the ancestry of the vertebrates occupies a prominent place, mainly on account of its great scientific importance as a purely biological problem, but also partly on account of its bearing on the momentous question of the ultimate origin of the human race. This latter consideration certainly has its sentimental side, but there is nevertheless little room for doubt that the great attention that has been attracted by the problem is largely due to this ever-present desire to know as much as possible about ourselves. At all events this seems to be the only possible explanation of the very prominent position which the question has assumed, for considered as a purely biological problem it is hardly of such vast importance as the amount of its literature would seem to indicate. This unique peculiarity is not the only one that distinguishes the problem. There are others which also tend to separate it in a certain sense from other questions of phylogenesis. One of these is the sharply defined and isolated character of the class *Vertebrata*. There are no obvious homologies between vertebrate animals and any members of the invertebrate series—homologies such as exist between *Arthropods* and *Annelids*, for example. In this latter case it is obvious that the ventral nerve cord of the one is directly com-

parable with that of the other, and there are many other essential resemblances which make it unquestionable that the two groups are phylogenetically closely related. But in the Vertebrates the case is very different. The three characteristic peculiarities of this group—gill-slits, notochord, and dorsal nerve cord—are both collectively and individually absent in all invertebrates; they are entirely confined to the Chordata, and are present either permanently or transitorily in all forms of this group from the lowest to the highest. Indeed, this fact is so striking, that it formerly led many biologists to provisionally abandon the problem in the hope that future generations would be in a better position to surmount this apparently insuperable difficulty.

The problem has thus its peculiarities and difficulties, but it has also its fascinations; and we find that in the early years of its existence its fascinations were altogether too much for the less cautious and more speculative biologists of the time. They attacked the problem with great enthusiasm, but in the absence of decisive facts their theories plainly could not be expected to agree. Decisive facts were rare; but this want was more than made up for by the imaginative vigor displayed by the theorists, and many very astonishing theories were evolved, which often differed as much as possible from each other, and often had little enough to say for themselves from the strictly scientific standpoint. Later on, however, there was an improvement in this respect, and theories were put forth which have a great deal of direct evidence in their favor. It is to theories of this sort that I wish to refer more particularly this afternoon, remembering Bateson's remark: "It is with phylogenies as with romances,—the most sensational are not always the best works of art."

The first zoologist to definitely put forth the view of a direct relationship between vertebrates and invertebrates was the celebrated Étienne Geoffroy St. Hilaire. Early in the beginning of this century he published his views, the principal one of which was the so-called "theory of analogues," which stated that the same parts occur in varying degrees of form and development throughout the whole animal kingdom. This theory was at first propounded with regard to the vertebrates alone; but afterwards he was struck by the thought that it might be equally

applicable to the rest of the animal kingdom, and, under the influence of this idea, he undertook the task of identifying in the insects the structural peculiarities of the vertebrates. At the very beginning he was confronted by the obvious difficulty of the ventral position of the nerve-cord in insects as opposed to its dorsal position in vertebrates. Out of this difficulty there was but one way open to him, and he did not hesitate to take it. He came to the conclusion that the distinction between dorsal and ventral surfaces was an artificial one, and devoid of all morphological meaning; and that, therefore, the popular distinction between back and belly was of no importance, but simply one of the gross conceptions of the ignorant. These expressions simply indicated the position relative to the earth assumed in locomotion, some animals assuming one position, others the reverse. Having got over this difficulty, St. Hilaire proceeded to a detailed comparison of insect and vertebrate. The chitinous rings of the insect body he compared to the vertebræ of vertebrates. Thus in the insects the viscera are enclosed within the vertebral column,—a condition which he compared to that existing in turtles and tortoises, where the carapace is fused with the vertebral column. As regards the legs of insects, being attached to the vertebral column, they were obviously comparable to the *ribs* of vertebrates. St. Hilaire had no intention to speculate concerning the ancestry of the vertebrates, his sole object being to show the possibility of a comparison such as he attempted. At that day the theory of descent, while held by a few, had little evidence in its favor, hence it was out of the question to attempt to show that vertebrates were *descendants* of invertebrates, and probably no such idea was present in St. Hilaire's mind. He merely wished to demonstrate an adherence to the same type of structure throughout the animal kingdom, and a consequent direct relationship between the structure of vertebrates and invertebrates.

The idea of a direct blood relationship between these two great groups was a necessary corollary of Darwin's evolution theory, and it is only since the publication in 1858 of his results that serious attempts have been made to discover what this relationship is. The first attempt was made in 1864 by Leydig. Curiously enough, though Leydig's point of view was entirely

different from that of St. Hilaire, yet he also attempted a comparison of vertebrates with insects, and endeavored to identify the different parts of the vertebrate brain in the brain of the bee. Both Leydig and St. Hilaire started from the *a priori* assumption that the segmentation of the invetebrates was morphologically identical with that of the vertebrates. The same assumption was made by the upholders of the Annelid theory, and in fact forms the basis of their operations. The idea seems natural enough at first sight, but it is almost certainly erroneous, as numerous facts go to show, and affords a good example of the danger of *a priori* conclusions in science.

In 1866 Kowalevsky's researches on the development of Amphioxus and the Ascidiæ threw an unexpected light on the problem of vertebrate descent, inasmuch as they brought to view the direct relationship of the Ascidiæ to Amphioxus and hence to the vertebrates. The development of the two, up to a certain point, is almost identical, and proves beyond a doubt the existence of a genetic relationship. The discovery was naturally hailed with enthusiasm, and even so great an authority as Haeckel regarded the discovery of the Chordate character of the Ascidian larva as affording a direct solution of the problem of the connecting link between vertebrates and invertebrates. As a matter of fact it removed the question one step further back, since it is clear that granting the chordate character of the Ascidian larva, the question is not removed, but resolves itself into the question of the origin of this larva.

In 1875 the foundations of the Annelid theory of vertebrate descent were laid independently by Dohrn and Semper. This theory regarded the vertebrates as descendents of a chaetopod-like form, which having taken to swimming on its back, reversed the position of its originally ventral nerve chain with regard to the earth, and in this way came to resemble the vertebrates in the position of the nervous system. The descendents of this acrobatically-inclined chaetopod have retained its position, so that the nerve cord of the vertebrates is situated near the surface farthest from the earth, *i.e.*, has a so-called dorsal position. On this supposition a comparison of Annelids with vertebrates was rendered possible.

The Annelid theory is of great importance in many ways,

more especially as being the means of bringing about a large amount of fruitful research. But as a solution of the problem of vertebrate descent its value was merely temporary, and it has long since been superseded. As mentioned above, it starts from the assumption that the segmentation of the Annelids is morphologically identical with that of the vertebrates. The discovery of the segmental origin of the excretory tubules of the shark's kidney may be said to have first led to the definite framing of the Annelid theory. As everyone knows, the excretory organs of the Annelids consist of paired segmentally-disposed tubules called nephridia, which open into the body cavity by ciliated funnels, and to the outside by segmental pores. Now it was discovered in 1875 by Semper and Balfour independently, that the shark's kidney arises as a series of segmentally-disposed tubules opening interiorly by ciliated funnels and communicating with the outside by means of a longitudinal canal which primitively arises as an invagination of the ectoderm or outer body layer. This ectodermic origin of the renal-duct indicates that the nephridia primitively opened directly to the outside just as they do in annelids; and as it seemed impossible that such an agreement should have no phylogenetic significance, the conclusion was arrived at that vertebrates were the modified descendents of a primitive annelid-like form. The difficulty of the opposed positions of the nervous system in the two cases was removed as mentioned above, by the assumption that the terms dorsal and ventral had no ultimate morphological meaning, and that the ventral surface in annelids was homologous not with the ventral, but with the *dorsal* surface of vertebrates.

This assumption necessarily gave rise to conclusions that seem strange at first sight. The mouth of the annelids is ventral; so also is that of the vertebrates. But when the ancestral annelid turned over on its back its mouth of course assumed a position which would correspond with the dorsal surface of a vertebrate. But the present vertebrate mouth is ventral. How, then, has the mouth acquired this ventral position? or is the vertebrate mouth homologous with the annelid mouth at all? This latter question Dohrn answered in the negative. According to him, the primitive annelidian mouth had disappeared, and had been replaced by a new mouth formed by the fusion in the

ventral middle line of a pair of gill-slits. As to the location of the old mouth and œsophagus, Dohrn was not quite certain. At one time he seemed inclined to consider the hypophysis as the representative of these structures; but his final conclusion was that the primitive œsophagus passed through the fossa rhomboidea of the brain and thus to the exterior. It was necessary to assume that the primitive œsophagus perforated the central nervous system just as it does in existing annelids, hence his location of this structure in the place mentioned. The brain would thus correspond to the supra-œsophageal ganglion of annelids, the sides of the medulla oblongata to the circum-œsophageal ring and the spinal cord to the ventral nerve chain. Other biologists gave other locations for the primitive œsophagus, and Beard thought that he had firmly established his theory that the hypophysis was the structure required. He brought forth in support of this hypothesis a very ingeniously arranged array of facts which appeared to him to be absolutely convincing. His paper, "The Old Mouth and the New," affords a splendid example of the way in which facts can be made to support an untenable hypothesis—for it is impossible in the light of our present knowledge to admit the possibility of such comparisons.

In considering the Annelid theory as a whole we are at once struck by the fact that it takes two things for granted: first, that the annelid segmentation is directly homologous with that of vertebrates; and, second, that the nerve cords of the two are morphologically identical. Both of these assumptions are unfounded, and not only so, but they are contradicted by a large and increasing body of facts, which more and more directly indicate that the two characters are merely analogous and independently acquired in the two cases. In connection with Bateson's views this will be more clearly seen. In the meantime it may be said that there is every reason to believe that the proximate ancestor of the vertebrates was not a highly segmented animal, and that segmentation has arisen independently within the limits of the group. Another striking characteristic of the theory is the way in which it regards the Protochordates. Obviously it was hardly possible for the Annelid theory to regard these forms as ancestral, for such a view is incompatible with



the doctrine of annelid descent. Dohrn, therefore, denied that they were primitive; in fact he regarded them as extremely degenerated descendents of the true chordata which were themselves directly descended from the annelids. As a matter of fact the protochordates and *Amphioxus* in particular, so far from being degenerate, are, in reality, very far from presenting the characters that we should expect to find were they really so. In their whole organization they give every evidence of being primitive and ancestral, and much light has been thrown by their study on many hitherto obscure points of vertebrate morphology. Dohrn's method of regarding them is unjustifiable and is nowadays held by no one. Its object was simply to save the Annelid theory, but it has failed of its purpose. The Annelid theory of vertebrate descent has already had its day, and at present it is mainly of historical interest as being the first elaborate theory advanced with regard to this problem.

The Annelid theory as propounded more especially by Dohrn seemed plausible, and attracted a large number of adherents. However, it was far from gaining universal acceptance. The explanation of the difference in position of the central nervous systems by the assumption of a phylogenetic reversal of dorsal and ventral surfaces had an unsatisfactory sound about it; and this feeling led to the formation of another theory which aimed at an explanation of this difference in position without requiring any such assumption. It was held that the nervous systems of both annelids and vertebrates were formed in the same way by a fusion of two primitive lateral nerve cords such as are present in the lower worms, *Turbellaria*, nemertines, etc. The difference in position, however, was due to the circumstance that in the primitive annelids the fusion had occurred ventrally, while in the primitive vertebrates it had occurred dorsally. Thus both annelids and vertebrates were divergent descendents of a primitive worm-like form with two lateral nerve cords corresponding to those of *Turbellaria* and *Nemertines*. This theory seemed more satisfactory than the other and was supported more especially by Balfour and Hubrecht, the latter of whom showed that in certain nemertines the two lateral chords actually did approach one another dorsally. It seemed clear that the vertebrate nervous system was formed by the conjunction of two originally

separate cords. The bilateral character of the adult nerve cord confirmed this view, and although in most cases it arose in the embryo as an *unpaired* median thickening of the ectoderm, still this rule was not without its exceptions, *e.g.*, the amphibian embryo, in which, from the beginning, the cord is distinctly bilateral in structure.

While these and other speculations were occupying the attention of some biologists, work on the various protochordate forms was rapidly proceeding, and with the increase in the knowledge of these forms came the conviction that they were of great phylogenetic importance with reference to the problem of vertebrate descent. The work of Bateson on the remarkable worm-like form, *Balanoglossus*, is of interest in this connection. Bateson showed not only that *Balanoglossus* was very different from the typical worms, but also that its organization presented resemblances to that of *Amphioxus*, which were only explainable on the supposition that the two had descended from a common ancestor. *Balanoglossus* in fact possesses the three characteristic vertebrate peculiarities, an endodermic notochord, an ectodermic dorsal nerve cord and gill-slits, which latter are almost identical in structure with those of *Amphioxus*. *Balanoglossus* is practically unsegmented, however, and Bateson saw that the first thing to be done was to explain the morphological meaning of segmentation, and to show that the presence of segmentation in the vertebrates is by no means incompatible with the view that their ancestor was unsegmented. He regards the segmentation of the vertebrates as the final result of a gradual summation of repetitions of certain organs in the long axis. It is thus by no means a unique condition which might unite forms otherwise so different as vertebrates and annelids; but is rather the ultimate result of a tendency which exists in a varying degree in almost all animals. He shows by many examples that a repetition of organs approaching metamery may arise within the limits of a comparatively small group. He gives no explanation for this tendency to repetition, but his evidence leaves little doubt of its existence; and one can readily see how through the influence of selection a regular metameric repetition of parts might have been evolved in the manner indicated.

Bateson thus shows that there is no *a priori* reason why the

vertebrates should not be descendants of unsegmented ancestors. Not only so, but there is considerable direct evidence in favor of the view that they *are* so derived. It is well known that certain organs such as the nervous system, axial skeleton, mesoblast, and excretory ducts arise in development as unsegmented structures, and that it is only afterwards that segmentation sets in. The question is whether the notochord, etc., were associated in a highly segmented or a non-segmented ancestor. If the ancestor were highly segmented as the Annelid theory maintains, we should expect such organs as the dorsal nerve cord and the notochord to exhibit marked segmentation from their first appearance, since the dorsal part of the body is always markedly segmented in such forms. Instead of this we find both these structures arising without a trace of segmentation, which in the case of the spinal cord only later makes its appearance in connection with the nerves, and in the case of the notochord is always characteristically absent. The presence throughout the vertebrates of essentially unsegmented structures, such as the liver, is an additional confirmation of the view that the ancestral form was unsegmented.

Thus all objections are removed to considering *Balanoglossus* as a primitive member of the group Chordata. *Balanoglossus* is undoubtedly a much modified off-shoot from the original line of descent of the vertebrates, and is in no way to be regarded as bearing a close resemblance to the ancestral form. There are, however, strong reasons for believing that it has inherited from the true ancestors structural features of great significance. For example, the nervous system is of the utmost morphological interest. It resembles that of nemertines in presenting a nervous network at the base of the skin all over the body, and in the presence of a dorsal longitudinal nerve cord. It differs, however, in presenting a single ventral cord in place of the two lateral cords of the nemertines. The dorsal nerve cord arises as a longitudinal delamination of a solid cord of ectoderm, which by the invagination of its two ends becomes extended as a tube in both directions. The formation by delamination and the secondary incomplete invagination Bateson regards as of primitive significance, and in confirmation of this view points to the condition in *Amphioxus*, where also the invagination

occurs subsequently to the separation from the external ectoderm. We may suppose that in higher vertebrates there is an abbreviated development, the invagination occurring simultaneously with the separation from the external ectoderm. In *Balanoglossus* the longitudinal nerve cord is not completely isolated from the integument, but is connected, with it by several median nerve cords, which Bateson regards as the representatives of the dorsal nerve roots of vertebrates. The muscles are innervated by irregular roots, which necessarily arise from the inner (ventral) surface of the cord. The separation of the nerve cord from the skin and its subsequent invagination would leave these relations undisturbed, and the dorsal roots would be sensory, being connected with the external integument; and the ventral motor being connected with the internally situated muscles. This condition we find in all the higher vertebrates. Typically, however, the two roots shortly after leaving the cord become connected to form a common nerve trunk; but this connection is plainly shown to be secondary by the fact that in the most primitive cyclostome fishes and *Amphioxus* the two roots remain separate throughout life. The importance of the nervous system of *Balanoglossus* is thus obvious. From the conditions existing in *Balanoglossus* and the nemertines the conclusion has been arrived at that the dorsal nerve cord arose primitively as a dorsal longitudinal thickening of a sub-epidermic nerve plexus which was originally continuous all over the surface of the body. The enlargement and specialization of this structure have given rise to the vertebrate central nervous system. This view has been strongly supported by Hubrecht, and is in all probability a close approach to the truth.

Bateson's remarks on the notochord and gill-slits are equally worthy of attention. He suggests that the notochord probably arose primitively in the middle third of the body as a fulcrum in swimming, and that it subsequently extended in both directions in the primitive vertebrates to form the skeletal axis. As to the gill-slits, although he does not attempt a complete explanation of their origin, still he opposes the idea that they were formed by the modification and change of function of preceding organs such as nephridia, and strongly upholds the view that they were developed as structures *per se*. His conclu-

sions as to the characters of the primitive chordata may be interesting. He points out that the presence of gill-slits in all vertebrates shows that they arose in an aquatic habitat, while the notochord shows that they were free-living, and other facts indicate that the ectoderm was ciliated; but he is undecided as to whether they were pelagic in habit, or bottom-feeders and mud-burrowers like *Balanoglossus*. At present, indications point in the direction of a pelagic ancestor; and this view has recently been strongly upheld by W. K. Brooks.

Brooks has been led by various well-founded considerations to the conclusion that the earliest metazoa were pelagic in habit and were represented by floating or swimming animals of minute size and simple structure, traces of these being seen at the present time in such larvæ as *Tornaria*, *Planula*, *Nauplius*, and the ciliated larvæ of mollusks, annelids, and echinoderms. Accordingly the ultimate ancestors of all the forms of the animal kingdom are to be found in this primitive pelagic fauna. Now when a pelagic larva is still represented by a pelagic adult of minute size and simple structure, it seems very probable that the latter is a purely pelagic production, and as such was represented in the primitive pelagic fauna. If this is granted we have a striking exemplification of this principle in the case of the ascidian larva and the free-swimming pelagic *Appendicularia*. *Appendicularia* bears a marked resemblance to the ascidian larva, which in its turn shows many signs of close relationship to *Amphioxus*. It thus appears that the proximate ancestor of the tunicates and *Amphioxus*, as well as *Appendicularia*, was very probably an *Appendicularia*-like form from which both *Amphioxus* and the ascidians have inherited their chordate peculiarities. As to the characters of this primitive form it is possible to draw conclusions that may be of value, and this Brooks proceeds to do. According to him the ancestor of *Appendicularia* and the Chordata was a simple, minute, unsegmented animal leading a free life and living on the micro-organisms of the ocean. Its body was stiffened by a notochord, and it possessed a simple elongated dorsal nervous system and an elongated ventral digestive tube without pharyngeal clefts. This tube was nearly straight and possessed a capacious lumen, lined as in *Amphioxus* and tunicates with ciliated cells, whose function it was to sweep

the water with its contained micro-organisms through the intestine, the walls of which were also furnished with slime cells for the capture of these organisms. The anterior slime cells on account of their greater efficiency became specialized and were localized in the pharyngeal region, which, in consequence, became enlarged and set off as a special part of the gut. Probably at an early stage a blind pouch was formed just behind the pharynx in order to catch food-particles and retain them for digestion. In this way the rudiment of the liver was formed, an organ universally present in vertebrates and one which actually arises, as is well known, in the form of a ventral diverticulum of the intestine.

Now it is plain that in this hypothetical early form the water containing the food material had to pass throughout the whole length of the intestine, a great quantity of food material being thus swept away and lost. In such a state of affairs an advantage would arise if by any possibility the water could be got rid of in a more direct way without the loss of food-particles. This result was attained by the formation of a secondary opening in the pharynx, which allowed the escape of the surplus water ; and in this way the first rudiment of a gill-slit was formed. The laws of growth would cause a duplication of this structure whose efficiency would of course be increased by natural selection. The gill-slits are thus very archaic structures, whose primitive function was, as we have just seen, in no way connected with respiration. The respiratory function possessed by these clefts in higher vertebrates is undoubtedly a secondary adaptation, connected with the greater size and higher degree of organization of these animals. In the primitive chordate animal the formation of these openings brought about a re-arrangement of the pharyngeal slime-cells in such a way as to effect the capture of the food particles before the openings were reached. The rudiment of the endostyle was thus formed, another archaic structure which is present in a modified condition in all vertebrates from Cyclostomes to Man, in the shape of that formerly enigmatical structure, the thyroid gland.

The conclusions which have been reached as a result of the recent great increase in our knowledge of the protochordates are in accord with the results obtained by Hubrecht, Bateson, and

Brooks, in that they are strongly in favor of the view that the segmentation of the Chordata is an independent acquisition, and constitutes a character that has arisen entirely within the limits of the group. This view may now be taken as established, and it practically removes all claims to validity that the Annelid theory once possessed. The annelids are now considered to be extremely distant relatives of the vertebrates, and specialized along an altogether different line; so that the resemblances between the two groups are principally accidental, and the result, not of genetic affinity, but rather of the independent occurrence of similar variations in the ancestors of both groups. With the overthrow of the Annelid theory all objections are removed to regarding the Protochordates as primitive forms, whose simplicity of organization is not the result of degeneration, but a direct consequence of their comparatively close relationship to the ancestral forms of vertebrates. This mode of regarding *Amphioxus* and related forms is so obviously the correct one that it seems utterly absurd to entertain the view of their extreme degeneration,—a hypothesis the existence of which was due simply to a desire to save the Annelid theory, combined with an imperfect knowledge of the morphology of the group. Now we have changed all that, and the light which *Amphioxus* in particular has thrown on vertebrate morphology is such as to leave no doubt of its extreme importance as an ancestral type. In *Amphioxus* many systems of organs, such as the nervous, alimentary, excretory, and circulatory systems more especially, are found in the adult stage in a condition essentially similar to that which exists only transitorily in the embryos of the higher vertebrates. It is impossible here to discuss these resemblances in detail, but their immense importance is obvious.

Concerning the characters of the primitive chordate animal, it may be said that it was in all probability a pelagic form, resembling in most essential points the larva of the ascidians. The dorsal nervous system was a tube connected at both ends with the alimentary canal. The mouth, as in the ascidian tadpole, was situated dorsally. Into the base of the buccal cavity opened the anterior neuropore, in connection with which was a sense organ of an olfactory nature, a structure which persists in a vestigial form in higher vertebrates as the hypophysis cerebri.

The posterior communication of the dorsal nerve-tube with the intestine, or so-called neurenteric canal, is also represented in nearly all vertebrates at an early embryonic stage. The reason of the present ventral position of the vertebrate mouth is not so difficult to find as might be supposed at first sight, and is to be sought for in the high development of the vertebrate brain. So long as the anterior end of the nervous system remained simple and undifferentiated the mouth retained its primitive dorsal position. The gradual increase in size and forward growth of the anterior differentiated extremity of the nervous system has however caused the mouth to forsake its primitive dorsal position, and gradually become pushed forwards as it were, until finally in consequence of the bending of the brain over the anterior end of the notochord (cranial flexure), it was caused to assume its present entirely ventral position. The primitive buccal sense-organ or hypophysis still remains in connection with the mouth, though in a greatly reduced condition.

Regarding the ultimate or primordial origin of the vertebrates comparatively little can be said. The remarkable *Balanoglossus* larva, *Tornaria*, bears a most striking resemblance to the echinoderm larva, *Auricularia*, so much so that it seems impossible to account for this fact otherwise than by assuming that the two are genetically related. The most primitive echinoderm larva, that of *Antedon*, possesses an apical plate and a series of regular ciliated rings, in which characters it shows close relations with the trochophore larva of annelids and mollusks. *Tornaria* also possesses ciliated rings and an apical plate, but the occurrence of the latter structure is merely transitory and it completely disappears in the course of development. This apical plate is a very characteristic feature of the larvæ of aquatic invertebrates. Its occurrence in *Tornaria* is a feature of great interest and shows that there was a relationship between the primitive Chordata and the ancestors of the important invertebrate groups. It is now a very generally accepted belief that the radiate symmetry of the echinoderms was originally an adaptation to a sessile mode of life. The original ancestors of the echinoderms were thus in all probability bilateral; and on these grounds we can understand how an affinity should exist between such widely different forms as *Balanoglossus* and the Echinoderms. *Balanoglossus* is undoubtedly an



*The Ancestry of the Vertebrates.*

off-shoot from the original line of descent of the vertebrates, hence the justification of the view expressed by Willey that the "ultimate ancestor of the vertebrates would be a worm-like animal whose organization was approximately on a level with that of the bilateral ancestors of the echinoderms."

I have given a very short and incomplete account of some of the speculation on the subject of vertebrate descent, and have been obliged to omit many important matters of fact bearing upon it. It is however evident from what has been said that attempts at reconstructing phylogenies, though doubtless very fascinating, are almost always more or less uncertain. At present the difficulties in the way of satisfactory solutions of the problems of phylogenesis are better appreciated than they were ten years ago, and in consequence many biologists are devoting less attention to questions of this sort and more to more promising and fruitful lines of study. That the relations of the various groups of the animal kingdom will in the future be much more thoroughly understood there is no reason to doubt; but at present it seems somewhat premature to construct detailed phylogenies in the absence of decisive and unequivocal facts. However the future holds forth great possibilities, and we have reason to hope that a well founded phylogenetic classification of the whole animal kingdom will one day be framed. This would certainly be a most remarkable intellectual achievement; but in face of the scientific progress of the last fifty years it would be rash to pronounce it impossible. Perhaps some of the members of the Society may live to see the fulfilment of this prophecy.

## THE RELATION OF PHILOSOPHY TO RELIGION.

BY A. M'VICAR, '96.

[Read before the Philosophical Society.]

IN "Comus," Milton writes:—

“How charming is divine philosophy!  
 Not harsh and crabbed as dull fools suppose,  
 But musical as is Apollo's lute,  
 And a perpetual feast of nectared sweets,  
 Where no crude surfeit reigns.”

In one of his Epistles the apostle John says: “God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all.” Christ, in prayer, shortly before His crucifixion, utters these words: “This is life eternal that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent.” James, the practical apostle, in his Epistle gives this definition: “Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this: to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.”

The manifest implication in the above quotations viewed collectively is that there is an intimate connection between being, knowing, doing, and enjoying. With reference to a part of what is comprehended in these terms, it is my task to examine the validity of this implication, and, if it be found to be correct, to show in what way and to what extent this connection exists. In undertaking this work, I feel like one starting out, in the uncertain light of the early dawn, on a path beset with dangers and obstructed by many obstacles. Cold avalanches of criticism may overwhelm me from the heights to the right on which Philosophy has his abode. And, to put it mildly, the beautiful maid who rules the region to the left may with angry glances repel me as a matchmaker bent on wedding her to an oft-rejected but persistent wooer for whom she has no affection, and with whom she anticipates nought but incompatibility of temperament with

all its dire consequences. The path, moreover, is throughout uneven and upgrade.

Looking about us in the present, and turning to look behind us over the field of history which, with its indistinct boundaries and its diversified surface, stretches away into the dim distance, we see these two forces of philosophy and religion in some places apparently in the closest harmony; in others in friendly rivalry, both bent on the accomplishment of good; in others in bitter conflict; and in others apparently in complete separation. The further we look the more we are inclined, if restricted to the empirical method of determining the true relation of philosophy to religion, to abandon the task with, *mutatis mutandis*, the plaintive wail of Clough:—

“ To spend uncounted years of pain,  
Again, again, and yet again,  
In working out, in heart and brain,  
The problem of our being here;  
To gather facts from far and near,  
Upon the mind to hold them clear,  
And, knowing more may yet appear,  
Unto one's latest breath to fear,  
The premature result to draw—  
Is this the object, end, and law,  
And purpose of our being here? ”

But if it be true, as the demands of the intellect and the heart, the results of science in the broadest sense of the term, and the teaching of religion in its purest form, seem to indicate, that the universe is organic, then it may be possible to go beyond the mere historical forms, and grasp the idea from which the relations between the parts necessarily follow. Without being more explicit in regard to this idea for the present, I may say here that it is with reference to it, as well as to their own inner consistency, that the various views will be examined.

It is historically correct to say that all possible views on this question have been held. These may be comprehended under four headings, as follows:—

I. There is absolutely no relation whatever between philosophy and religion.

II. They are in necessary and everlasting opposition.

III. They are partly in opposition, partly in agreement.

IV. They are in complete agreement.

I. If we could decide as to which is the correct view by the easy method of counting heads, the verdict would soon be given in favor of the one mentioned first. Among those whose votes would go in favor of this view are the majority of that vast number who have reflected but little on the problem, as well as many of those who have reflected more or less, but have by self-erected barriers restricted themselves to a portion of one or the other of the two spheres. As the unsophisticated ones of this class would likely, owing to their dogmatic disposition, arrive at the same conclusions upon reflection as those of the class last mentioned, it will be sufficient to examine the arguments of the latter.\* By these the separateness of philosophy and religion has been affirmed on three distinct grounds: 1. Religious truth is altogether beyond the scope of human intelligence; 2. Religious truth is attainable only by intuitive and not by rational insight; 3. Religious truth forms the content of a fixed supernatural revelation.

1. The first objection stated more fully is that human knowledge, being essentially relative and finite, can never attain to the cognizance of that which is infinite and absolute; that the business of philosophy is merely the systematization of the various natural sciences; that the dark, impenetrable background beyond experience is the province of religion; and that our altars should be erected neither to the known nor the unknown God, but to the Unknowable. These doctrines will be readily recognized as the ones that Mr. Herbert Spencer is noted for holding, and to a great extent responsible for disseminating.

As regards the relation between knowing and being, these statements are self-contradictory. We cannot deny all consciousness of the Absolute in order to maintain that human knowledge is limited, and in the same breath assert a consciousness of the Absolute in order to justify our cognizance of that limitation. It is not possible for one and the same consciousness to be purely relative and conscious of its relativity. In

---

\*For much of the remainder of this topic, and for portions of the rest of the paper, I desire to express my obligations to Principal Caird.

setting up the unknowable as an object of worship, Spencer again contradicts his own principles, invites us to perform an impossibility, and approaches very closely to the Fetishism from which he derives the worship of the one God through Polytheism in its various forms. These contradictions are all due to the fact that the statements are based on a false theory of knowledge—namely, the sensational theory. Because of its exclusion of the synthetic activity of thought, this theory cannot account even for the knowledge either of the world or of the self. But a knowledge of these must be possible if there is to be science of any kind. When it is seen what is involved in knowledge, it will be admitted that the presupposition and the final goal of thought is that which comprehends all finite things and thoughts, only because it is itself the unity of thought and being. In the words of Browning:—

“To know  
Rather consists in opening out a way  
Whence the imprisoned splendor may escape,  
Than in effecting entry for a light  
Supposed to be without.”

2. The second class of those who affirm the separateness of philosophy and religion think that by so doing they escape the arguments of materialists, sensationalists, and agnostics. They hold, as has been said, that religious truth is attained only by intuition, and not by rational insight. They sacrifice too much in handing reason over to their opponents, in order to escape its criticisms. Are subjective notions and impressions the ultimate arbiters in religious truth? These will be found to vary greatly, owing to influences of temperament, tradition, and association; and hence contradictories will be true. The same objection may be made against the phase of this theory which makes the principles intuitive rather than the particular judgments. The theory is right in so far as it is held that there is something universal in all men, divine in its origin. This is reason, not of individuals out of all relation with each other and with the universe, but of these in so far as they partake of reason in its universal and absolute nature.

3. The third class claim that the ideas of revelation and science, meaning humanly acquired knowledge, are mutually

exclusive. Religion presupposes revelation, but any conception of revelation that excludes the activity of human reason in the province of religion is untenable. The scholastics, finding that the dictates of reason and the dogmas of what they regarded as revelation were in some cases contradictory, took the view that contradictories might both be true: one in the sphere of reason, the other in that of faith. But it should be remembered that the human spirit is not a thing divided against itself, so that faith and reason can subsist side by side in the same mind, each asserting as absolute principles those which are contradicted by the other. Further, it will surely be admitted that reason must be competent to judge, if not of the content, at least of the credentials of revelation. But an authority proving by reason its right to teach irrationality is an impossible conception. To escape this argument it has been held that the content of revelation is not contrary to human reason, but above it. Though it is possible to distinguish human and divine, it is not possible to make the complete separation that this position involves. Reason, on this view, is divided into a higher and a lower quantitatively, while leaving it throughout qualitatively the same. Where is the line to be drawn between the finite and the Infinite? Each age would probably have drawn it at the degree of advancement human reason had made at that time. If the present age should do the same, it would be tantamount to saying that all unsolved religious problems are insoluble; that what has up to the present baffled human reason can never yield to persistent inquiry; that religious knowledge, unlike other knowledge, is unprogressive. The revelation of what is, and always must remain, a mystery is self-contradictory. If what has been said so far be correct, Agnosticism, Intuitionism, and Dogmatism—all, with reference to the relation of philosophy and religion, arrive by different roads at the same goal, and all alike are essentially wrong.

II. The second possible view of the relation of philosophy and religion is that they are necessarily in opposition. The Deists of former days, with their belated survivors of the present, claim that human reason alone is sufficient. On the other hand, there are people who maintain that religion is sufficient; that it has a right to the whole field, and will dispel all doubts and diffi-

culties of the intelligence, whereas philosophy necessarily destroys men.

The Deistic principles are so tersely put and so pointedly criticised by Falckenberg that I shall use his words: "Deism seeks to free religion from Church dogma and blind historical faith, and to deduce it from natural knowledge. In so far as Deism finds both the source and the test of true religion in reason, it is rationalism; in so far as it appeals from the supernatural light of revelation and inspiration to the natural light of reason, it is naturalism; in so far as revelation and its records are not only not allowed to restrict rational criticism, but are the chief objects of criticism, its adherents are freethinkers. The general principles of Deism may be compressed into a few theses. There is a natural religion whose essential content is morality; this comprises not much more than the two maxims: Believe in God, and do your duty. Positive religions are to be judged by this standard. The elements in them which are added to natural religion, or conflict with it, are superfluous and harmful additions, arbitrary decrees of men, the work of cunning rulers and deceitful priests."

In criticizing these principles he says: "The real flaw in the Deistical theory, which was scarcely felt as such, even by its opponents, was its lack of religious feeling and all historical sense, a lack which rendered the idea acceptable that religions could be 'made,' and priestly falsehoods become world-moving forces. Hume was the first to seek to rise above this unspeakable shallowness. There was a remarkable conflict between the ascription to man, on the one hand, of an assured treasure of religious knowledge in the reason, and the abandonment of him, on the other, to the juggling of cunning priests and despots." Religion cannot be explained by being explained away.

At the other extreme we find men who espouse the cause of religion and regard philosophy not only as useless, but as dangerous and without any good excuse for existence. They sometimes insinuate, sometimes impatiently assert, that it is a lack of spiritual regeneration that gives rise to intellectual and moral difficulties, and claim that the truths of religion are only to be known by those who have through faith entered the kingdom of

grace. They know several who as truthful, active Christians began to study philosophy and having become entangled in this Satanic net have lost their faith and their zeal, and who if not the bitter opponents of religion are at least indifferent to its claims.

The element of truth in these objections will be considered later. Here it may be pointed out that this position is generally taken by those who retreat from a conflict on the field of reason. If the claim regarding the effect of faith be correct, many who think themselves Christians, with as much right, perhaps, as the defenders of this view, are woefully deluded, for they have not found a solution for all intellectual and moral difficulties in some instantaneous and mysterious way. It is on a par with saying that day causes night, to say that philosophy causes spiritual degeneracy, merely because the latter succeeds the study of the former. The adherents of this view are often mistaken with reference to this degeneracy, regarding, as they do, the abandonment of certain unessentials prompted by lack of thought or of good taste as a fall from grace. Sometimes nothing is abandoned, but the babbling brook is thought to be lost because it has become a quiet river, or because its current has been diverted into another channel.

III. More light will be thrown upon these points in the consideration of the third heading—viz., that religion and philosophy are partly in harmony, partly in conflict. Some of the more conservative leaders in the church have made up their minds that philosophy of some kind will always exist, and hence that it is a necessary evil. Without admitting it into the bounds of religion, certain forms may render indirect aid to religion by being used to ward off the attack of others, and possibly in destroying them. For instance, Hegelianism may for a time be of service to religion by combating and extirpating Spencerianism. When this task is done, it will be necessary to find another philosophy to be pitted against Hegelianism. Others go further and admit philosophy as a subordinate ally of religion. The doctrines of religion are held to be absolutely unquestionable; the work of the philosopher is to show that they are in accordance with reason. This was the opinion so common in the Scholastic period. It is still, to some extent, extant. Those who serve



religion in this way must be kept carefully within bounds, and it is better if philosophy be kept from the populace altogether, the work of philosophy being chiefly, if not entirely, the silencing of the objector. These stanzas, from Tennyson's "In Memoriam," give poetic expression to this thought:—

“ O thou that after toil and storm  
Mayest seem to have reached a purer air,  
Whose faith has centre everywhere,  
Nor cares to fix itself to form.

Leave thou thy sister when she prays,  
Her early Heaven, her happy views ;  
Nor thou with shadowed hint confuse  
A life that leads melodious days.”

In dealing with these contentions, it may be readily allowed that from a practical standpoint at least they have considerable force. The claim that he is not qualified to deal with the problem who has not an experimental knowledge of religion is valid. It is a mistake to hold that philosophy can make a man pious. There must be approval of, and voluntary identification with, the true and the good if there is to be piety. But there is a distinction which has been overlooked—namely, that philosophy is not identical with the study of philosophy. It is to the *study* of philosophy, not to philosophy, that the evil consequences mentioned are to be attributed. Some who are thrust into the water or who go in, without due care, for the purpose of learning to swim are drowned. Yet others learn to swim, and even become able to navigate the ocean. So some, owing to the wrong way in which they enter philosophy, bring ruin upon themselves. But those who enter it aright find themselves at home in this ocean of truth which embraces the continents of religion, sends upon them the showers which render them fruitful and beautiful, and connects all into a unity, everyone of whose parts contributes to the advantage of all the others. It is conceivable that the intellectual and moral elements of one's environment may be such from youth up that many of the struggles reason has now to pass through may be obviated. The skill and the example of instructors may reduce many of the dangers to a minimum, if not entirely remove them.

IV. Let us now pass to the fourth thesis, which is that philosophy and religion are in agreement. By this it is not meant that one is swallowed up by the other, and lost in it, nor that the two are absolutely separable. They are distinct, co-ordinate, and complementary. From one point of view, a complete philosophy must comprehend and explain religion. From another, he who has religion has solved the riddle of life, has become the possessor of wisdom whose price is above rubies. Philosophy has been defined by one of some repute as "a search for unity, the effort of thought to gain a point of view from which the contrast variously expressed by the terms the One and the Many, the Universal and the Individual, the Infinite and the Finite, God and the World, shall be reconciled and harmonized." Religion has been defined as "the return of the finite consciousness into union with the Infinite, the reconciliation of the human spirit with the Divine." Granting the correctness of these definitions, the philosophy of religion is not the thoughts or reasonings of a finite observer as to the being and nature of God and our relations to Him, but simply a conscious development of the process which is given implicitly in religion, and in religious feelings and acts—the process, viz., by which the finite spirit loses or abnegates its finitude and self-sufficiency, and finds its truer self in the life and being of God.

Some may regard this "conscious development of the process" as superfluous, but that it serves a good purpose may readily be shown. It is of advantage in defending religion from the attacks made upon it from without, in helping one to select the best from the many forms in which religion exists in the world, and in rendering one a fit agent for the imparting of religion to others.

The belief in one God receives collateral support from the act that all constructive philosophic work points towards monotheism. Instances of this are Plato's supreme idea, the Good; Spinoza's *Unica Substantia*; the natural scientists' postulate of the uniformity of nature, besides many others where the conviction has been explicitly stated. Philosophy also supports religion by refuting the charges with which materialistic evolutionists attempt to discredit it by deriving it from certain phenomena of savage life produced by some of the lower emotions.

As Caird points out, these have no more bearing on the origin of religion than they have on the origin of science or philosophy or art.

The selecting of one from the many forms of religion is of more than trifling importance. Commonly, tradition or social connections determine the choice. The mental discipline furnished by a course in philosophy, along with the truth supplied by it with reference to the fundamental idea of religion and the requirements for the realization of this idea, enable one to make the choice on more rational grounds. The tendency of this will be to eliminate error from these various forms, thus making them the same in doctrine while differing, if it all, only in organization and methods of work. That much that is undesirable will give place for what is better, that much waste energy will be diverted into its proper channels, and that much latent energy will be brought into action by the actualization of this tendency scarcely requires mentioning.

Finally, philosophy may be made an aid in the imparting of religion. Sincerity and fervor are prime requisites, but these alone are in many cases insufficient. To remove the sophistical structures in which many, particularly men of one-sided education, take refuge from the claims of religion, a philosophy is needed which can demolish these shelters by removing their foundations of sand. Many heathen religions—for instance, Brahmanism—are entrenched in subtle philosophies, and can be replaced by the pure and the true religion only when the false philosophy is routed by the more correct. But the work of philosophy is more than negative here. By clearing up one's ideas as to what man and what religion are, it enables one to so present the truth that it will reach the divine germ in the human heart with vivifying power. And *pari passu* will the problems now pressing upon the human race approach their solution.

GOETHE'S LOVE AFFAIRS, IN SO FAR AS THEY ARE  
DEPICTED IN HIS WORKS.

BY JESSIE ORR WHITE, '96.

[Read before the Modern Language Club.]

IN one of the contemporary and leading English journals of the present day there is an interesting and spirited discussion concerning the opinions of the British public on middle-aged love. The point to be settled is whether men and women of forty-five or fifty are as susceptible to the tender passion as when they were half that age. The flat contradictions with which the letters on this delicate topic abound show for one thing the infinite variety of human temperament and experiences. A middle-aged lady, who declares that when a middle-aged man marries there is no sentiment at all, love never enters his head, is answered by "Twice a Husband," who testifies that on marrying at forty-five he finds the old romance repeated, and a writer, whose letter in large type announces, authoritatively, that the abstract notion of eternal and unalterable love has never been entertained by any practical physiologist, and as men at fifty can neither run, jump, ride, nor row as when they were twenty, so neither can they love ardently, absorbingly, and immoderately. On the other hand, a matter-of-fact woman says, as the result of a wide acquaintance with men, "that though young men may be, and sometimes are, ardent lovers, yet, for fever heat, for absolute insanity as regards the object, give me a hard-headed, capable man of 50 or thereabouts." It is rather difficult to say just what attitude Goethe would have assumed towards such a discussion, but from the fact that we have glowing descriptions of love before he had yet reached a score of years, and that as the years go on these love affairs swayed his whole life, until even verging upon four-score years, we see him falling passionately in love with a beautiful

maiden—a love which brought back once more the exaltation of the Werther period, we incline to the opinion that he would have argued strongly on the affirmative side of the question.

“ Still with their love fires tipt his keenest darts,  
As once they drew into two burning rings  
All beams of love, melting the tender hearts  
Of maidens and of queens.”

More fascinating and more charming could these tales of love scarcely be, as we hear Goethe, after searching in the golden mines of thought and memory to lift the hidden ore—to gather the glimpses of his early affections and repeat each little sound and sight—the dull pain, the pleasures of one affection scarcely past, than he seeks again to plunge into the wondrous track of dreams.

“ But no two dreams are like,  
As when a soul laments, which hath been blest,  
Desiring what is mingled with past years  
In yearnings which can never be expressed  
By sighs or groans or tears.”

From the naive, gentle, and simply rustic Frederica, the domestic, unsullied and trusting Charlotte, the charming coquette, Lili Schonemann; the intellectual, gifted Frau von Stein, and Christiane, who seems to have brought into his life a home-like and peaceful contentment, we gain the pictures of real life—the persons who really lived, and thought, and loved, and lost—from which Goethe drew his great drama and kaleidoscope of love—those beautiful, though often fleeting silhouettes, which culminate and finally all blend into his life-pictured thought,

“ The woman-soul leadeth us  
Upward and on.”

We are not now writing to justify or condemn, but to give a brief sketch in order to show the influence of his love in his works. Though, indeed, were we to answer the question as to whether Frederica, Charlotte, Lili Schonemann, and Frau von Stein were but the rude stone in which sleeps the statue, or whether they breathed, and suffered, and felt the chisel and polish of the artist, we must believe with Grumer that nothing would

convince an incredulous age of sincerity of love and a broken heart but a suicide. Then would they say, "He must have loved."

Goethe speaks of many women of whom we hear little. Gretchen, the sister of one of his nefarious companions in Strassburg; Annette, of whom he writes in "Die Lanne des Verliebten;" Käthen, whom he torments jealously and capriciously, the daughters of the dancing-master, and many others. These, however, being overshadowed by stronger lights, and having but a supplementary interest, we will pass over. Let us briefly sketch the romance with Frederica, with Charlotte, with Lili, and with Frau von Stein.

First, Frederica.—Our hero is Wolfgang von Goethe, a young man of some twenty-five years of age and in the midst of his college career, buoyant in spirit, susceptible to maidenly beauty and charm, with a strong poetic tendency which imbued him with idyllic visions of the happiness of life and innocence and love. The time is spring, "when a young man's fancy lightly turns to thoughts of love." The place is a little German parsonage at the end of a blossoming lane, surrounded by fruitful country and budding trees and fragrant flowers; misty mountains away in the distance, and the Rhine flowing near. The parson with his apologetic tone, the younger sister, and the charmingly hospitable mother are there, but now comes our *heroine*—a veritable Maud Müller. She appears, and we involuntarily think—

" Maud Müller on a summer's day,  
Raked the meadow sweet with hay.  
Beneath her torn hat glowed the wealth  
Of simple beauty and rustic health.  
Singing, she wrought, and her merry glee  
The mock-bird echoed from his tree."

And all too soon was to be completed the next scene in our picture—a handsome youth, a simple, rustic maiden.

" The sweet song died, and a vague unrest  
And a nameless longing filled her breast,—  
A wish, that she hardly dared to own,  
For something better than she had known."

There she stands, merry blue eyes, tall and graceful, fresh rosy cheeks, a short white skirt, dainty little feet beneath, a white surplice, and a black taffeta apron—and she simply warbled in the twilight Swiss and Alsatian peasant songs. It was moonlight, too, that first night. The story may be completed. Charming, attractive and talented as was Goethe, he became a welcome, and an oft-expected guest. The confidence grew not only in the family, but in the two mutually attracted hearts. The end of all must come. A consciousness in our hero of a love existing only in imagination, a confession, oft repeated, of love from Frederica; a visit to the rich home of a friend where the rustic simplicity of the maidens is not in harmony—a disillusion for our hero, and the melody dies away. As he rides away from the door of the parsonage for the last time, it was autumn, and the leaves were falling, and the merry blue eyes of the maiden were dimmed with tears.

Such is our first tale of love, and as we read it, and as we know that the friendship lasted into later years as they again meet, we would fain believe but too sincerely in Goethe's lines,—

“ Wir wollen kleine Kränzchen winden  
Wir wollen kleine Sträuszen binden  
Wir wollen kleine Kinder sein.”

Many are the idyls in prose and poetry which we have in remembrance of this love. We can hardly decipher how many of those secret charms which we meet in Lotte, Mignon, Gretchen, and Ottilie find their source in Frederica and her spiritual inspiration. Goethe says himself: “As often as I go into my secret thoughts and there list to the tones of the great harp which vibrates, the passionate and the stormy, the tender and the peaceful, vibrating in emulation, out of which the saddest and the sweetest, the most present and the more charming feelings rush through the soul, then a voice whispers softly, ‘*Das war Friederike.*’” In his *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, he has depicted in a simple and most charmingly natural way his love for Frederica. Every line of this idyl of life is a revelation of his love; noble and pure, and yet nobler and purer when he fancied he saw “unsullied and spotless in the twilight dusk the soul of Frederica.” Just nine years before his death he writes “Wiederholte

Spiegelungen." "Time but nourished and, indeed, renewed the picture, imprinting it ever more lovingly, ever more beautifully on my remembrance. It passed from memory to memory undimmed by time, and so, in spite of all the various shiftings of our human lives, we lived ever near to one another."

The simplicity of Nature's own art which we see in Gretchen in Faust, the love-awakening swelling to fuller and deeper notes, the rapture and the passion find their likeness in Frederica. How beautifully the bird-like simplicity issuing from the tender sequestered current of her life harmonizes in Gretchen's exquisite monologue:—

Meine Ruh' ist hin,  
Mein Herz ist schwer ;  
Ich finde sie nimmer  
Und nimmermehr.

Wo ich ihn nicht hab'  
Ist mir das Grab,  
Die ganze Welt  
Ist mir vergällt.

Mein armer Kopf  
Ist mir verrückt  
Mein armer Sinn  
Ist mir zerstückt.

Meine Ruh' ist hin,  
Mein Herz ist schwer ;  
Ich finde sie nimmer  
Und nimmermehr.

Nach ihm nur schau' ich  
Zum Fenster hinaus,  
Nach ihm nur geh ich  
Aus dem Haus.

Sein hoher Gang,  
Sein edle Gestalt,  
Seines Mundes Lächeln,  
Seiner Augen Gewalt,

Und seiner Rede,  
Zauberflusz,  
Sein Händedruck  
Und ach sein Kusz !

Meine Ruh' ist hin,  
Mein Herz ist schwer ;  
Ich finde sie nimmer  
Und nimmermehr.

Mein Busen drängt  
Sich nach ihm hin.  
Ach dürft ich fassen  
Und halten ihn,

Und küssen ihn  
So wie ich wollt',  
An seinen Küssén  
Vergehen sollt !

In Werther there may be gleams of Frederica amidst the unimpassioned Charlotte. In Wilhelm Meister there seems to be a picture of her in the loving genuine Mariana, and even in the sensuous, graceful Phillina, while still again in the angelic love of Mignon we catch a glimpse of her trusting and confiding love. In Clavigo he reproduces his love for her and has here his same haunting thought that it is the *womanly* which tests *man*. Lastly, many of his most beautiful lyrics are due to her. "Das



Heidenröslein," "Das Veilchen," "Wie herlich leuchtet mir die Natur;" and others, not so well known, in which, however, are many gems.

"O komm zurück! Schon rufen Hirt und Heerden,  
Dich bang herbei.  
Komm bald zurück! Sonst wird es Winter werden  
Im Monat Mai."

and—

"Wie ich dich liebe mit warmem Blut!  
Die du mir Jugend, und Freud, und Muth,  
Zu neuen Liedern und Tänzen giebst.  
Sei ewig glücklich wie du mich liebst!"

In Gotz von Berlichingen, in the tender heart of Marie, moved to pity and interest and ripening into love in her hero's misfortunes, he pictures *Frederica*, and in Weislingen's desertion and faithlessness he does penance for his own actions

It is only the next year that we have to trace another romance, different indeed, and yet not lacking in charm. Charlotte Buff is the heroine of an Arcadian pastoral. The sister of a number of children, and exercising a maternal influence, she plays a charming rôle.

Tall and fair, we see her first attired in a simple white gown amidst her brothers and sisters, to whom she is giving their evening meal. Wolfgang has come to take her to share in an evening's festivities, and here we follow her amidst the pleasure, charmed with the vivacity, ease, and grace with which she flits 'neath the softened lights at the side of her handsome lover. We hear her speak; and the rapt attention of her auditor shows that before his mind is being unfolded another glimpse of life, which to him has until now been veiled in mystery. She speaks of home and her own duties, reveals a little sphere which, small indeed, flashes forth with one of those hidden gems which glitter but feebly in larger circles. With a certain naïveté and grace, which is irresistible, she speaks of her likes and dislikes in books, of an innocent pleasure in dancing, of a soothing love for her harpsichord, and again of home. Her voice was soft and filled with the melody of one whose heart is kind. Thought flew, tongue followed, and the flash of meaning quivered in her expression, and though for the moment we have forgotten our hero, he is still

at her side, enraptured by her eyes, her voice, her Phyllisean beauty. Another romance has begun. Charlotte is betrothed to another. Goethe lives and sees her, ever more enamored of her charms. The time for parting comes, and his heart is rudely torn, as in an unimpassioned way she bids him farewell. How could she thrust a love like his thus aside? It was, however, of short duration. A night's sleep again disillusioned him, and but a month or two later he speaks with light irony of this experience.

In *Dichtung und Wahrheit* he partially relates his love for Lotte, seeing ever a sadly sweet enthusiasm in the maiden who said, "Welches Herz von Goethe geliebt worden, das kann keinem Manne weiter angehören." In *Werther*, we have, with much detail, passion and sentiment, the history of this love, and here in passing we must refer to Maximiliane von La Roche, whose attachment for Goethe aroused the jealousy of her own husband. From this episode in his life we have the supplementary material for *Werther*. In *Clavigo*, *Stella*, and *Claudine of Villa Bella* Goethe recognizes her influence over him, and also many of his beautiful songs and ballads were written at this time.

Two years later, while Goethe is still young, handsome and famous, with an overflowing fountain of youthful power, amidst receptions and masquerades, excursions by sea and land, we have another romance, with a maiden whom he had met some few years before, as a fascinating young school girl, with all the charm of freshness and innocence. Not the wild-flower beauty of Frederica, nor the beauty blossoming in retirement of Lotte, but the artificial beauty of a society maiden, whom, however, we admire.

"Wherefore, resistlessly dost draw me  
Into scenes so bright?  
Had I not enough to soothe and charm me  
In the lonely night?"

Alas! the gentle bloom of Spring, no longer  
Cheereth my poor heart!  
There is only Spring, and love and Nature,  
Angel! where thou art!"

Transformed into a fashionable lady, she makes for Goethe the hated amusements of Society more alluring than Nature itself. He comes, he sees, he conquers. The summit is reached. His

path now lies downward. He strives to free himself from his pledge. Artfully, she tries to win him back, but he has decided to break the ties so tenderly woven and so firmly joined. He does break them, and yet he seems to cling to her. Her image ever recurs to him. He leaves her and goes to Switzerland. With nothing of Frederica's tenderness of nature, nor of Lotte's impressionableness of soul, she excited a wilful energy and refused to set Goethe free. Her resistance piqued and charmed him, and although it seemed as if he left her, he had to confess to himself that it was really she who left him. In *Dichtung and Wahrheit*, in an exquisite love-story, he relates this tale; and many beautiful songs he addresses to Lili—"The Night Song of the Ranger," and others.

In each of these three we have an impressionable soul, the birth of love, a brief period of blossoming, a pause;—the blossoms do not expand but droop gently, then fade, and all is over. But in Frau von Stein we find for the first time a nature that possessed the poet's own fire. Let us briefly sketch this friendship. "We see a woman of a somewhat cool temperament who from her youth has been accustomed to render an exact account to herself of her life. She is married. She lives in no way separated from her husband, whom she indeed has never passionately loved, but who treats her well and with whom she has lived and still lives in entire harmony." With this woman Goethe becomes acquainted. An enthusiastic admiration for her seizes him, which extends to her whole family, not excluding her husband. Goethe makes the interest of this family his own. One of the children he educates, takes him into his house, remains through life his highly revered friend. Nothing could be more respectful than the letters in which this youth to the very last maintains his intercourse with Goethe. No disagreement ever rose between the husband of Frau von Stein and Goethe. Never has the honourable character of Herr Von Stein been doubted. Last of all it may be mentioned that the old confidence was replaced by a genuine mutual esteem in later days, when Goethe renewed his friendship with Frau Von Stein.

In his intercourse here, intellect is chiefly conspicuous. He finds her a mother among her children. A beautiful woman with none of the bloom of maidenhood: no timid, wistful being

whose experience is all before her, but a woman acquainted with life. She knew many things which Goethe had yet to learn. To her Goethe addresses his lines :

“Thou didst know each motive of my being ;  
 Feel each subtle nerve ring out reply,  
 Glance of thine could read without the seeing  
 Deeps, almost unknown to human eye.’

Her existence had been aimless, insipid, accidental. She is as much in need of consolation as Goethe. We need hardly speak further of the uncertainty, the subsequent mutual out-pouring of heart, the calm, and then the soul-inspiring friendship which ensued.

The letters to Frau von Stein flow on like a deep, unbroken melody, showing the slightest modulations of the heart. To her he carried all his poems and work, and gained sympathy from a kindred spirit. Goethe had from the beginning sought a poetic symbol for his relation with Frau von Stein and had found it in a beautiful phrase—“O thou wast in times outlived, my sister or my wife.” He embodied this in a short comedy, “Die Geschwister”; but admitting of higher possibilities, his imagination yielded his drama “Iphigenia.” “Iphigenia” was the representative of the beloved woman, the form in which she accompanied him in his travels in Italy. In his “Wahlverwandtschaften” his broken friendship with Frau von Stein is transfigured. And here, too, we find many lyrics and songs of exquisite beauty, while *Losso* cannot be understood without some knowledge of Goethe’s friendship for this lady.

We have traced briefly these four love-idyls and they *that were*, become their former beauty treble. His wish :—

“Look up and let thy nature strike on mine  
 Like yonder morning on the blind half world ”

was answered; and through the almost inextricable maze he leads us to his final summing up of human life, the meaning of this world’s experience as a symbol of eternity—all that the human heart has longed for.

“Das Ewig Weibliche  
 Zieht uns hinan ”

“The woman soul leadeth us  
 Upward and on.”

## RALPH WALDO EMERSON.

BY W. K. STEWART, '97

[Read before the Modern Language Club.]

IF we were asked to name what is most unique and striking in American literature, we should select the poems of Edgar Allen Poe, the romances of Nathaniel Hawthorne, and the essays of Ralph Waldo Emerson. Such a choice is, of course, largely a matter of personal preference and may not commend itself to all. Nevertheless the high rank that has been universally accorded to the authors of these works must make them to some extent an object of interest to us. It is to the life and writings of the last of these men, Emerson, that we wish to devote some attention. "Happy," says an old adage, "are they who have no history." And, if this be true, Emerson's life must have been pre-eminently a happy one; for of few men of letters is there so little to be chronicled in a biographical way. His peaceful, unostentatious life moved along untroubled save by such bereavements as must sooner or later come to us all, and by a certain amount of inevitable friction caused by his rubbing against the preconceived opinions of his contemporaries.

The progenitors of Emerson, on both sides of his family, were New Englanders, and not a few of the mental characteristics of the inhabitants of that region are to be seen in him. He was the descendant of eight generations of clergymen. His father, Wm. Emerson, was the pastor of the First Church of Boston. In that city on May 25, 1803, Ralph Waldo Emerson was born. It may be remarked in passing that on the same day, across the water, was born Edward Bulwer, who afterwards became the distinguished novelist, Lord Lytton; and it may be added that few contemporary men of letters have ever exhibited a more thorough contrast than the Prophet of Transcendental-

ism and the versatile author of "Pelham" and "The Caxtons." From his father Ralph Waldo inherited what animal spirits he possessed, while the higher and rarer elements of his character came from his mother. The young Emerson went through the public schools in the usual way without achieving anything remarkable. His school-companions speak of a certain aloofness about him, which manifested itself even then and which continued to be a distinct trait of his character throughout life. He entered Harvard University in 1817. He did not distinguish himself at all at college, except, perhaps, in the study of Greek, of which language the great orator, Edward Everett, was the professor. After graduation Emerson assisted his oldest brother in teaching a young ladies' school in Boston. Later on he tried other experiments in teaching, but it does not appear that he was particularly adapted for the profession of pedagogue. In 1825 he entered the Divinity School at Cambridge, thereby maintaining his family traditions. Emerson was prevented by ill-health from pursuing his full course at Cambridge, and in 1826 was granted a license to preach, though still continuing his studies. It was fortunate for him, he afterwards said, that it so happened; for if he had been compelled to stand examination he should certainly never have obtained his license. However, the next year saw him duly installed as minister of the Second Church of Boston, his first and only real pastorate. As a preacher Emerson is described as quiet, effective and giving satisfaction to his congregation, but not rhetorical. In September, of the same year, he was married to Miss Ellen Tucker, a young lady of remarkable beauty and buoyant spirit, but inheriting a fatal delicacy of constitution. She died early in 1831, after but little more than two years of wedded life.

During these years a mighty revolution was taking place in the theological opinions of the New Englanders. The stern, harsh Calvinism of the Pilgrim Fathers was undergoing a slow but steady and sure change. Its more grotesque dogmas were being abandoned to satisfy the increased scientific knowledge of the times, and its harder features softened under the influence of the humanitarian spirit of the age. Naturally Emerson could not remain unaffected by such an intellectual movement. But with him there were no years of storm and

stress and spiritual shipwreck. His intellectual and spiritual development continued its uninterrupted course, with no rude break from the past. A disagreement arose with his congregation in 1832 in regard to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and, being unable to effect a compromise, he reluctantly resigned his pastorate. In December of the same year Emerson made his first trip to Europe. He visited Sicily, Italy, Switzerland and England, meeting with many great literary men, among them Landor, Coleridge, Wordsworth and Carlyle. His friendship with Carlyle was of life-long endurance and mutual benefit. Within the next few years Emerson's brothers, Edward and Charles, died. They were men of rare gifts and abilities, regarded in their life-time as the superiors of their brother. If they had attained the maturity of their powers, it seems probable that the believers in hereditary genius would have found in the Emerson family a confirmation of their theory as remarkable as the Coleridge and Brontë families. In 1834 Emerson moved to Concord, which was to be his home until his death. Two years later he was united in marriage to a Miss Lydia Jackson, daughter of a noted physician.

Emerson's main occupation, during these years of domestic enrichment and bereavement, was lecturing. He also edited Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus," and thus introduced that author to the American reading public. His slender book entitled "Nature" was published in 1836. At this time Washington Irving and William Cullen Bryant were the leading American writers respectively in prose and verse. Longfellow was professor of Modern Languages at Harvard University, and had not yet written those poems which were afterwards to awaken such an echo in the popular heart; James Russell Lowell was an undergraduate of the same University; Poe was an editor in the South, writing his bizarre tales and his virulent literary criticisms; and Hawthorne was a mere unknown. "Nature" created quite a stir among thoughtful minds. The book contains the first exposition of that type of pantheism which is such a salient feature in Emerson's philosophy. It is not the materialistic pantheism of Spinoza which reduces all forms of being to one underlying substance. External nature is the incarnation of the divine mind, but God and Nature are not confounded. Such

a belief is unalterably opposed to that system which regards Nature as an inert, lifeless thing, and the Deity as a "magnified and non-natural" engineer; "an absentee God," as Carlyle says, "who, since the dawn of the first Sabbath, has been sitting on the outside of his universe watching it go." Certain meetings of Emerson and his friends at George Ripley's house in Boston gave rise to the name Transcendentalists. The exact significance of the famous term, Transcendentalism, as applied to Emerson and his followers, is rather difficult to determine. The origin of the term is a matter of simple history. It was first employed by the great German philosopher, Immanuel Kant. In opposition to the English experimental school of John Locke and the French materialists, whose system may be summed up in the simple and apparently harmless and axiomatic formula that all our knowledge comes from experience, Kant maintained that certain principles involved in our knowledge went beyond or *transcended* experience. The Transcendentalism of Emerson is characterized by the absence of a formal system of thought, a somewhat mystical phraseology, the exaltation of the spiritual over the material, a tendency to regard man and nature as a divine manifestation, and a belief that there is no right or wrong except the determinations of the private spirit.

Meanwhile Emerson continued to lecture and occasionally to preach. An oration entitled "Man Thinking, or the American Scholar," is especially noteworthy. It denounces the servile American imitations of English literary models, and has been aptly called by O. W. Holmes "our intellectual declaration of independence." In 1838, Emerson delivered his famous address before the graduating Divinity Class of Cambridge. This address is an attack upon the traditionary and limited way of using the mind of Christ. The average orthodox apologist argues that Christ was either divine or else he was an imposter, claiming to be what he was not; thereby overlooking two very obvious alternatives, either that Christ might not have uttered the sayings attributed to him, or that he might have been a sincere but deluded man. But Emerson chooses neither of these alternatives. Christ, indeed, claimed to be divine, he believed, but only because and in the sense that God incarnates himself in all men. This poetic truth was distorted by narrow-minded



men, who said of Christ in the following age: "This was Jehovah come down out of heaven. I will kill you if you say he was a man." Emerson was promptly branded as a heretic, and, of course, obtained all the gratuitous notoriety which accompanies that name in these piping times of peace when schism and dissent are no longer punished by the axe and the faggot. Several years later another great man, though differing fundamentally from Emerson, Theodore Parker, was likewise expelled from communion in the Unitarian Church for his freedom of thought. To-day this same Unitarian Church has advanced even beyond the positions of these men, and is proud to claim them as her own. Even thus does history ever repeat itself, and the heretic of one age becomes the aureoled saint of the next.

This expansion of Emerson's intellectual horizon made Concord the resort of thinkers. Among those who went thither were Miss Margaret Fuller, afterwards Marchioness Ossoli, Amos Bronson Alcott, and Jones Very. In 1840 appeared the first issue of the *Dial*, the organ of the Transcendentalists, with Margaret Fuller as editor, and Emerson one of the contributors. The *Dial* soon became a byword in the land for crazy mysticism. Emerson had indeed fallen in with strange friends. The more revolutionary of them united in the Brook Farm community of plain livers and high thinkers, which Hawthorne has immortalized in his "Blithedale Romance." Emerson did not join them, being too much rooted to his Concord home, and attached to his opinions upon individualism. About this time Emerson's oldest child died, a bright, affectionate five-year-old boy of great promise. None of his numerous domestic afflictions seems to have pierced his soul to the quick as did this.

Already in the previous years Emerson had published the first series of his essays, Carlyle writing the preface to the English edition. These remarkable writings constitute what is best of Emerson's work both in matter and style. His reputation, from being local spread over all countries where the English language is spoken, and Concord became the literary Mecca of America. It is impossible to do more than refer to the subjects of these essays, which bear such titles as "Heroism," "Intellect," "Prudence," "Spiritual Laws," "The Poet," "Art," "Love," "Friendship," "History," etc. Two of them require special

notice. That on the "Over-soul" is probably the most celebrated of all. This beautiful essay has been admired even where it was but partly understood. It is a tribute to that Divine energy, the eternal One, which pervades the universe and finds expression in man, breathing through his intellect as genius, his will as virtue, and his heart as love. The essay on "Self-Reliance" contains the pith of the Emersonian Gospel. Its motto is, "Trust thyself." "Obey the impulses of your own heart." Imitation and conformity are the greatest of intellectual vices. A friend objected "But these impulses may be from below not from above." Emerson replied: "They do not seem to be such, but if I am the Devil's child, I will live from the Devil. No law can be sacred to me but that of my own nature." Thus Emerson is an intuitionist in contradistinction to Rousseau, Mill and other moral reformers. It is difficult to compute what would be the consequences if his rule of action were generally adopted. As regards politics certainly Emerson's teachings are favorable to Democracy, and, if logically followed, even to anarchy. His writings constitute a veritable storehouse of quotations for all upholders of personal liberty.

In the realm of ethics, Emerson teaches the lesson of cheerfulness. Action should always be spontaneous and duty never a burden. He dislikes to hear of ailments or physical ills and never willingly speaks of death. Upon the great subject of sin and of those phenomena of nature which shock our moral feeling, he is silent. He believed that though all things were not the best, yet they were for the best. Evil is simply the price that man pays for being above nature. We should be worse off without it. And for its punishment he has set up a fair-weather abstraction called "Compensation." In the well-known essay which bears this title he not only upholds the theory that sin brings with it its own punishment—a proposition that the modern pulpit has enunciated with so much insistency, though the mass of mankind still seems to doubt—but he would also reduce each man's existence to the same dead-level of mingled happiness and misery, every evil or misfortune of life being atoned for by a compensating advantage. Surely it requires but little experience of the real facts of life to perceive how utterly inadequate such a theory is. Because Emerson cannot

see moral evil from his standpoint, he summarily denies its existence, and thus lightly disposes of a problem that has baffled the greatest thinkers from the times of the author of the Book of Job to the present day.

In considering Emerson's prose style it should always be remembered that the bulk of his essays and other prose works was delivered first in the form of lectures and has never been recast into more pretentious literary form. This fact will explain many peculiarities, which would otherwise be regarded as defects of taste. His dislike of long sentences and his love of epigram combine to form a staccato style, which, it must be confessed, is often very hard reading. Nothing, however, can surpass his pithiness of expression. His better writings seem shaken, sifted and cooled in the winds of the American autumn. The flush of his style is like the red-hue of the Indian Summer inscribed upon the leaf. But even this brilliancy at length palls, and one would willingly dig for a dull or commonplace sentence as for a hidden treasure. Occasionally the reader will meet with an odd or archaic word, and now and then there are constructions at which a grammarian might look askance. There is also scattered through his writings an abundance of homely illustrations, such as De Quincey or Macaulay would have disdained to use. But these seem rather to lend force to the expression, instead of detracting from its dignity. One cannot help being struck by the wealth of literary reference and quotation. A page of one of his essays selected casually will often contain allusions not only to the great modern and classic authors, including his beloved Plato, but also to writers whose names are hardly familiar to the average reader.

To the general public Emerson will probably forever remain a sealed book by reason of what is commonly reputed to be his extreme obscurity. It is not that his individual sentences are involved or cumbrous in their construction. They are, in fact, as simple and clear as can well be imagined. But his abrupt and sudden transitions, his discontinuous thought, and the inconsecutiveness of the various succeeding paragraphs serve to confuse the reader and render the gist of the whole argument doubtful. But it is false to say, as Poe has absurdly charged with his usual acrimony, that he was obscure for obscurity's

sake. He was simply unsystematic on principle, never shrinking from inconsistent propositions. "Man," he says, somewhere, "has no more to be troubled with inconsistency than with his shadow on the wall." He often exhibits as great a fondness for paradox as Macauley, though not like the latter using it as a literary artifice for the sake of a startling antithesis. In his opinion there were so many sides to Truth, that all he could do was to notice each face in turn without troubling himself whether they agreed. And after all it is not the man who can string together a number of syllogisms and write a Q. E. D. at the bottom who is able to move the heart, or attract the masses of men to a new teacher and a higher doctrine.

On account of certain resemblances of character, creed and style, Emerson has often been called the American Carlyle. And the resemblances are not so superficial as to bring out in strong relief the many great differences between the two men. The sincerity of Emerson is scarcely less marked than that of Carlyle, but the former is as cheerful and optimistic as the latter is constitutionally despondent and bilious. Carlyle certainly excelled in wit, humor, pathos, penetration, poetic grandeur, and in fervid sublimity of imagination, and Emerson just as surely in high and transparent sanity. Carlyle obstinately flung himself athwart the great current of forces tending to the amelioration of modern society. On the other hand no great man of literature has been more profoundly in sympathy with what is best in the spirit of our century than Emerson. Contrast the attitudes of the two men to modern science. Emerson filled the place which Goethe's death left void of a poet divining the secrets of nature by his instincts of beauty and religion. He was an evolutionist before the publication of Darwin's epoch-making book, in the sense that he perceived the real relation of man and nature, and the fundamental unity which pervades organic life in its seeming varieties. Compare with this Carlyle's taunts at modern science, and his contemptuous references to Darwin, whose books he had never read; and yet, according to Froude, Carlyle always possessed a lurking dread that Darwin's speculations might be true. From the discoveries of science Emerson, at any rate, had absolutely nothing to fear.

In 1847, was first collected and published a volume of

Emerson's poems, though the final version was not made till thirty years afterwards. Philosophers tell us that all men are by nature either Platonists or Aristotelians; and so we may say that all poets are followers of Browning or Tennyson, according as they give the greater prominence to the thought or to the expression, to the substance or to the form. And Emerson certainly belongs to the former class. His poetry is essentially intellectual. It is neither spontaneous nor inevitable. Probably no man of the century moved more habitually in an atmosphere of poesy than himself, but he lacked the requisite power of poetic expression. There are many beautiful touches in his work, and a few gems of purest ray, but there are likewise lame and unscannable lines, and a lack of harmony that is often most offensive to the ear of the reader. It is true that he is to be reckoned as one of America's six or seven greatest poets—but then the muse was never very prolific upon American soil. Among his poems should be mentioned the one entitled "The Problem"—a well-nigh perfect thing of its kind. "Threnody" is a beautiful and touching lament on the death of his son. "The Adirondaes," "The Snowstorm," "The Humble Bee," are pretty and pleasant bits of pastoral. Some of his poems, such as the "Sphinx" and "Uriel," are almost unintelligible. It is perhaps fair to say that there is to-day a growing admiration for Emerson's poetry; but it is extremely improbable that the poet-loving public will ever be able to share in the rhapsodies of his more enthusiastic admirers. One has only to compare his best work with such poems as Shelley's "Skylark" or "Sensitive Plant," or Keat's "Ode to a Nightingale" to perceive how modest a portion of all the rare and exquisite qualifications of these writers reveals itself in the verse of Emerson.

Despite his literary fame Emerson was becoming peculiarly embarrassed, and having received invitations from various English Mechanics' Institutes to address them, he sailed for Liverpool in October, 1847. The lecturing tour was an unqualified success and Emerson's fame was securely established in England. He met with such authors as Macauley, Leigh Hunt, De Quincey, Froude, Clough and George Eliot, and, of course, Carlyle. His impressions of England were published in

1856 in his "English Traits." They are both sympathetic and acute, being probably the best American criticism of our transatlantic kinsmen—and, on the other hand, comparing favorably with such criticisms on America as Dickens or Matthew Arnold have written. In 1850 Emerson published his discourses on "Representative Men." These discourses are singularly uneven in merit, those on Napoleon and Swedenborg being the keenest. Naturally they provoke comparison with Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero Worship," which they resemble both in subject matter and method of treatment.

There comes a time in the life of every great writer when, having spoken his message to his contemporaries, his vein of originality becomes exhausted. Such a time Emerson had now reached and he was happy in recognizing it. Hereafter his thoughts were increasingly turned to politics and public life as his discourses on subjects like the "Conservative," "Man the Reformer" and "The Young American" show. The American Republic was rapidly approaching the great crisis in its history. Emerson had always been a consistent opponent of slavery, but not an extremist. But the growing influence and brutality of the slave holders, culminating in the attempt to strangle free suffrage in Kansas and the ruffianly assault on Charles Sumner in the Senate House, made him an avowed abolitionist. What a contrast between Emerson's position on this question and the positions of Hawthorne and Carlyle! No American writer worshipped conscience as Hawthorne did, but he saw in the slavery question nothing to arouse his moral feelings; while a contemptuous sneer at the "Nigger Problem" was all that Carlyle, that great prophet of the nineteenth century, warring against the "Everlasting Nay," had to offer at the spectacle of a nation presumably given over to material aggrandisement and the worship of the Almighty Dollar, rising in moral revolt against a great established iniquity. Emerson made lecturing tours far and wide in the country during these years. These lectures were embodied in volumes entitled "The Conduct of Life," published in 1860, "Society and Solitude," in 1870, and in his "Letters and Social Aims," in 1875. These later works call for no special attention. They are a reiteration of his old message and show a falling-off of his old

powers. Emerson in fact was ageing rapidly, and that he himself was aware of this may be seen from his swan-song "Terminus," beginning with the line "It is time to be old." The destruction of his house by fire, the collection of a handsome sum of money by his friends and admirers to indemnify his loss, and a third and last trip to Europe to recover his health which had been undermined by the shock and worry attending the accident, are the only noteworthy details of Emerson's closing years. His memory failed towards the last, but his other faculties remained unimpaired. The "Reaper whose name is Death" had gathered a great harvest of distinguished men and women in the first two years of the eighties. Within that time George Eliot, Carlyle, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Longfellow, Darwin and Lord Beaconsfield died. To this number was soon added Emerson, who died of pneumonia after a short illness on April 27, 1882, in his 79th year.

Such, in brief outline, is a far from adequate or satisfactory account of Emerson's life and works. What, it remains to be asked, are the imperishable monuments of his teaching? What has he done to justify the eulogies of his admirers as the foremost thinker of the 19th century? What will constitute his chief claim upon the attention of posterity? He founded no sect whose adherents should perpetuate his fame, but he is, as Matthew Arnold has beautifully said, "the friend and aider of those who would live in the spirit," and his influence upon the thought of the last half century has been paramount. His intellectual serenity is as marked as Goethe's or Humboldt's. He is like some god of classical antiquity seated upon the solitary heights of Olympus, and unmoved by the petty turmoils which agitate humanity. But there is in all his works a pervading note of sympathy with mankind. He was in no sense a mere intellectual machine like John Stuart Mill. His love for nature and his interpretation of it are more spiritual than even Wordsworth's. For Emerson man and nature are in the deepest sympathy. The most intimate experiences of our inner life find a parallel and illustration in the phenomena of the external world. But there is something which breathes through all of his writings, which makes them peculiarly fitted for our own times, something which can command the appreciation of the most hard-

headed advocate of common-sense, to whom Emerson's mysticism is mere sublimated nonsense. We refer to his optimism. A distinguishing mark of the thought of the present century (and especially of its latter half) is its despondancy and gloom. Pessimism is in the air. It has been formulated into philosophies, and infects our whole literature. This *Weltschmerz* was never more manifest than at the present day. We show it especially in our literary preferences—in our admiration for Ibsen and kindred writers, and in our eager perusal of a whole school of fiction, from Zola to the author of the latest *fin-de-siècle* novel. To one who has inhaled the noxious atmosphere of this species of literature Emerson's writings must come as a breath of pure, fresh air. Here, at least, is one man of thought, who, in the face of the stern facts of the universe, was undisnayed and even cheerful. For, after all, optimism is a direct inference from the existence of the Deity. If Emerson had no other title to fame he would stand out prominent to future generations as one robust and manly figure in a morbid and repining age.



## ON TRANSLATING HOMER.

BY BERNARD K. SANDWELL, '97.

[Read before the Classical Association.]

THERE is no task in literature so hard as that of rendering into a modern tongue a poetical work of which the language, the ideas, the style, the spirit itself, are all dead; of rendering it, that is, in such a way that he who reads the modern version shall experience the same emotions, the same pleasures, shall acquire the same knowledge, as he who reads it in the original tongue. This is what is meant by translation, and one looks in vain for a single example. Virgil is probably the most modern of ancient poets, if we exclude the satirists from this designation, and Dryden's is probably the best English translation of Virgil, but who would dare to say that Dryden's translation is even an approximately adequate version? Similarly, many great men have adapted Sophocles, and failed; many of the greatest poets have adapted or translated Homer, and all have failed completely. The world is still waiting, and is still likely to wait, for a chance to read Homer without the trouble of acquiring a knowledge of the Greek tongue.

You will at once say that I am passing the most sweeping judgments on works which by no means deserve such condemnation. But I am not. If you will consider the definition I gave of translation you will admit that all I have said is justified. I would not deny that Pope's *Iliad* is, in passages, remarkably fine poetry, though I do not admire its style. I admit that there are portions of William Morris's *Odyssey* which are of great beauty, though I abominate its metre. Chapman's translation, cumbrous as it is, is a superb specimen of Elizabethan poetry. Even Cowper's translation, which no one ever reads, has its excellences. But I am sincerely sorry for the man who, not knowing Greek,

imagines that in reading these works he is reading Homer. Better a bald, literal, prose translation, by far, than the fantastic decorations of Chapman, the studied balladism of Morris, the brilliant rhetoric of Pope. Beautiful these things may be of themselves; they are not in Homer, and they do not improve him. And these faults, or others like them, are common to every translation of Homer up to the present day.

The reasons for this lamentable fact lie partly in the translator, partly in the inevitable circumstances of the case. Apparently there are causes unconnected with the individual character of the poets who attempt to re-write Homer, which make a perfect translation an impossibility. These causes consist in the inherent characteristics of thought which every age possesses, and which differentiate it from every other age, and outside of which one can only get by getting outside of the age. We do not notice these habits of thought in one another; they are born and bred in us; because of them we cannot truly criticize the works of our own day and generation; and we work them into Homer without perceiving their presence, much less their incompatibility with Homer's spirit and with Homer's style. Pope probably did not know how much he was importing into Homer when he made Achilles say,

" O parent goddess ! since in early bloom  
Thy son must fall, by too severe a doom ;  
Sure, to so short a race of glory born,  
Great Jove in justice should this span adorn :  
Honour and fame at least the Thund'rer owed ;  
And ill he pays the promise of a god,  
If you proud monarch thus thy son defies,  
Obscures my glories and resumes my prize."

It was the fashion of the day to talk like that, in poetry; and we must charitably suppose that Pope followed the fashion in all innocence, the only alternative being, that he thought to improve Homer. Similarly, Chapman's extraordinary fancies belong as much to the age as to the man. No one at that time could have made a translation of Homer wholly free from such defects. If anyone had, no one would have read it.

But, given an age comparatively free from affection in thought and diction, may we not then look for an adequate trans-

lation of Homer? Perhaps. I am afraid not. The man who translates Homer must be a great poet, and refrain from writing his own poetry; he must be a great scholar, and suppress the desire to exhibit his scholarship: he must have a most vivid imagination, and be able to restrain it completely; he must have the simplicity of Wordsworth, the musical diction of Swinburne, the grandeur of Milton, and be willing to use them to re-incarnate another's work, to re-popularize another's name. His reward will be the cold approbation of the scholar, who possesses the original in all its glory, and the gratitude of the layman, whose opinion is valueless, for he cannot know how much nearer to Homer than its predecessors this great work will be.

But let us turn from what we never shall have to what we have already. The translations of Homer which we now possess are failures, all of them, either because they are not great poems, or because they are not Homeric. This does not overlook the sad fact that many of them are neither. The remainder however may be divided into two classes, according as they come more or less under each of these two heads, the un-poetic and the un-Homeric. Owing to the very different conception of translation prevalent at the present time, nearly all the recent versions of Homer place faithfulness before everything else, and while abject failures as poetry may be used as keys with perfect satisfaction. Of the older works, however, or at least all those that are still read, it may be truly said that Homer himself would have difficulty in recognizing them, but could hardly help admiring them.

As soon as one mentions poetical translations of Homer, two names are at once brought into consciousness—the names of Chapman and Pope. Neither of these translated Homer, in the sense I have given to that word. They took the realistic sketches of Homer and used them as material, the one for fantastic decorative panels in soft colours and airy lines, the other for brilliant conventional designs, stiff and rigid and cold; both differing from their original only less than from one another. A very few examples from each will suffice to shew the justice of the assertion. When Chapman says,

“Haste to Achilles tent, where take Briseis' hand, and bring  
*Her beauties to us,*”

he is taking liberties which, insignificant as they seem in that one instance, enter so deeply into the whole pattern of his work as to stamp it a counterfeit of Homer. The Greek poet is plain, direct; Chapman is extravagantly fanciful. Here is the standard example. "There shall be a day when sacred Troy shall perish utterly." Thus saith the literal version. But observe Chapman.

"And such a stormy day shall come, in mind and soul I know,  
When sacred Troy shall shed her towers, for tears of overthrow."

Would Homer recognize that? And which of these renderings would the realistic standard of our day call the better?

Chapman translated Homer into Elizabethan; Pope, into Queen Anne. One's choice between the two styles is purely a matter of taste—either is equally bad for Homer. Let us consider Pope. We all know the style which he and his contemporaries aimed at. Poetry was rhetoric in those days. Gilt and cut glass took the place of art. Their phrases please and attract the ear with a smooth, polished beauty which was the result of long practice in every trick and device known to the manipulators of language. Their workmanship is exquisite, and covers with a gorgeous lacquer their frequent poverty of inspiration and idea. No medium could be more unfitted for conveying the history of the rough, simpleminded, unsophisticated Achæans, as told by the only poet who has succeeded in always combining grandeur and simplicity, the every-day subject and the poetic treatment. For you cannot get around it, however much you may rave at Daudet, and Howells, and Ibsen, *et al.*; Greek art, the highest art we have ever known, was an art of realism. There was hardly a strain of artificiality in it. Therefore, in the return of literature from the paths of unbridled fancy and impossible romance, to a true and broad realism, such as we now see the signs of,—in such a return lies the only hope of an adequate translation of Homer. Pope had not a notion of what realism was. Let us examine a few of his speeches, and observe how far they are appropriate for the mouths of Agamemnon, and the excitable Achilles, and Hector, bidding farewell to the woman he loves.

"To this the king, 'Fly, mighty warrior! fly;  
Thy aid we need not, and thy threats defy.  
There want not chiefs in such a cause to fight,  
And Jove himself shall guard a monarch's right."

If thou hast strength, 'twas heaven that strength bestowed ;  
 For know, vain man, thy valor is from God !  
 Haste, launch thy vessels, fly with speed away ;  
 Rule thy own realms with arbitrary sway ;  
 I heed thee not, but prize at equal rate  
 Thy short-lived friendship and thy groundless hate.  
 Go, threat thy earth born Myrmidons :—but here  
 'Tis mine to threaten, prince, and thine to fear. ”

And—

“ But witness, heralds, and proclaim my vow,  
 Witness to gods above and men below !  
 But first, and loudest, to your prince declare  
 (That lawless tyrant whose commands you bear),  
 Unmoved as death Achilles shall remain,  
 Though prostrate Greece shall bleed at every vein :  
 The raging chief, in frantic passion lost,  
 Blind to himself, and useless to his host,  
 Unskilled to judge the future by the past,  
 In blood and slaughter shall repent at last. ”

And Hector to Andromache,—

“ Yet come it will, the day decreed by fates !  
 (How my heart trembles while my tongue relates ! )  
 The day when thou, imperial Troy ! must bend,  
 And see thy warriors fall, thy glories end. ”

I have not time to read you either the Greek or the literal translation, but if you have ever read Homer, you know it is very, very different from that. The introduction to Butcher and Lang's exquisite prose version of the *Odyssey* sums up these two great poets very well.

“ For the Elizabethan age Chapman supplied what was then necessary, the mannerisms deemed of the essence of poetry, daring and luxurious conceits. In the age of Anne, ‘dignity’ and ‘correctness’ had to be given to Homer, and Pope gave them by his dazzling rhetoric, his antithesis, his *netteté*, his command of every conventional and favorite artifice. As transcripts of Homer they are like pictures drawn from a lost point of view.”

These that we have been considering are great poems and bad translations. Let us come now to the works of our own day and generation, which are for the most part good translations except in that they are not great poems. There are plenty of them, and I will not weary you with a list. Most of them, I re-

gret to say, are not to be found in the Library. Of those that are, the worst, I think, is Newman's and the best Lord Derby's.

It may be said of Lord Derby, that while he is not a great poet, nor a great scholar (for he translates all the Greek gods into Latin), he is nevertheless a very faithful translator; and while his work contains little of the grandeur of Homer, yet nearly all it contains *is* Homer, and not Lord Derby. As a translator, therefore, he is more successful than Pope, or Chapman, or Cowper. But one may be literal enough, and miss entirely the spirit and value of the finest passages in Homer, and even Lord Derby's servile adherence to the original is not enough to keep him always in the right path. Pope does not pretend to reproduce Homer, and what he writes has a value of its own; Derby, as soon as he cuts loose from his text, is valueless, for his translation has no charms as original poetry. Examine his version of what is literally as follows; "Most hateful to me," says Agamemnon, "art thou of the Zeus-cherished kings, for ever is strife dear to thee, and wars and battles; and even if thou art strong, a god I ween gave it thee." Here Derby is closely literal until the last line, and then he falls.

"Of all the heaven-born kings, thou art the man  
I hate the most; for thou delight'st in nought  
But war and strife; thy prowess I allow;  
Yet this, remember, is the gift of Heaven."

"A god I ween gave it thee."—

"Yet this, remember, is the gift of Heaven."

The one, the utterance of a jealous, bitter, unpolished warrior; the other, the trite moral reflection of a missionary!

There is in the Library a translation into Miltonic metre of the first XII books only of the *Odyssey*, by another titled scholar, the Earl of Carnarvon. Less rigid, but less faithful, than Derby's *Iliad*, it is an almost equally successful translation, and far better poetry. There is very much more of the Homeric spirit, the Greek idea, in these few lines, for instance, than in whole books of other translations.

"Tell me, O Queen,  
Art thou of mortal lineage, or divine?  
If thou art one of Heaven's high company,

Most like thou art, methinks, to Artemis,  
 Daughter of Zeus, in stature and in face :  
 But if thou art of them who dwell on earth,  
 Thrice happy then thy sire and mother too,  
 And thy fond brothers, when with pride they see  
 Thee, like some lovely flower, adorn the dance ;  
 But happiest he of all the sons of men,  
 Who with his wedding gifts shall win thy love,  
 And lead thee to his home. Never before  
 Have mine eyes lit on such a peerless form  
 Of man or woman ; as I gaze my heart  
 Flows o'er with reverent awe.' "

There are things here that one does not like—" My heart flows o'er with reverent awe," for "*σέβας μ' ἔχει εἰροπόοντα,*" but as a whole the passage may be called a fairly successful translation.

One of the most interesting, though by no means the best, of attempts on Homer is that of Simeox, which is written " in the original metre," hexameters, and very free hexameters at that. Now this metre can only be used in English under restrictions which render it very different from its Greek prototype, and its use must be attended with the utmost care and precaution. When Mr. Simeox gives us such lines as

" Atreides, the hero, the far-ruling king Agamemnon,"  
 " Him then thus answered the swift-footed noble Achilles,"

and

" Of sacred Killa and Tenedos mighty commander,"

he is not writing English poetry, for such lines are utterly foreign to the English language, which knows no such foot as a spondee. Moreover, having got what he thinks is Homer's metre, he does not bother himself to imitate Homer any further.

' No man, while I live and behold terrestrial actions,  
 Shall, near the hollow ships, lay hands inimical on thee."

The metre simply drives him into a vocabulary of long Romance substitutes for the plain and simple words of the Greek, and the result is neither Homer nor poetry.

Another recent version is that of Mr. P. S. Worseley, which is by far the most beautiful of all the later renditions. It is not particularly Homeric, except for the fine rapidity of its style, and

for a certain insistent, indefinable air of sadness that pervades it; but it is very exquisite poetry, extremely correct, and governed by a perfect taste. Take for example the passage where Odysseus interviews his mother in Hades.

“ Ah ! mine own mother, tell me, tell me why  
Thou scornest to abide my fond embrace.  
Could we but clasp each other feelingly,  
Even in Hades might we yet find place  
To slake our sorrows, and enjoy long space  
Of weeping. Or hath proud Persephone  
Sent me a shadow with thy form and face  
Only to mock me, that I yet might see  
Some bitterness beyond my former misery ? ”

“ I ceased and she made answer : ‘ O my child,  
’Tis not Persephone deludes thee here  
This is their portion who, from light exil’d  
Dying descend into these regions drear,  
Sinewless, fleshless, boneless. On the bier  
All substance was burnt out by force of fire  
When first the spirit, her cold flight to steer,  
Left the white bones, and fluttering from the pyre  
Straight to these shadowy realms did like a dream retire. ’ ”

I am not sure that the Spenserian stanza is a suitable medium for translating Homer. No one, however, can deny that Mr. Worseley is a master of it, and has succeeded, in spite of the exacting scheme of its versification, in preserving a high standard of fidelity to the original. Its only blemish is an occasional intricacy of inversion, such as

“ Great Tyndareüs, who sons had twain,  
Tamer of horses, Castor, and in strife  
Of boxing Polydeukes void of stain. ”

The great disadvantage under which the *stanza* labors in such work may be seen by a comparison of Worseley’s version of the address to Nausicaa with that of Carnarvon, which I read you a little while ago. The whole continuity is destroyed here by the Alexandrine line.

“ Queen, hear me—art thou of the earth or skies ?  
If of the deities in heaven that dwell  
To Artemis, the child of Zeus, in size  
And form and beauty I thee liken well—



Or if of mortals who on earth excel,  
Thrice fortunate thy mother and thy sire !  
Thrice fortunate thy brothers ! Haply swell  
Their hearts when they behold in fair attire  
Such scion of their house threading the mazy choir.

“ But he more fortunate than all beside,  
Who with rich gifts contending shall prevail  
To win thy hand, and lead thee home a bride.”

I will not examine many more of the modern versions. Newman and Maginn remain, and they can be demolished by a quotation apiece. This is Newman :—

“ Chestnut, why bodest death to me ? From thee this was not needed.  
Myself right surely know also, that 'tis my doom to perish,  
From mother and from father dear apart, in Troy ; but never  
Pause will I make of war, until the Troians be glutted '  
He spake, and yelling held afront the single-hoofed horses ”

This is Maginn, in what its author considers “ a manner similar to Homer's.” I give it merely as an interesting indication of how bad a translation of Homer can really be.

“ And scarcely had she begun to wash  
Ere she was aware of the grisly gash  
Above his knee that lay.  
It was a wound from a wild boar's tooth  
All on Parnassus' slope,  
Where he went to hunt in the days of his youth,” etc.

I have mentioned Morris's *Odyssey*. Nearly all the recent translations have been by men more prominent as scholars than as poets ; Morris is therefore an exception. But Mr. Morris is a victim to a serious delusion which was very prevalent some time ago, and of which Dr. Maginn is the most advanced representative. I do not know who it was discovered and published the obvious fact that the literary position of the Homeric poems bears a strong resemblance to that of the *sagas* of the Norwegian and Icelandic skalds ; but whoever it was, he is responsible for a vast number of bad translations of Homer. For no sooner had this idea been promulgated than a number of persons independently concluded that the style of the Norwegian saga would therefore be a fitting medium for the reproduction of Homer in a West-

ern tongue. Some, Dr. Maginn, for instance, even dragged the early English balladists into the analogy, and converted Homer into the garrulous drivel of a *jongleur*. Morris's *Odyssey* is a less extravagant specimen of the balladistic heresy. For example—

“ But Odysseus, grieved at heart,  
Spake thus unto his bedmate well skilled in gainful art :  
‘ O woman, thou sayest a word exceeding grievous to me !  
Who hath elsewhere shifted my bedstead ? Full hard for him  
should it be,  
For as deft as he were, unless soothly a very God came here,  
Who easily, if he willed it, might shift it elsewhere.’ ”

It is unnecessary to shew that the associations called up in our minds by a balladistic style such as this, quaint, garrulous and jerky, are not such as we experience in reading the original, with or without the aid of a key.

Another “ homometrical ” translation is the little-known work of C. B. Cayley. The preface, although I am quite unable to scan it, I cannot refrain from reproducing, as a beautifully characteristic piece of humor.

“ Dons, undergraduates, essayists, and public, I ask you,  
Are these hexameters true-timed, or Klopstockish uproar,  
Like ‘ Wie's den tausendmal Tausend der Todten Gottes einst seyn wird,  
Or like ‘ that wonderful land, at the base of the Ozark mountains,  
Where ‘ they found Andromeden and Persea, fairest of mortals ?  
Such measure I'd never hear ! sooner blank-verse chloroform me,  
Seesaw me couplets, gape for me sooner, immense Earth ! ”

Mr. Cayley seeks to be a realist, which is right. He endeavors to infuse into the speeches of his characters a vigor and *vraisemblance* that are highly commendable. But unfortunately in the process he makes them humorous. Agamemnon's exhortation to the heralds, Book 1, reads,

“ Go to the tent, you twain, of Pelidean Achilles,  
Thence to remove sweet-hued Briseis, her hands within your hands.  
See whether he'll give her up, whether he'll have me come about her  
With many good followers, which might still worse for him answer.”

There is not in all his *Iliad* a trace of that grandeur which is the pre-eminent requisite of a translation of Homer. His vigor is the result of an extraordinary combination of archaism, Græcism, and slang.

Among the older translations is one by a man whose works are well known to the gentlemen in the Philosophy department—Thomas Hobbes. It is probably best known by the observation upon it in the preface to Pope's version—a perfectly true judgment, and doubtless caused by the fact that Pope errs just as badly on the other side—to the effect that its poetry is “too mean for criticism.” The following passage gives one a realizing sense of the need for “grandeur” in a rendering of Homer.

“ On Circe waiting-women four attended  
 To do the service of the house, and were  
 From sacred rivers, springs, and groves descended ;  
 Each had her proper work assigned her.  
 One does the chairs with coverings array ;  
 Another does the silver tables spread.  
 And on each one of them a basket lay  
 Of gold, and into it she puts the bread ,  
 The third does in a silver flagon mix  
 The wine and water in a silver pot ;  
 The fourth to make a fire brings in the sticks  
 And for a bath makes ready water hot.’

Those who assert that Homer “ follows his subject,” is commonplace when the subject is commonplace, mean when it is mean, should hail this as an ideal version.

The little-known work of Sotheby, published in 1833, has certain good qualities. It is rapid in diction, fairly literal, and not aggressively commonplace in phraseology. But in the pathetic passages—those passages in which the simplicity of Homer, that art concealing art, is at its height—he fails altogether to make any impression. The two lines into which Homer compresses, somehow, by an exquisite choice of words, by a harmony of sound with sense, all the emotional value of the story of the dog Argus,

*\* Ἄργον δ' αὖ κατὰ μοῖρ' ἔλαβεν μέλανος θανάτῳ,  
 αὐτίκ' ἰδόντ' Ὀδυσῆα ἔεικοστῶ ἐνιαυτῶ,*

these Sotheby renders, quite literally (except for omissions), and quite cheerfully,

“ Then in his twentieth year, as Argus eyed  
 His much loved lord, he gazing on him died.”

It is useless to ask the faintest trace of Hellenism from these early writers, and so we cannot blame him for such a modern turn as—

“ Half the virtue that the God-head gave,  
The God resumes when man becomes a slave.”

The work of Cowper, which deserves a much better fate than it is generally receiving, is a sort of compromise between the old school and the new. It is promising to find, in the preface, the reader “admonished, that the matter found in me, whether he like it or not, is found also in Homer, and that the matter not found in me, how much soever he may admire it, is found only in Mr. Pope.” It is needless to say that Cowper’s *Iliad* does not quite live up to this declaration. If it did, we should not still be seeking a translator of Homer. Nevertheless it is rapid, musical, (far more so than most of the rhymed versions), and in places majestic, and exhibits a degree of classical learning (perhaps to be attributed to the “ingenious Mr. Fuseli”) far in excess of that displayed by most of the true poets who have tried this task.

Besides the many complete translations of one or both of the Homeric poems, there exist numerous fragmentary scraps, in many styles and metres, which must not be passed over. Most of them are written to demonstrate the advantages of some particular metre for rendering Homer, and many of them are of exquisite beauty. It is now generally conceded that hexameters would afford the best metre for the ideal translation of Homer, but no one has yet arisen great enough to carry out the task of writing a complete translation successfully in this metre. That the hexameter is not necessarily responsible for such barbarisms as Simcox’s

“Of sacred Killa, and Tenedos mighty commander,”

is conclusively proved by this celebrated passage of Dr. Hawtrey’s :

“Clearly the rest I behold of the dark-eyed sons of Achaia ;  
Known to me well are the faces of all ; their names I remember :  
Two, two only remain, whom I see not among the commanders,  
Castor fleet in the car,—Polydeukes brave with the cestus,—  
Own dear brethren of mine,—one parent loved us as infants.

Are they not here in the host, from the shores of loved Lakedaimon,  
Or, though they came with the rest in ships that bound through the  
waters,

Dare they not enter the fight, or stand in the council of Heroes,  
All for fear of the shame and the taunts my crime has awakened ?

So said she ;—they long since in Earth's soft arms were reposing,  
Here in their own dear land, their Fatherland, Lakedaimon."

There could be no more conclusive proof of the possibilities of the hexameter than this ; and yet the hexametrical translations of Homer are easily the worst we possess. But the subject of the proper metre for this task is an interminable one, and I shall not approach it. Of Dr. Maginn's Homeric ballads, which are also fragments, I have given you probably as much as you want. Mr. Worseley gives us some interesting hexameter fragments, which shew how much harder sailing he finds it than in the smooth sea of Spenserian stanza.

"Come thou hither and rest, Olyseus, glory of Argos ;  
Stay thy bark for a while, give ear to the Siren-singers.  
Never hath mortal man yet passed in a black ship from us,  
Ere he a strain first hear from the sweet, sarill voice of the Sirens ;  
So he rejoicing goes in the light of a larger wisdom.  
Yea all things we know which once by divine appointment  
Argive men and people of Troy were fated to suffer,  
We know all that is wrought in the wide earth, feeder of all things."

But the field of Homeric translation it will easily be seen is an inexhaustible one, and I am not going to apologize for not touching all sides of so gigantic a subject. I have not considered the pedantic view of translation ; I have only mentioned a very few out of a vast army of translators, and my judgments on these have been of a very *ex pede Herculem* character. In conclusion, let me recommend you all to read the papers "On Translating Homer" by Matthew Arnold. I can do nothing more self-denying than this, for I am indebted to Mr. Arnold for nearly all the ideas expressed in this essay. If, however, you read them, and are not sincerely grateful to me for mentioning them, you are incapable of appreciating good criticism.