

that the fear of wounding my feelings, stayed their hand. Were Prof. Royce's review one of my book, I should probably be considerably stirred-up by his low opinion of me, and should feel the genial latitude of his style, when expressing the same, to be peculiarly exasperating. At the same time I should recognize the inevitableness of such differences of understanding, and should feel that I had no avowable *grievance*, since, unlike those critics who dismiss a volume of poems or a novel with a sneer for which no grounds are given, Prof. Royce had given his own reasons for all that he had said. My only remedy would lie in beating down my critic's philosophy and strengthening my own. Mr. Abbot's remedy of heaping personal outrages upon Prof. Royce and his motives, admits of no excuse but a pathological one. It is truly deplorable that the quarrel should spread beyond the academic world. But since Mr. Peirce has served it up for your readers in what they also may imagine to be an "impartial" statement, it seems but fair that one with a less *ex-parte* knowledge of the facts should also be heard.

WILLIAM JAMES.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, November 15, 1891.

53 (26 November 1891) 408

THE SUPPRESSION OF DR. ABBOT'S REPLY

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Since Mr. Peirce has thought fit to bring this subject before your readers, and to comment on Prof. Royce's conduct, as charged by Dr. Abbot, in stifling Dr. Abbot's reply by a threat of legal proceedings, I feel compelled to ask you to publish the evidence on that point in full.

Dr. Abbot bases his charge upon a letter written by me, as Prof. Royce's counsel. In a pamphlet addressed to the governing boards of Harvard College (but widely circulated and put on public sale), Dr. Abbot characterizes that letter as an attempt, on Prof. Royce's part, "to gag the man he had injured," and formally sums up his accusation by asserting that Prof. Royce "has sought, with incredible cowardice and meanness, to deprive me of all opportunity of being heard in self-defence."

I now give the letter (of which Dr. Abbot publishes only the few lines of formal protest), and also Dr. Abbot's reply. I should premise that I knew nothing of the controversy until Prof. Royce sought my advice in consequence of threat of a law-suit from Dr. Abbot. At that time Dr. Abbot's reply had been set up in type by the *Journal of International Ethics* with the expectation of publishing that as it stood, together with a rejoinder by Prof. Royce, and a final retort which Dr. Abbot was to write, all in the July number. This plan had broken off, as stated by Dr. Abbot in his pamphlet, because Dr. Abbot could not agree with Dr. Adler as to the tone in which he should write his final reply; Dr. Adler requiring a parliamentary tone, while Dr. Abbot demanded a freedom which he called "the freedom of the courts." It is Dr. Abbot's main reply, already in type, which is referred to in my letter. Dr. Adler and Prof. Royce are both editors of the *Journal*.

BOSTON, June 9, 1891.

Dr. Francis E. Abbot, Cambridge, Mass.:

MY DEAR DR. ABBOT: Your article entitled "Dr. Royce's Professional Warning" has been submitted to me as a part of the case upon which my professional advice is sought, and I must call your attention to some passages in it which I trust you will think it well, upon deliberation, to revise.

I will say at the outset that, considering the severity of Dr. Royce's article, I think, for my own part, that you are justified in replying with spirit, and that you should perhaps be allowed more warmth than the ordinary discussion of such subjects calls for. Of that Dr. Royce, I know, would not complain, but in the heat of your reply you have in some places used language which I think you will hardly wish, upon cooler judgment, to allow to remain to lower the tone of your argument.

Conceding, for the moment, that you are right in thinking that Dr. Royce has transgressed the limits of courteous controversy, I must say that your article, in some places, goes far beyond anything that he has said.

On Dr. Royce's behalf, I must warn you that he protests against the publication, or any circulation of it, in its present shape, and must point out to you that it may, if circulated, entail a serious legal responsibility.

In it you charge Dr. Royce with being guilty of "a slanderous attack" and of "libel," and with having called you an "impostor"; you seek to belittle and injure him in his profession and business as a teacher in Harvard College; you imply that he is guilty of wilful misrepresentation; you seek to bring him to contempt by a degrading comparison; you charge him with untruth, with having made a wanton and injurious attack upon your personal reputation, having abused his academical position, compromised the dignity of Harvard College, degraded the office of professor, publicly traduced and libelled a fellow-citizen; and finally you pronounce him professionally incompetent.

Such language, even though used in controverting an irritating review of your book, so far exceeds the proper limits that in my judgment you cannot indulge in it without danger of legal liability.

Permit me, too, as a cool spectator of the controversy, to say that this language greatly weakens and lowers a very forcible argument, and must have the effect of distracting attention from the points you wish to make, and stamping the whole discussion as a strangely undignified attack for such a combatant. And aside from the effect of such an article upon yourself, let me call to your attention the scandal which is brought upon Harvard College by such a public wrangle between two of her instructors.

I have not read carefully the whole of Dr. Royce's article, but I have read the parts which must be most offensive to you; and while I do not defend, in all respects, the tone of the review, I think that you have greatly exaggerated and misinterpreted it. As I said to you on Sunday evening, Dr. Royce has disclaimed, in the strongest way, any intention to wound you, or to reflect in any way upon your personal character; and after this, is it not a perversion to insist upon putting the worst and most personal construction on all that he says, omitting the qualifications which go far to soften his hostile expressions?

As I remember his article, he nowhere calls you an impostor, as you repeatedly charge; and in speaking of you as "sinning against the demands of literary property rights," you omit the word "unaware," which wholly changes the sense.

That the *Journal of Ethics* should publish the article as it now stands is not to be thought of. It could not do so with self-respect. The editors are, however, very willing to publish the body of your reply as you have written it, if you will leave out those passages which are merely personal.

I send with this a copy of your article, with the objectionable passages marked. You will, I think, admit that your argument is untouched, and that enough of anger and indignation are left to save the paper from any appearance of tameness. If these passages are omitted, or so changed as to be free from objection, the *Journal* will publish it in the July number, and without any other comment than a statement that a reply is reserved for the October issue.

I trust that you will adopt my suggestions and make the changes, which I believe will strengthen the article in the minds of those whom you most wish to persuade. You will not overlook the great advantage it will be to you to have your reply appear in the same journal which originally published the review, and I trust that you will be willing, for that reason if no other, to conform to the very obvious requirements which the *Journal* must impose.

I hope you believe me, when I say that I should not advise the *Journal* to refuse the article in its present shape, as I do, unless I were fully persuaded that you are offered the fullest opportunity of reply which fair play can demand.

Very sincerely yours,
J. B. WARNER.

P.S.—Please let me know your decision as soon as possible, as the *Journal* must be made up. Will you kindly return my copy of your article? J. B. W.

LARSEN STREET, CAMBRIDGE, Mass.,
June 9, 1891.

J. B. Warner, Esq., Exchange Building, Boston:

MY DEAR MR. WARNER: I beg leave to acknowledge receipt of your obliging letter of this date, with thanks, and to return at once the enclosed printed paper, as you request.

With great personal regard. I remain

Very sincerely yours,
FRANCIS E. ABBOT.

Dr. Abbot declined to make any change in his reply and it has never been published.

JOSEPH B. WARNER.

BOSTON, November 20, 1891.

53 (26 November 1891) 415

Pictorial Astronomy for General Readers.

By George F. Chambers, F.R.A.S. Macmillan & Co. 1891. 16mo, pp. 267.

CSP. identification: MS 1365. See also: Burks, *Bibliography*. This notice is unassigned in Haskell's *Index to The Nation*, vol. 1.

There is no lack of popular books about astronomy by those who look upon the subject from the inside, as, Herschel, Secchi, Newcomb, Langley, Young, Lockyer, Ball. Mr. Chambers is none of these. He is not a scientific observer of the stars, nor has he an ordinary astronomer's acquaintance with celestial mechanics. He is a well-known compiler of astronomical books, useful in their way, but marked by incompleteness and a want of discrimination. The present little treatise will serve the purpose of a person who wants some light reading with pictures touching most of those important topics of astronomy that call for no mental exertion, about right in most of its statements, and not seriously unjust in many of its appreciations. To show how simple everything is here made, we annotate a short passage taken almost at random. The numerals in parentheses refer to our remarks below:

"In calculating the different positions of Mars (1), and comparing his own observations (2) with those of Tycho Brahe, Kepler was astonished at finding numerous apparent irregularities (3) in Mars's orbit, and still more in its distance from the earth (4). He soon saw (5) that the orbit could not be circular, and eventually recognized that it must be (6) an ellipse, with the sun occupying one of the two foci. . . . The path of a planet once traced, the next thing (7) to determine was what regulated the irregularities observed in its course. Kepler, having remarked (8) that the velocity of a planet (9) seemed to be greatest when it was nearest to the sun, and least when it was most remote from the sun, proceeded to suggest that an imaginary line joining the centre of a planet and the centre of the sun would pass over equal areas in equal times. . . . He sought to discover if any relation subsisted between the diameters of the orbits and the times occupied by the planets in traversing them. After twenty-seven years (10) of laborious research (11), he found out that a relationship did subsist, and thus was able to assert his third law."

(1.) Kepler did not set out by calculating places of Mars from its elements, but on the contrary by endeavoring to deduce from the observations the eccentricity of the orbit.

(2.) At the time referred to, Kepler is not known to have observed Mars, and only a very few of his observations were used by him in the investigation of the motions of that planet.

(3.) What incited Kepler to his great work was not finding irregularities, but a belief that by a method of calculation different from that in use (based on apparent instead of mean oppositions) known seeming irregularities could be made to disappear.

(4.) The distance from the earth could not be a subject of observation, and consequently irregularities in this distance could not be detected. The only thing