

in the work with which we can connect this belongs to a later time, after a great part of the work had been done and a corrected theory of the earth's motion had been made.

(5.) For "soon" read: after five years of diligent research.

(6.) This "must be" conveys no hint of the mode in which the opposite errors of two hypotheses directed Kepler's suspicions to the ellipse as the form of the orbit.

(7.) Mr. Chambers writes as if Kepler first ascertained the form of the orbit and then introduced the principle of areas. But it was the other way. He had assumed this principle long before he dreamed of the orbit not being circular. Indeed, without some such assumption he would not have had sufficient data to determine the shape of the path, since the distance of Mars could not be determined except by an intricate procedure seldom applicable. Indeed, except for movements in latitude too slight to prove much, all that is observed is variable movements in longitude.

(8.) This remark was of course one of the earliest generalizations concerning planetary motion.

(9.) A *superior* planet is meant.

(10.) The discovery was made 1618, May 8. Twenty-seven years before, Kepler had not taken up the pursuit of astronomy.

(11.) Although he puzzled long over the figures, before he happened to light on the true relation, there was nothing to be called systematic research, nothing comparable for an instant with the work upon Mars.

In short, the author correctly states Kepler's laws; but as to how he came by them (further than that two were from studies of the motions of Mars) he seems to have not the slightest idea. To show that the passage is not exceptional, as this comes from p. 10, we will see what we can find on the tenth page from the end. We find this:

"His [Ptolemy's] great work was the celebrated *Μεγάλη σύνταξις*, better known by its Arabian designation of *The Almagest*. This work contains, amongst other things, a review of the labors of Hipparchus; a description of the heavens, including the Milky Way; a catalogue of stars; sundry arguments against the motion of the earth, and notes on the length of the year."

Even the title is wrongly given, and the description of the contents is as if one should explain that the Bible is a work containing among other things a discussion of the age of Moses, a description of Solomon's temple, a list of commandments, sundry exhortations against sloth, and the memoirs of Paul of Tarsus.

53 (3 December 1891) 426

#### MR. WARNER'S "EVIDENCE IN FULL" COMPLETED.

Francis Ellingwood Abbot (1836-1903) was an American philosopher and active religious reformer. He was the founder of the Free Religious Association, editor of *The Index*, and Colonel Bob Ingersoll's running-mate on the Liberal League's presidential ticket of 1880. He was graduated A.B. from Harvard in 1859, along with Peirce, and spent one year at

the Harvard divinity school. In 1863 he was graduated from the Meadville Theological Seminary, and was ordained in the First Unitarian Society of Christians at Dover, New Hampshire, in 1864. When the National Unitarian Conference of 1865 adopted a constitution that referred to its members as "disciples of the Lord Jesus Christ," Abbot found that he could no longer accept the creed of that church, and so set out to organize the Free Religious Association. *The Index*, which was the literary branch of the Association, served Abbot as a forum for his philosophical and theological views. His experience with the Association led Abbot to form the National Liberal League, which became important as the strongest opponent of a drive to secure an amendment to the Constitution citing "God as the source of all authority and power in civil government." In 1881, Abbot received his A.M. and Ph.D. from Harvard in Philosophy. After this, he sought academic positions with Cornell and Harvard, but despite strong recommendations, all attempts failed. He did, however, win a position as temporary replacement for Josiah Royce at Harvard in 1889, during the latter's leave of duty. He authored three books: *Scientific Theism* (1885), *The Way Out of Agnosticism* (1890), and *The Syllogistic Philosophy* (1906), published posthumously.

As Peirce pointed out in his letter of 12 November, the argument between Abbot and Royce arose over Royce's scolding review of Abbot's *The Way Out of Agnosticism*, which appeared in the first number of the first issue of the *International Journal of Ethics*. Abbot's book was a compilation of lectures he had delivered at Harvard in 1889 while taking Royce's place during the latter's leave of absence. Ironically, Royce had recommended Abbot for this position. But upon his return, Royce was outraged when word reached him of certain statements Abbot was alleged to have made concerning Royce's teachings. This can partially explain the vehemence of Royce's review.

Several years prior, however, Royce had already shown his distaste for Abbot's work in a review for *Science* of Abbot's *Scientific Theism*. This is the same work that Peirce reviewed in *The Nation*, and was in its third printing in a German translation. Despite such signs of approval, Royce attacked even Abbot's use of capitals and italics, and characterized the book as indicative of "Dr. Abbot's not uncommon, but highly amusing state of mind." (*Science*, 7:335-338)

Aside from the philosophic merits of Abbot's books, there was a certain measure of pride at stake. Although a classmate of Peirce at Harvard in 1859, Abbot was 45 years old before he took his Ph.D. (1881). And so he was forced to compete for an academic position with men many years his junior. Royce, however, was young, bright, successful, and enjoyed the influential backing of William James, who was responsible for Royce's first position at Harvard. He was already making a name for himself while Abbot was still looking for a permanent job.

Abbot's radical religious views had caused him to be a maverick in the academic world, where success still depended heavily upon religious orthodoxy. Had *The Way Out of Agnosticism* only proved itself to be valuable, it might have become Abbot's "way out of obscurity." But even after the attention drawn to Abbot's cause by Peirce's letter in *The Nation*, Abbot slipped back into the shadows and never attained the prominence he thought was due him.

Joseph Bangs Warner (1848-1923) was an American lawyer. He was graduated A.B. from Harvard in 1869, A.M. in 1872, and LL.B. in 1873. He began his practice in Boston in 1873 with the firm Warner, Warner, and Stackpole. He served as trustee for Radcliffe College and Simmons College, and, together with O. W. Holmes, coedited James Kent's *Commentaries on American Law*.

#### TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your last week's issue, Mr. J. B. Warner professes to give the "evidence in full" respecting Prof. Royce's suppression of my reply to his (the latter's) avowed "attack." The long letter he publishes as "evidence" on this point is evidence of nothing but the lawyer's attempt to put forward his own baseless assumptions in his client's behalf as if they were assured facts. The adroit assump-

tion in this case is, that the "language" of my suppressed reply was improper, and justified exclusion of the reply from the *Journal of Ethics*. This assumption I deny with vigor; and, what is more telling than any denial of mine, Dr. Adler and Dr. Royce, as editors of the *Journal*, denied it themselves, when at first they both accepted the reply for publication, had it put in type, and sent me proofs both of the reply and of Dr. Royce's rejoinder to it. The subsequent rejection of my reply, under Mr. Warner's advice, cannot undo the effect of their previous sanction of it as *perfectly fit for publication*.

But the "evidence in full" on this point cannot be given without showing, by actual quotation, what really was the "language" to which Mr. Warner so unreasonably objected. I have no right to ask you to devote much space to such quotation; but, relying on your well-known fairness, I must ask leave to cite, as a fair specimen of the "language" objected to, the opening of the suppressed reply. The passages here italicised were marked by Dr. Royce himself as the grounds upon which he and his lawyer based their threat of prosecution and their suppression of the reply itself. It will be perfectly clear to any fair-minded man that they were aiming to force me either to concede that Dr. Royce's original article was a legitimate criticism, or else to lose all opportunity of being heard in self-defence.

That his article was a libel, and not a fair criticism at all, has been proved in my pamphlet beyond all possibility of a successful reply; and the reader, bearing this in mind, will judge for himself whether the "language" as such, or whether the effort to defend myself against the libel, was the real ground of Mr. Warner's threatening letter. The following passage from the suppressed reply is a fair sample of its "language" throughout:

"The mere fact that, in the *International Journal of Ethics* for last October, there appeared a hostile review of my book entitled 'The Way Out of Agnosticism,' by Dr. Josiah Royce, assistant professor of philosophy in Harvard College, would not induce me to break my uniform custom of silence in such cases, were it not that Dr. Royce *oversteps the limits of legitimate literary criticism, throws out personal accusations of a slanderous nature, and resorts to empty and undignified official denunciation* in order to flank indirectly a philosophical position which he has not ventured openly to assail. *His mode of attack is a marked case of 'reversion' to controversial methods which, common enough some centuries ago, are happily going out of use to-day. Dr. Royce presumes to accuse me, falsely and injuriously, of 'frequently making, of late, extravagant pretensions as to the originality and profundity of [my] still unpublished system of philosophy,' and of 'sinning against the most obvious demands on literary property rights'; and he even goes so far as to issue a solemn 'professional warning,' formally addressed to 'the liberal-minded public,' against myself as a philosophical thinker and author. Such tactics as these are unknown among reputable literary men. They are justified by no higher ethical principle than that which dictated the old pettifogger's advice to the young one: 'If you have no case, abuse the counsel on the other side.'*

"This paper, therefore, is written *as a reply, not to a critique, but to a libel*. If I notice below what Dr. Royce puts forward as 'criticisms,' it is not because they deserve to be noticed as such, but solely because they are made to serve as the ostensible warrant and support of his libellous 'professional warning.' *And the only reason why I make my defence in these columns is that believing the 'liberal minded public' to be a just judge, I have greater confidence in the court of reason than I have in the courts of law.*

"When civil-service reformers plead the urgent necessity of political reform, they are irrelevantly charged by the adherents of the spoils system with being 'hypocrites and pharisees.' Precisely so, when I plead the urgent necessity of philosophical reform, *I am irrelevantly charged by Dr. Royce, in effect, with being a false pretender, a plagiarist, and an impostor.* The charge is just as true in one case as in the other. But, be the charge true or untrue, the attention of keen and candid minds is not to be diverted by this perfectly transparent device from the main point of reform. In both cases, interests more important than any personal reputation are at stake; and loyalty to interests more important than my own reputation requires me *now to expose Dr. Royce's endeavor to divert attention by irrelevant, useless, and utterly unprovoked vituperation from the main point of philosophical reform.*"

Will any fair man say that the "language" here used is other than temperate, dignified, and parliamentary? I protest against Mr. Warner's attempt to misrepresent the character of my "language," as improper in any degree. A libelled citizen has a right to defend himself against the libel; and, when Dr. Royce blew his bugle-blast of defiance, "We must show no mercy, as we ask none," he deprived himself of all excuse, in the eyes of men who prize the good old English principle of fair play, for seeking refuge behind a menace of prosecution. And here I must express my surprise at Mr. Warner's statement that "Prof. Royce sought my advice in consequence of threats of a law-suit from Dr. Abbot." I never threatened Dr. Royce with a law-suit at all.

FRANCIS E. ABBOT.

CAMBRIDGE, NOVEMBER 28, 1891.

[We cannot print any more letters respecting this controversy.—ED. NATION.]

### 53 (17 December 1891) 474

#### An Introduction to Spherical and Practical Astronomy.

By Dascom Greene, Professor of Mathematics and Astronomy in the Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute. Boston: Ginn & Co. 1891. Pp. viii, 150.

CSP, identification: MS 1365. See also: Burks, *Bibliography*; MS 1371a (draft). This piece is unassigned in Haskell's *Index to The Nation*, v.

Dascom Greene (1825-1900) was graduated in 18 from Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, where he was appointed assistant professor of mathematics and practical astronomy. He wrote on both astronomy and mathematics, and was a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.