

and the other party possibly be living in America. Mr. May had his fellow-geographers all had the same weakness for classical compounds is not even hinted at in most of the books. As Mr. Mason has given a photographic copy of the original text, it is perhaps superfluous to call attention to two mistakes in transcription, viz., *hæc* for *has*, and *fortitæ* for *fortitæ*.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

ABINGDON COLLEGE, OLYMPIA, WASH.
September 25, 1892.

THE BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The hopes of one student were mightily raised when Mr. Samuel A. B. Abbott averred that there was "not a particle of foundation" for the statement that the Boston Public Library "no longer grants to persons actually engaged in authorship the privilege of drawing books, though non-residents." Certainly I knew there were several particles of foundation, at least for the statement, but I inferred that the Trustees were not aware of such facts, and were determined they should not exist. I therefore ventured to address the President of the Board, saying this, and asking, for the reason that I am writing a course of lectures for the Lowell Institute, on the History of Science, that I be allowed to borrow Gilbert's treatise, 'De Magnete.' I offered, at the same time, if desired, to deposit \$50 as security for the book, which usually fetches about \$35 in the market. My letter was returned to me by Mr. Abbott unanswered. I wonder how the kingdoms of this world appear when viewed from that awful pinnacle, the Presidency of the Board of Trustees of the Public Library of the City of Boston. What funny little creatures ordinary men must seem! Such a situation would be quite enough to render many a poor gentleman so dizzy that he would not know whether he was telling the truth or not.

O. S. PRINCE.

Notes.

MR. WHITTIER'S literary executor, Mr. Samuel T. Pickard, who has been charged with the preparation of the poet's Life, desires the loan of any autograph letters that may be serviceable to that end. Mr. Pickard's address is No. 44 Exchange Street, Portland, Me.

Additional announcements by Houghton, Mifflin & Co. are, 'An American Missionary in Japan,' by Dr. Gordon; 'Children's Rights,' by Mrs. Wiggins; 'Zachary Phips,' an historical novel by E. L. Bynner; and a holiday edition of Longfellow's 'Evangeline,' with Darley's illustrations reduced.

Mr. Edward Eggleston, Elizabeth Eggleston Beelye, and Allegra Eggleston will collaborate a series of popular historical works, called 'Delights of History,' beginning with 'The Story of Columbus.' D. Appleton & Co. will be the publishers.

Ginn & Co. publish directly 'The Place of the Story in Early Education, and Other Essays,' by Sara E. Wilcox, with an introductory note by President G. Stanley Hall.

We have referred more than once to the effect of the new copyright legislation in making the publication of plays again profitable. Mr. W. S. Gilbert had already printed the most of his plays, and Mr. Bronson Howard had put two or three of his into print. Mr. Pinero is now engaged in publishing regularly all his more successful plays. It is this state of

affairs, perhaps, which has helped to bring about the discussion now raging in London as to the reason why the British novelists do not write for the theatre. Some of them do, notably Mr. Robert Buchanan and Mr. Hall Caine. Now it is announced that there will shortly be published a volume containing three plays written by Mr. Robert Louis Stevenson in collaboration with Mr. W. E. Henley. One of these plays, "Deacon Brodie," has been acted in New York and elsewhere in America. Another, "Beau Austin," has had a few experimental performances in London. The third, "Admiral Guineas," has not as yet been produced anywhere. None of them is of recent writing; indeed, all three of them were privately printed at least six or seven years ago.

The revived interest in the South Sea marked by recent English fiction and by the republication of Mr. Stoddard's 'South Sea Idylls' is fanned afresh by the U. S. Book Co.'s reprint of Herman Melville's works, beginning with 'Typee' and its sequel 'Omoo.' Mr. Arthur Stedman prefixes to the first-named narrative a biographical sketch of the author, whose portrait also accompanies the same volume.

We have already noticed that portion of the 'Gentleman's Magazine Library' (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.) which relates to English Topography. This series is compiled by George L. Gomme, and the second volume, recently issued, covers the notes relating to the counties of Cambridge, Cheshire, Cornwall, and Cumberland. Its 328 pages, however, do not contain anything very interesting; the only article of any literary merit being that on Morwenstow in Cornwall, written by its vicar, the late brilliant and eccentric poet, R. S. Hawker. As a supplement to a good gazetteer of England, these volumes have a certain value, though the contributions to the old 'Gentleman's Magazine' were of course fragmentary and incomplete. The old engravings were the most valuable part, and these are omitted in the reprint. We should have preferred the illustrations without the text, if either was to be dropped.

The twelfth edition of Hoblyn's 'Dictionary of Terms Used in Medicine and the Collateral Sciences' (London: Whittaker; New York: Macmillan) is chiefly, as the editor, Dr. Price, advertises in the preface, changed by way of additions, and among these he specifies the newer words and phrases relating to bacteriology (though we observe that *microbe* is not introduced), and the indication of the period in which celebrated physicians lived. Public opinion, it appears, has not sanctioned the reformatory attempt to substitute *k* for *c* as the equivalent of the Greek *k*, so the *kakos*, *kephal*, and *kerato* of the tenth edition have been restored to their place among the *c*'s. The Greek of the Dictionary, by the way, is not to be judged for its accuracy by the unfortunate *κύμα* (for *κύμα*) which still disfigures the preface to the tenth edition, here repeated.

Although since the foundation of the Grollier Club in New York there are fewer writers who refer to the famous collector as though he were a binder—a blunder made by the London *Daily Telegraph* more than once—yet the facts of Grollier's life are little known. The standard book on the subject is M. Leroux de Lincy's 'Recherches,' published in Paris twenty-six years ago. Mr. W. L. Andrews has now prepared a brief biography, 'Jean Grollier de Servier, Viscount d'Aguesy. Some Account of his Life and of his famous Library.' This is a pleasantly but carelessly written booklet, of

interest chiefly from its illustrations, some of them in colors, reproducing the Grollier bindings now in New York. These plates, prepared by Mr. Bierstadt's artotype process, are excellent, but it is to be regretted that they represent almost the same bindings as were admirably reproduced in the *Century*, two or three years ago, to illustrate an account of the Grollier Club. The typography of Mr. Andrews's little book is such as we expect from the DeVine Press.

Prof. Charles Letourneau contributes to the Contemporary Science Series (London: Walter Scott; New York: Scribners) a treatise entitled 'Property: Its Origin and Development.' He begins with an account of property among animals, and, following the institution down through savage and barbarous times, leaves it at the end of the feudal system. While he has shown great industry in collecting all sorts of information, much of which is not without interest, his work is wholly uncritical. The tales of all travellers are listened to by him with the credulity of an Herodotus, and it makes little difference whether they concern the institution of property or not. The whole of Plutarch's account of the legislation of Lycurgus is accepted as if it were the testimony of an eye-witness. Of course much that is cited by Prof. Letourneau is from trustworthy informants, but the book is not of a kind to be admitted into any really scientific series.

T. Y. Crowell & Co. publish a little volume, entitled 'Equitable Taxation,' which is made up of seven essays by different authors. The appearance of such a book indicates that the subject is attracting the attention of students, but we find nothing in these essays that shows any originality of thought; and they are too slight to contain many of the lessons of experience.

Of somewhat more importance is a book entitled 'Who Pays Your Taxes?' compiled by Mr. Bolton Hall, issued by the authority of the New York Tax Reform Association, and published by Putnam's in their "Questions of the Day" series. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it shows the existence of an aggressive movement to abolish taxation of personal property and concentrate it upon real estate.

'English Social Reformers' is the title of a work by H. de B. Gibbins (London: Methuen & Co.) which reviews the life and deeds of a number of men who have sought to improve the condition of their fellows. The selection ranges from 'Piers the Plowman' to Carlyle and Ruskin. Its spirit may be judged from the statement that Lord Shaftesbury incurred "opprobrium, contempt, and misrepresentation from interested people like the late John Bright."

Social questions have aroused such intensity of feeling in England of late years that it is difficult for a foreigner to obtain information as to matters of fact that is not distorted by the prejudices of the informant. 'The Rural Exodus,' however, by P. Anderson Graham (London: Methuen & Co.), is an impartial discussion of the circumstances of the agricultural laborer in England, and, as it is based upon the personal observation of the author, continued through many years in most of the English shires, it is a really valuable contribution to our knowledge of a problem—the movement of population from the country to the towns—which is not less perplexing in the New World than in the Old.

The return of the cholera has brought down from the booksellers' shelves two works, both written in 1885 and both especially designed for professional readers. One, 'A Treatise on

P 00507

the same subject as those in the thirteenth. They cover the dates from November 6, 1776, to March 14, 1777. We see Lord Stormont, the English Ambassador in Paris, a haughty, ill-mannered man, who yet thinks himself very polite and diplomatic, remonstrating with the French Ministers and trying to bully them. They are lying to him, and he knows it, but neither side is ready to throw away the mask. Both countries expect war, and both are willing to postpone it.

In a letter written by the American Commissioners in France to the Committee of Correspondence of Congress in Philadelphia, we get a glimpse of the methods by which the English Ministers are recruiting their armies in America:

"The Anspachers who were to be embarked in Holland mutinied & refused to proceed; so that their Prince was obliged to go with his Guards & force them on: A Gentleman of Rotterdam, writes us that he saw Numbers brought bound Hands & Feet in Bouts to that place. This does not seem as if much Service can be expected from such unwilling Soldiers." (1448.)

The incident referred to was not unknown. The British Government, among its contracts for "Hessians," included one for a contingent of the subjects of the Margrave of Anspach-Bayreuth. The soldiers who were thus sold marched out from Anspach in two regiments, with 101 chasseurs and 44 artillerymen—in all, 1,285 men. They marched in good order to the neighborhood of the little walled town of Ochsenfurth, which is prettily situated on the Main, and which belonged at that time to the Bishop of Würzburg. Here, toward nightfall, they were put into the boats in which they were to float down stream to Holland. But one night aboard made the hearts of these landmen sink within them. They had enlisted to face the enemy, but not the perils of the deep and rapid Main, or of that even greater expanse of water of which they had vaguely heard as the Ocean. They were willing to stand their ground, but they wanted ground to stand on; so they broke out into mutiny and rebellion, pushed their boats ashore, and refused to obey their officers.

Here was news to disturb the serenity of the Most Serene Highness, sitting there quietly in the palace at Anspach and wondering in a dreamy way on what day he might expect the first instalment of the subsidy he was to receive for the services of these very troops. A fine time he expects to have spending that money. He has planned a most charming journey to Paris. Visions of the Boulevards, with their rows of smaller theatres, of the Palais Royal and its mixed company, of Versailles and the court, are chasing each other in somewhat confused fashion through His Serene Highness's day-dream. The young Queen of France is smiling most graciously on a prince supposed to have leanings toward her native Austria—but a chamberlain has burst into the room: "The troops, Durchlauchtster Herr, the troops are in revolt!" "What does he say?" The Margrave is out of his arm-chair. "Bring me my boots! Superment! not those things!—the riding-boots! Never mind the watch! No need of a carpet-bag. My gray horse and such cavalry as are on guard, and see that the pistols are in the holsters!" And so His Highness gallops off to Ochsenfurth, and appears among his naughty children by the waterside, and coaxes and drives them aboard, and even accompanies them down the river, stopping at Hannau to borrow some clean shirts, and brings them to Rotterdam, where Dr. Franklin hears

of them; but His Serene Highness does not go with his men to America.

Perhaps it would have been better for their reputation and his own had he done so. Perhaps in that case Sir Henry Clinton would not have found it necessary to send the Anspachers round by water from Philadelphia to New York in the summer of 1773, with the invalids and the non-combatants instead of including them in his marching army. Perhaps the German prince would have shown himself a brave man if an unscrupulous one, willing to sell his own body for foreign service as well as those of his subjects. But no, the Margrave returned to Anspach, picked up his watch and pocketed his subsidy, and went off to Paris after all.

Distinction and the Criticism of Belief. By Alfred Sidgwick. Longmans. 1893.

MR. SIDGWICK enjoys a certain reputation, he carries an air of distinction and mundanity in his style, and he professes to discuss questions of logic in a fresh and enlightened way; so that we open his books in high expectation. But we lay them down with a sigh. All that has been accomplished in this department of thought since the days when it was possible for a Hegel to publish such attempts at analysis as Hegel's were, might as well have remained unrecorded as far as Mr. Sidgwick's teachings are concerned. Now, that a man can do fine work in logic without being well read in its literature, several eminent instances render more than evident. But the requisite to such fruitfulness is an extraordinarily vigorous mind, that brings forth genuine flowers of thought, bright, delicate, and redolent of suggestion, and not mere fabrications of tissue-paper, needing wires stuck through them to hold them in shape.

The author opens by explaining that the subject of his studies is Ambiguity. This promises well, for there is nothing thinkers of his quality need more to study. But we soon find ourselves wondering whether he knows what the word ambiguity means. He can hardly be unaware there is such a fault, but he appears to have little dread of it. The real topic of his book is not that, but vagueness. Ambiguity is a confusion between ideas quite distinct, such as the *unlimited* and the *immeasurable*; and though 'Distinction' does not treat of this, it richly illustrates it. Vagueness is an indeterminacy in the limits of the application of an idea, as to how many grains of sand are required to make a *heap*, and the like. It is not necessarily a fault of reasoning; in its lower degrees it is but an unavoidable and harmless imperfection of thought. The problem Mr. Sidgwick sets himself is to note the precautions needful that vagueness may not lead into positive error; and a problem of elementary simplicity it is. Yet 280 pages might suffice to muddle it, and this volume has 278. An efficient aid in treating such a subject, so as to satisfy the skimmer of books that he has gone over matter which would have been worth reading—and this class numbers important critics—is a vocabulary well chosen to render the meanings of dubious propositions questionable, and to dress up familiar ideas in queer disguises.

Mr. Sidgwick informs us that "distinction as such—distinction at all—is the separation of kinds; and the notion of separate kinds is unavoidably opposed to the notion of differences which are merely of degree." The first half of this statement is, of course, true, if the writer chooses to take the word "distinction" in the

sense which makes it so. In the received language of logic the separation of kinds is called *division*, and *distinction* is restricted to a separation of significations; in metaphysics *distinction* is any kind of otherness. But the second part of the statement, that a "distinction" cannot be merely quantitative, is a fair specimen of Mr. Sidgwick's logic. Is there any "distinction" between the color of scarlet iodide of mercury and that of Paris green? If not, we fear the new meaning of "distinction" is not a very useful one. The two colors are defined by the following equations:

$$\text{Scarlet} = .78 R + 0.10 G - 0.05 B.$$

$$\text{Emerald} = -0.03 R + 0.91 G - 0.13 B,$$

where R, G, and B denote a standard red, green, and blue respectively. It is seen that the colors differ only by the magnitudes of certain coefficients. There seems to be some conflict here.

Is Mr. Sidgwick quite sure of his position? Here is his argument, with which he is plainly very well satisfied: "In order to put any quaining into the name 'difference in kind,' we must have some alternative contrasted with it, and that alternative is 'difference in degree.'" What shall we say of this reasoning? It is highly philosophical, no doubt; but a favorite division with Mr. Sidgwick is that of thought into philosophy and good sense.

He tells us that wherever there is continuity, every distinction must be vague and hazy in its outlines. If he means that a surface cannot be part scarlet and part emerald, with a sharp boundary between them, he is making a large draft upon the confiding trust of the reader. But on p. 72 Mr. Sidgwick lets drop a remark about continuity (and a long annotation shows it to be no inadvertency) which disqualifies him from teaching the properties of continuity, by showing him ignorant of one of the fundamental discriminations established by modern discussions, and no longer in intelligent dispute. The remark in question implies that infinite divisibility—that is, the presence, in a row of points, of intermediate points between every two points—excludes the existence of finite gaps in the row. But put this to the test. From the whole series of rational fractions remove $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{3}{4}$ and all fractions intermediate between those in value. This makes a gap in the series; yet it remains as true of the series so mutilated as it was of the uncut series, that if any two fractions which belong to it are given, a fraction of intermediate value can be found, belonging to it.

Mr. Sidgwick says that if nature is continuous, it certainly follows that "the laws of thought" (the quotation-marks are his) are false in every case, as applied to actual things. By the laws of thought he means the principles of identity, contradiction, and excluded middle, which he says are "usually" so called. If he would look into the last fifty treatises on logic in German, English, and French, he would find, we think, that these principles are not now usually called the laws of thought. Any deeper acquaintance with the actual state of logical analysis would show that such a designation is the mark of an adolescent and degenerate school of logicians. But let us see what his reasons are for saying these principles are falsified by continuity. In the case of the principle of identity, the reason is that "any actual A has been non-A and will be non-A again; it has therefore some non-A in it." But suppose we grant this (though it therefore is absurd), it does not touch the principle of identity, which simply says, "A is A"—i.e., every term can be predicated of itself—

The following is taken from page 325:

and makes no reference to the relation between A and non-A. For the principle of contradiction his reason is, that "any actual A may deserve to be called non-A." For the principle of excluded middle his reason is, that "between the actual A's and non-A's there is always a middle region, or borderland." Besides being the baldest possible *petitiones principii*, these reasons overlook the paradox which really does give to continuity an appearance of inconsistency. If a surface be painted part red and part green, it is true that points on the boundary-line are equally green and red, and thus for them it seems that either the principle of contradiction or that of excluded middle must be violated in form. But this is not true of points in general, nor of any region, as Mr. Sidgwick's reasons imply. The violation of consistency is merely apparent, as any sound brain will feel. Every portion of the surface is either red or green, those which cross the boundary being partly red and partly green. But a point is not a portion of a surface; and the true characters of the points with reference to the colors are three: namely, they are either (1) wholly surrounded by red portions, or (2) wholly surrounded by green portions, or (3) partly surrounded by red and partly by green portions. Literally, nothing but a surface is colored; to call a point colored is a figure of speech, and this figure of speech it is which alone gives the appearance of a violation of the principle of contradiction.

But enough of this. The spectacle of Mr. Alfred Sidgwick grappling with the problem of continuity is like an infant slapping the face of the Great Sphinx: it is so ridiculous as to become positively touching. He is more in his element with such questions as these: "Is snow a thing, or is it only an accidental state of matter? And is water, for that matter, anything more than an imperfectly stable condition of its two component gases?" He reaches his largest proportions in our eyes when we find him criticising with success the reasoning in those gigantic efforts of intellect, the debates in the British House of Commons, such as the following:

"Lord R. Churchill—He says it is well known in war that movements which are offensive in their nature are sometimes defensive in their essence.

"Mr. Gladstone—Offensive in their form.

"Lord R. Churchill—What does that come to—that the attack of Gen. Graham was offensive in its form but not in its nature? Three thousand men or more were slaughtered, as a matter of form, by movements which were not offensive in their nature!"

Until our "G. B." has his way, it may be feared we shall not hear debating like that in the House of Representatives. In this country we have not time for such reasonings, nor for the other argumentations which Mr. Sidgwick is occupied with refuting, nor for the closely similar ones with which he would replace them.