

be said to have exercised influence, and made the masculine brain at this date the superior" (pp. 167-9).

"It does not militate against their right to happiness if women are not the intellectual equals of men; but few will seriously deny that they are capable of developing into equals, and that it is the fault of men that they have not done so. When women have had the intellectual training for generations that men have had, so that if education itself does not become instinct, the habits of education do—when they have had for such time the same freedom, the friction, and the scope, equality will no longer be a matter of question" (p. 130).

In other words, inheritances along the line of sex seems to be assumed by the writer without question. I have always been taught that when inheritance was not from both parents, it very frequently, if not more frequently, was from father to daughter and from mother to son; and if education plays a part in inheritance, we should be inclined to pity the sons rather than the daughters of uneducated women.

Even Mrs. Spofford seems to admit this idea when she gets away from the past and her theories as to it, and regards the present and the future and what the advancement of women may do for coming generations:

"Their upward movement in the last two generations is already seen in its reaction on men, for it is impossible that their continued aspiration and struggle and achievement should not have had effect on their sons. Another century may see yet greater marvels than the present, since men only attain the whole of their own rights and a possibility for the whole of their growth when they inherit from the side of their mothers as well as from that of their fathers a complete and trained intellectual force" (p. 171).

GEORGE HEMPL.

ANN ARBOR, September 22, 1893.

WAS COPERNICUS A GERMAN?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your review of Mr. Oliver Lodge's book on the 'Pioneers of Science,' I was quite surprised to read that the father of Copernicus—and Copernicus himself necessarily too—was believed to have been a German. I had always taken it for a well-established fact that Copernicus was a Pole by birth and nationality. Copernicus is merely a Latinized form of the original name Kopernik, which corresponds with it in sound; and Kopernik is not a German, but a Slavonic name. It is not Polish, but Bohemian, and in the light of documentary evidence the family of the Koperniks can really be traced back to Bohemian ancestry. The *zemani* (knights) of Kopernik were Bohemian noblemen whose name appears in the historical records of the fourteenth century, and has been preserved to this day in the name of the Bohemian village Kopernik, their former seat, situated between the cities of Kosmonosy and Bakov in northeastern Bohemia. In the records of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the name can no longer be found, but a clue to its disappearance may be found in the archives of the city of Cracow. From the 'Acta Consularia Cracoviensia' (Proceedings of the Cracow City Council), *ad annum* 1396, we learn that A. D. 1396 citizenship was conferred upon Nicolaus Kopernik. The attesting witness, a citizen of Cracow named Dambrova, testifies that Nicolaus Kopernik had come to Cracow from Bohemia. This testimony is highly important. It is corroborated by the Bohemian origin of the name Kopernik, derived from the word *kopr*.

Historically, the naturalization of Nicolaus can easily be explained. The relations of the two Slavonic kingdoms, Bohemia and Poland,

and notably of the two great cities of Prague and Cracow, were friendly, and, as the two languages do not very materially differ, Mr. Nicolaus Kopernik found little difficulty in establishing himself at Cracow and finally obtaining its citizenship. He probably emigrated to Cracow towards the end of the fourteenth century. His family evidently was Bohemian, but his sons and grandsons spoke Polish. One of his grandsons, the eldest, also named Nicolaus (the frequent occurrence of this name in the Kopernik family is not to be overlooked), left Cracow in 1402 and settled at Thorn, where, on the 19th of February, 1464, his son Nicolaus, the great astronomer, was born.

These facts show pretty clearly, I think, that both Copernicus and his father were Poles of Bohemian ancestry, and, therefore, doubly Slavs. I add some minor facts which may throw more light upon this question: The coat-of-arms of the Bohemian Koperniks bears the figure of a man; so does the escutcheon of Copernicus. Copernicus went to study at a Polish University, Cracow, in preference to that of Leipzig, and when in Italy, at the University of Padua, he registered as a Pole and not as a German. J. J. KRÁL.

CHICAGO, ILL., September 18, 1893.

[If our correspondent has not heard of Copernicus being called a German, then he has not heard of perhaps the bitterest and most loud-resounding literary dispute of our day. We simply followed the authority of Prowe, whose great biography in three volumes (Berlin, 1883, 1884) occupied many years of its author's life, and was, we fancy, chiefly written in Thorn. Prowe says that until the father Niklas married Barbara Watzelrode, the family was "ein durch und durch deutsches Geschlecht." The greatest living historian of mathematics, Moritz Cantor, in a letter published in the *Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung* for August 1, 1876, fully sustains this opinion. It has further been defended by Max Curtze, Perlbach, A. Knoetel, and S. Günther. The Italians, who almost lead Europe upon questions of the history of science, seem to favor the German side. All the arguments advanced by our correspondent will be found fully considered in the above works.]

Although Greek was not taught in Cracow, writings brought to light in 1873 show that Copernicus had more knowledge in that direction than one would suspect from the 'De Revolutionibus.' He gives a Greek form of his name, *Νικολαυος Κοπερνικος*, showing that he understood the first two syllables to mean *copper*. The astronomer's family, in fact, was a family of coppersmiths; by copper they had made a fortune. Now, the Thorn directory for 1422 shows that Margaret Koppernigk had business connections in the town of Frankenstein in Silesia, and in other ways the family has been traced to that point. Near that town is a hamlet named Koppernick, where there is an old coppersmith. This neighborhood is distinctly German, and always has been so, although it is on the very border of Bohemia, and was at one time in the kingdom of Bohemia.

As for the assertion that Copernicus was registered as a Pole at Padua, that was investigated, at the instance of Prince Boncompagni, by Favaro, and found utterly baseless. On the other hand, Carlo Malagola, in his admirable work on Urceo Codro, showed that "Niccolò Kopperlingk di Thorn" had registered as a law student at Bologna in the album of the "Nazione Al-manna." This may not prove much, but it is, at least, not an invention. As for such coat-of-arms as this family of coppersmiths may have used, it can prove nothing at all. They never were ennobled. It may be granted that Copernicus (*ἀνὴρ πατριδὸς λόγου κρείττων*, Scaliger called him) was, as a member of the Polish Parliament, a sturdy adversary of the Teutonic knights. But, on his father's side, the evidence seems to be that his blood was German.

We take this opportunity to correct an inadvertence not pointed out by our correspondent, by which, in the notice under discussion, we spoke of the bishopric of "Regensburg" in place of Ermeland.—ED. NATION.]

THE DIVISION OF WORDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you allow me a few words on one of the subjects mentioned in a communication from me in the *Nation* of August 31? What you then said in answer to my objections to the division of words in the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* seems to conflict with your practice, which is in accordance with the rule laid down by Lindley Murray and followed by the English press everywhere. This rule is to divide according to etymology, and, when this makes no demands, then on the vowel, as it is called, unless in the case of two or more consonants. Apparently, in the United States, the only rule followed is that of pronunciation, and this leads sometimes, even in the works of our best publishers, to such divisions as *noth-ing*. This has a high flavor of illiteracy, but I can't see that it is worse than some of the cases quoted, *viz.*, *physiol-ogy*, *prom-ising*, etc.

You say truly that the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* is not an official publication, nor is it published at a university press; but a magazine issued under the sanction of a picked body of graduates, with a long list of distinguished officers and council, would never take shelter under such a plea, nor would these consider themselves otherwise than responsible for the reputation of their university.

Possibly your learned correspondent "F. H." might give us some light on this subject.

H. U., '91.

[We should not like to have our own practice scrutinized too closely for consistency. A narrow column like the *Nation's* precludes the uniformity, which may be exacted in book-work. Some of our first printing-houses fall under our correspondent's censure, but for ourselves we regard the question rather as one of taste than of literacy. An authoritative treatise to harmonize usage is wanting.—ED. NATION.]

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY