

ligious sacredness, and happiness the aspect of a duty. Two volumes, not of this special propagandum, but which have added to the serenity of existence, are "The Pleasures of Life," by Sir John Lubbock, and "The World Beautiful," by Lillian Whiting.

The cardinal principle of the new teaching is the power of the mind over the body—the exposition of the fact that disease and weakness in their attack upon the citadel of health receive treacherous aid from within. Fears, apprehensions, undue conviction of the force of hereditary tendency, nervous and muscular strain, and a whole brood of similar evils, are shown to be amenable to the sane and vigorous exercise of the will. Excessive emotionalism is combated by physical diversion and rest. Alluring ideals of self-control, serenity, and usefulness are held up to nervous invalids until a new heaven and a new earth open before them. A pain forgotten becomes a pain half cured, and at last all the force of the will is enlisted in a passive resistance to the conditions of ill health. This is by no means a new gospel,—being probably, in some guise or other, as old as Æsculapius,—but undeniably it has taken a new hold in this country, particularly among women, and the results, present and prospective, are a subject of congratulation. The delicate, die-away, tight-laced type of young woman, popular a generation ago, has long been out of favor, and a robust but not less feminine type has taken her place. This is not wholly due to athletics, but to the fact that men and women have reached a serener and broader view of life. This shows itself, even if a little artificially, in the "Don't Worry" clubs, in the associations for the study of longevity, and in many other less public manifestations.

One of the desiderata to which this line of thinking is sure to contribute is the substitution of morality for emotionalism in religion. Probably more than any other people in the world we have suffered from the misdirection of the conscience into emotional channels—into something corresponding to a highly wrought love-affair, instead of the deep-felt but undemonstrative adhesion to ideals of right living. The proportion of inmates of sanatoriums due to this cause is so appalling that it behooves religious teachers to look to the doctrine of relaxation, not as to a foe, but as to an ally in the uplifting of humanity to a greater efficiency of moral power.

"Wanted: Gentlemen."

THE exhibition of a copious lack of that gracious quality in the actions of a certain prominent official has brought up again the fragrant theme of gentlemanliness. In this connection, it has been declared by an undoubted expert that what is needed in a certain department of our public service is a greater number of "gentlemen." An eminent scholar, very much of a gentleman himself, the other day expressed a desire to see a public discussion of the subject, from a purely disinterested and literary point of view. It is indeed a very good and timely subject to discuss; and in a democracy like ours it can be discussed

without offense; for there has grown up a democratic amplification of the term which makes it entirely convenient for any two citizens to exchange views freely on the subject, no matter what contrasts may be apparent in their social positions. In fact, under democratic influences the original meaning of the word would seem almost to have disappeared. The idea that a "gentleman" must be of aristocratic birth has small consideration nowadays; that bearing of the phrase carries, indeed, little more than a philological suggestion. The modern note was struck by one Oliver Cromwell when he said: "I honor a gentleman *that is so indeed!*" It is notorious now that a coal-heaver may, without risk of contradiction, say of another, in view of any generous or pleasing action: "He ain't no snide; he 's a gentleman."

It is interesting to note how the dictionaries work steadily along in their definition to the modern uses of the word. Take the Century Dictionary, for example. Go back to the word "gentle," and you find your "*gen(t)-s*, race, family, clan"; your "noble or good birth." Under "gentleman" itself the definitions begin, quite conventionally, with "a man of good family," and easily expand to "in a loose sense, any man whose breeding, education, occupation, or income raises him above menial service or an ordinary trade." Down the page the word still further expands so as to cover any "man distinguished for fine sense of honor, strict regard for his obligations, and consideration for the rights and feelings of others." The dictionary refers to a still greater broadening of the phrase in its application to the human male in general, as where the polite orator addresses his audience as "ladies and gentlemen." But this latter interpretation is as foreign to the discussion as it would be to the use of the word "lady" in the not unknown locution: "Tell the woman of the house that the lady as does her washing is waiting to see her."

Robert Louis Stevenson endeavored to reconcile the old with the new—the gentle-birth definition with the democratic definition that concerns itself with actual and existing traits. "We in the present," he said, "and yet more our scientific descendants in the future, must use, when we desire to praise a character, the old expression 'gentleman,' in nearly the old sense—one of a happy strain of blood, one fortunate in descent from brave and self-respecting ancestors, *whether clowns or counts.*"

'T is a matter for hair-splitting, no doubt. Yet we are inclined to cherish the feeling that there are uses in the old-fashioned meanings of the phrase which may be to some extent worth preserving till the hoped-for day arrives when all men shall be well born, in the view of the scientist as well as of the philanthropist, and, being well born (that is, born of healthy, gentle, and brave parents), shall be themselves brave, gentle, and considerate. Meantime it is well to say of the good and gentle deed of a rough and ill-bred man that it is a gentlemanly deed; but is it not confusing to say of an ill-bred man—one who, albeit unconsciously, wounds others by his untrained

actions—that, because he is not incapable of kindness, therefore he is a gentleman? Does or does not such a use of the term tend to destroy an ideal of constantly noble, generous, and considerate manners?—which ideal, in the interest of the race, should continuously be held up and striven after.

Though, under the cloak of inherited or acquired good manners, many a dastard has done all the ill that gave him pleasure, still the *noblesse oblige* of feudalism has been one of the factors of the world's advance in civilization. If the feudal gentleman was a necessity, so, too, is the democratic gentleman.

Now, Stevenson thought that with the decay of ceremonial the part of the gentleman is the more difficult to play. A celebrated critic of American institutions has said, however, that good manners are more common in America than among any other people. When asked to explain his assertion, he replied that consideration is the foundation of good manners, and that there is less insolence and more consideration here than in any other country with which he is familiar. But, again, an American philosopher has maintained that it is the cheerful "mission of America to vulgarize the world."

Whether or not a democratic society conduces to true gentlemanliness, there can be no doubt that the realization of the ideal of gentlemanliness, as it is now defined and understood, tends to the cure not merely of superficial inelegancies, but of those deeper evils whose existence troubles the philanthropist and the patriot. A good deal of Washington's world-resounding patriotism was just plain, every-day, decent gentlemanliness. Compare his considerate and disinterested political leadership—compare Abraham Lincoln's—with the careers of the "political leaders" whose methods have recently attracted the curiosity of courts and investigating committees! Leave out the morals of it—the undemocratic character of the "government" thus exposed; withdraw the mind from contemplating the depths of political corruption uncovered; and think only of the grotesque ungentlemanliness of conducting public affairs, under a so-called democratic system, not on the line of public policies, but for the immediate purpose of feathering the nest of the "statesman" himself!

Gentlemanliness in the pulpit would drive out the mountebank; gentlemanliness in journalism would exclude whatever there is inconsiderate, salacious, and dishonorable; the gentlemanly and ladylike would drive from the stage the vulgar and the indecent. Gentlemanliness in politics would extinguish scandalous lying and a hundred smart practices. Gentlemanliness among races and nations would be only another name for Christian consideration and forbearance on a larger scale; it would put an end to international bullying, and would bring, finally, that era of universal peace for which the true heart of man is forever hoping.

There are some who will say that a gentlemanly world would be an effeminate, decadent, and contemptible world—that the hardy virtues are de-

sirable, even at the cost of any amount of uncouthness and brutality. But the selfish and the brutal in man needs no reinforcement; and looking over the whole face of the earth at the present epoch, we do not see that there is the slightest danger to be anticipated from laying rather heavy stress, just now, on the virtues catalogued in the dictionary as belonging to "a man distinguished for fine sense of honor, strict regard for his obligations, and consideration for the rights and feelings of others."

"The Century's" Prizes for College Graduates.

AN incident attending on the appearance of this number of the magazine is the closing of the second competition for THE CENTURY'S literary prizes. The contestants, whose manuscripts must be in on June 1, are students who received the degree of Bachelor of Arts during the commencement season of 1898, the object of the competition being to give a literary turn to the activity of graduates during the first year out of college. The announcement of the winners of the prizes will be made in THE CENTURY early in the autumn.

In the past year innumerable inquiries have been received from the colleges, and from graduates, denoting an increase of interest in the contest for the prizes. This may be ascribed in large part, no doubt, to the publication of the prize manuscripts of the first competition, their excellence being sufficient proof of the success and utility of THE CENTURY'S undertaking. The prize story, entitled "A Question of Happiness," was printed in THE CENTURY for last November, and was by Miss Grace M. Gallaher of Essex, Connecticut, who was graduated at Vassar in 1897. The prize poem, "The Road 'twixt Heaven and Hell," was published in the December CENTURY. Its author, Miss Anna Hempstead Branch of New London, Connecticut, was graduated at Smith College in 1897. The prize essay, on "Carlyle's Dramatic Portrayal of Character," appeared in the January CENTURY, and was by Miss Florence Hotchkiss of Geneva, Illinois, also a Bachelor of Arts of Vassar, 1897.

COMPETITION FOR GRADUATES OF 1899.

FOR the information of students who are graduated during the commencement season of the present year we reprint the rules of the competition:

With the aim of encouraging literary activity among college graduates, THE CENTURY MAGAZINE offers to give, annually, during four successive years, three prizes of \$250 each, open to the competition of persons who receive the degree of Bachelor of Arts in any college or university in the United States during the commencement seasons of 1897, 1898, 1899, and 1900.

1. \$250 for the best metrical writing of not fewer than fifty lines.

2. \$250 for the best essay in the field of biography, history, or literary criticism, of not fewer than four thousand or more than eight thousand words.

3. \$250 for the best story of not fewer than four thousand or more than eight thousand words.

On or before June 1 of the year succeeding gradua-