

ners. Manners are mere emanations from the general body; they are the adornments of life—they go to make up its decoration and finer appointments. Manners are controlled by custom, by climate, by geographical lines. No one law governs them all. A man may violate some law of what we hold good manners to be, and yet do it with so good a manner that we hold him above reproach. My friend Mary Perkins sat by a Russian Prince at dinner who ate his ice-cream with a knife. But he did it like a Prince! The man who pushes rudely by you in getting on the cars, determined on securing the best seat for himself, has bad manners, but one feels instinctively that his manner of thinking is worse.

You may drill a child in manners, but the manner must be its own. Its temperament, character, spontaneity or reserve of nature, will control it. It is a fashion now to teach little girls to make the merest little dip of a curtsy when greeting an older person, just as it has always been a custom to teach them to pause on the threshold of a door before entering, for the fraction of a moment, in order to begin again on the proper foot. I count among my friends many children who have been taught these things, together with all the other ways and customs of the world. But I know only two in whose manner, for all their training, one finds delight. One is twelve, the other six. They greet you, whatever your age, with no shyness or self-consciousness, but with a sudden lighting up of the face and a direct movement toward you, not as if they were doing what they had been taught to do, but as if the pleasure of seeing you had inspired them, and made them anxious to convey some of this pleasure to you, if only in the form of a welcome. And I am inclined to believe that these children are governed by some such feeling. Knowing their mothers as I do, I know what their training has been, and how every sweet and generous outgoing impulse has been cultivated and encouraged.

As manner is not to be confused with manners, neither is it to be confounded with presence. The best-bred man or woman is never conspicuous, never obtrusive, does not try to attract attention—is never out of the picture, as the theatrical people put it. We all recognize this fact, and instinctively draw away from one whose manner challenges attention in the street or a public assembly. And yet there are people of faultless manner, and irreproachable manners, whose presence is always felt, wherever they may be, by those who are sensitive to such influences. There is my friend Mathilda Wadsworth, for instance. She could never escape observation wherever she might be. She is beautiful and holds herself like a queen, but the secret of her power lies in the secret of her magnetism. I met a young married woman who sat for an hour or more behind her in the cars without knowing who she was. She told me afterward that, as she watched her sitting quietly talking to some friend, every one else in the car was forgotten. There was something so full of love and generous quality about Mathilda, she felt irresistibly drawn. And the presence of man or woman full of love and generous feeling must always be felt, however quiet and unobtrusive their manner may be. The law of vibration governs this. The presence of Bishop Brooks must have been felt, yet no man's manner was quieter.

"Why discuss manner with you?" I heard one friend say to another. "Our points of view differ." I realized all at once, as I listened, how wide apart they were, for all the similarity of their social training. One thought graciousness and love of pleasing insincere. The other thought cold reserve of manner very near to rudeness. For the natures of these two women were dissimilar. The manner of each was the nature of each, and, according to the temperaments and taste of different friends, each manner found its sympathizers.

And so, after all, getting down to an understanding of manner means getting down to an understanding of life. Ideal manner springs from ideal conceptions, manners being technicalities of expression. And into this conception must enter the attitude of the individual toward life, toward friends, toward personal desires and tendencies. For it matters much in manner whether a man be governed

by a desire to make himself and his own wishes paramount, or a desire to give way to the pleasure and happiness of others; whether he be willing to be governed by the larger law of attraction ruling all, or by a determination to be a law unto himself, forcing others to accept it.

When, therefore, a man's manner is good, his manners may be left to take care of themselves. The courteous and gentle Japanese is never offensive, however limited his training in our school of manners may have been. One's manner of addressing servants is as great a test of manner as a knowledge of the etiquette of courts and social life. The technicalities of polite expression are easily acquired by one who is open and receptive. Experience as well as training give these. But manner no man can teach another who does not teach that other some truth, some law of taste, some principle of harmony, by which the action of that other may be governed and controlled. Faultless manners do not make the best manner.

We judge the manner of a man, then, with the same test questions we bring to the judgments of a life: What has been its guiding principle—love of self, of individual interests, of whims and tempers; or love of something better for which we should all live, and for the sake of which we should subordinate ourselves, our personal pride and prejudice? And this test may be applied to the manner of a man living in any age, whatever the best manners of his time may have exacted as observances from those it esteemed as well-bred.

## The New Psychology

### The International Psychological Congress of 1896

By Herbert Ernest Cushman

The first International Psychological Congress, which was held in Paris in 1889—M. Ribot presiding—was really the result of the efforts of M. Richet and the different societies that had for a long time been formed to discuss hypnotic phenomena and telepathic hallucination. It is important to note that this first Congress took the name of the Congress for Physiological Psychology. The second Congress met in London in 1892, under the name of Congress for Experimental Psychology. The President, Professor Sidgwick, explained the term "Experimental" to mean a science founded on observation and experiment. The third Psychological Congress has just held its meetings in Munich, under the simpler name of the Psychological Congress. Of the four hundred and fifty members there were many famous men present—the trim Vaihinger, leader in the Kantian renaissance; the tall and gracious Brentano, at present the only leader of a school in the philosophical world; Ebbinghaus, famous for untiring experiments on the memory; the Frenchmen Janet, Binet, and Flournoy; the veteran Sidgwick; the Jew Münsterberg. Almost every member present had local fame. Conspicuous in their absence were the greatest of all living psychologists, Professor Wundt, of Leipzig, and the most charming of living personalities, Professor James, of Harvard. The American and English delegation was large. In point of numbers, moreover, the Congress was a great success, and the hospitality of the Munich people was unbounded. This Congress represented the development of what is called the "new" psychology from the physiological psychology of the first Congress and the experimental psychology of the second. At first, calling itself physio-psychological in opposition to the old Hegelian idealism, it claimed to be the beginning of a science; then, with enlarged boundaries, it dropped its first name and called itself experimental. Now the territory has been further enlarged, and, experiment and observation having been acknowledged as necessary, it has taken the simple name of psychology. In its first period it embraced only studies in telepathy and other rare mental phenomena; now it includes studies in ethnology, philology, law, sociology, history, epistemology, æsthetics, pedagogics, anatomy, zoology, physiology, psychiatry, and pathology. The sub-

jects discussed by the present Congress classified themselves naturally under five heads:

1. Anatomy and physiology of the brain and the psychology of the senses—thirty-four lectures.
2. Psychology of the normal individual—thirty-four lectures.
3. Pathological and criminal psychology—thirty-six lectures.
4. Psychology of sleep, dreams, and hypnotic states—thirty-six lectures.
5. Comparative psychology and psychology applied in teaching—twenty-eight lectures.

In these two things, then, is the "new" psychology *new*: (1) in its new standpoint, and (2) in the results it has obtained from its new standpoint. Let us consider these a little further.

1. *The New Standpoint of Psychology.* The most superficial thinker has heard of the everlasting contention between spiritualism and materialism. Which side does the new psychology take? Is it spiritualistic or materialistic? It is neither. It says: "Go to, you are both beyond my ken. I will have nothing with either of you. You are both metaphysicians, while I will be a scientist. You may be both right, but it matters not to me." So the new psychology studies the data of consciousness as an astronomer studies the data of the heavens. The old materialist and spiritualist had always presupposed something behind these data of consciousness—the materialist matter, the spiritualist spirit. Either may be right, but they belong to a world which the new psychology does not enter. The new psychology discusses the facts of consciousness and does not attempt to go behind them. Here, for example, are any facts of consciousness that you please—*i. e.*, feelings, sensations, impulses, thoughts, etc. Such facts are given; but they have two sides—an inner or mental side, an outer or a body side. These sides are called body and mind, for want of a better name. What they are psychology does not discuss, but it discusses the relations between them. The psychical must always be discussed and stated in physiological terms. This, then, is the standpoint of the new psychology: a scientific discussion of the *relations* between body and mind—*i. e.*, between the inner and the outer world.<sup>1</sup>

An extreme exemplification of the new psychology is the notable James-Lange theory that we do not laugh because we are glad or cry because we are sorry, but we are glad because we laugh and we are sorry because we cry. The bodily state is the cause of the psychological state, and not *vice versa*, and must be stated and investigated in physical terms. Am I in love? What are the physical accompaniments or causes of my mental state? What, mathematically and physically stated, are conditions of the emotion love? What are the physiological accompaniments—*i. e.*, how does my heart beat, my temperature rise? Does the blood fill my cheeks? Am I angry? What, stated in exact statistics, are the causes of anger? What are the physiological conditions—do I stamp, clench my fist, flesh my teeth? Am I remembering? What time is required to remember different objects and under differing conditions, such as repetition, diverting objects, etc.? Or is it will-power to be tested, or attention, or discrimination, or perception? All mental states must be stated and tested in physical terms. The psychological laboratories of the different universities are used to measure and test in all sorts of ingenious ways the mental states through the bodily states. The most notable laboratory in the world is that of Professor Wundt, at Leipzig; the most complete in its appointments is that at Harvard. Inasmuch as the investigations extend over so large a territory as I have before stated, there can be scarcely any subject that could

<sup>1</sup> This is called by most psychologists the parallelism between the physiological and the psychical. Only of late has the theory been attacked as parallelistic, and the attempt is made to bring the psychical and physical under the law of causality. I append a table here to show the different ways in which the relations between body and mind have been treated.

Psychology.	{	Old School, { Materialistic.	{	Intellectualistic, { Logical.
		Metaphysical, { Spiritualistic.		
{	New School, {	Scientific, {	{	Voluntaristic.

not be legitimately studied from the "new" psychological standpoint in a psychological laboratory.

2. *The Results of the New Psychology.* It would be impossible as well as wearisome in so short a paper to state the results of the new psychology, even if any one man knows all the results. Such a statement would be a series of statistics. The content of consciousness has been divided into its elements by the psychologists, and then these elements studied in their relations. The elements are the several sensations—*viz.*, hearing, sight, smell, etc. In studying the elements of consciousness, the relations, above described, between the inner and the outer world have been statistically stated with painstaking care. For example, the sounds that the physicist classifies into tones and noises are studied in their psychological relations. What physical conditions give me the comfort of a tone or melody? What give me only noises? Why should certain vibrations of the air be pleasing and others (noises) displeasing? These and very many other questions have been raised and answered in regard to the sense of hearing. With reference to the sense of sight, what physical conditions give us the sense of color, what of non-color? What is color saturation? What psychological state is it that gives rise to deceptions in forms and colors? Do certain colors affect certain sounds?

The same method has been pursued in reference to the senses smell, taste, and touch. The results obtained have not been, in the majority of cases, novel results; they have usually been the corroboration of what we have already known *a priori*. A real discovery, however, was made when it was proven that not only historically have all the senses been derived from the sense of touch, but that within the sense of touch are latent and partly developed senses: so that the *old-fashioned notion of the five senses vanishes*. There are, besides the five senses, the pressure sense, the cold and hot sense, and the pain and pleasure sense. Investigations are going on to ascertain, if possible, if there be special nerves for pleasure and pain. It is easily proven that there are special nerves for cold and heat; for if a cold iron nail is passed over the skin of the arm, only in spots will it be felt cold. Whether there be special nerves to carry pleasure and pain is quite uncertain. At any rate, the *a priori* notion of Leibnitz that pleasure is positive and pain negative, and that of Schopenhauer that pain is positive and pleasure negative, could never have been stated by those intelligent minds had they lived among modern psychologists. *Pain and pleasure are both positive.*<sup>1</sup>

The psychological elements, *i. e.* the sensations, are thus studied separately. In actual life, however, no one sensation comes alone. It always occurs in combination with others. Sounds, sights, smells, tastes, and touches occur in conjunction. The world in which we live is very complicated, because it is constructed in various ways out of these differing elements. For example, I am now sitting on the Schlossberg, at Freiburg, with many colors before my eyes—greens, browns, reds, etc., in many forms, regular and irregular. These colors and forms are what my eyes really see. But I seem to see what I call the Black Forest and the Höllenthal and the city on the Dreisam. The noise I now hear is only certain air-vibrations, but I call it the bark of a dog, and vibration of the air near me a baby's prattle. That is to say, my psycho-physical organism reacts upon my sensations in such a way as to construct a world that I call the Black Forest, the Höllenthal, and the city of Freiburg. One can easily see how profitable the field of our actual life is for psychological investigation. How is it that the ideas of space and time arise? Why and how are certain colors and sounds associated and not others? What is the object I perceive? How do I perceive it? How do I remember? How make the present world fit the past?

In regard to the question of free will, the psychologist would say, "I know of no supernatural motiveless part of

<sup>1</sup> The sixth sense is very early developed in the animal kingdom. The Flegelmaus (*Vesperugo noctula*, *Vespertilis proterus*), a species of bat, has a very highly developed nerve covering its wings. For experiment, many of these bats were blinded, and yet could fly about without injury in a dark cavern, guided by this sixth sense.

the human personality. Man is free to act as he is constituted to act. Nevertheless, the will is not determined by a single sensation, feeling, or desire. *The freedom of the will is this: the psycho-physical personality as a whole reacting on the outer world.*

As to self-consciousness and the unity of the Self, the psychologist answers that the feeling of self-consciousness is the *general feeling* that arises when the psycho-physical personality reacts upon the outer world.

I am aware of the weaknesses of the "new" psychology. It is easily vulnerable at many points. There is no time here for a fair criticism, however, except to say that the last Psychological Congress showed that incorrigible tendency of the German minds to out-Hegel Hegel in their daring theories. In spite of the boasts of the present generation of Germans that the new psychology is scientific and not metaphysical, the words of their own Jean Paul point to one of the dangers to the new young science in the hands of a German—"The kingdom of the English is the sea; that of the French, the land; while the German owns the kingdom of the air." The new psychology claims only to be in its beginnings. Its future will be safe and its effect salutary if it be not overwhelmed by highly inventive theorizing.



## Nagging

By Amos R. Wells

There once lived a centaur whose name was Correction. This centaur, whenever the man part of him saw a mortal in difficulty, fallen among foes, straying from the right path, conducting himself unseemly, would get the mortal to mount upon the horse part of him, and would canter swiftly away, carrying the mortal to a place of honor and happiness and safety.

This would have been in every way a fine thing for mortals, and they would always have rejoiced to see Correction approaching, if it had not been for a strange law of the centaur's being, which was this: As long as he did his good deeds solely with the thought of helpfulness, everything went well. The man-horse, with the man's wisdom and the horse's fleetness, was effective for the restoration of thousands to their proper places and conditions. As soon, however, as the centaur Correction ceased to think of the mortal he was helping, and began to think of himself, how much wiser he was than the mortal, how much stronger, how much better—just that instant the horse part of the centaur began to get uppermost.

In a very short time, as they moved on, the mortal would find himself on the back, not of a splendid, noble, spirited centaur, but of a raw-boned, cross-tempered old nag, that ran more and more slowly and less and less straight, until finally it simply ran around a stake driven in the ground, to which it seemed to be tied. That stake was made out of wooden selfishness. The mortal found himself unable to dismount, and was indeed in a sorry plight, until some kind traveler came along, or until the centaur Correction came to his senses and ceased his nagging.

Reader, can you not interpret the parable? Correction is a noble beast, but nagging is the meanest mare in the stable. The one is transformed into the other by the potent poison of selfishness. Nagging is admonition soured. Nagging is correction run to seed. Admonition is progressive, nagging is stationary. Admonition is sympathetic, nagging is egotistic. Admonition teaches, nagging judges. Admonition graciously leads, nagging spitefully pushes. Admonition is a sagacious St. Bernard, nagging is a snapping poodle. Admonition produces reformation, nagging produces only exasperation.

There is a righteous indignation, which is a teacher of righteousness; but nagging is born of unrighteous indignation. Its hidden source is offended self-esteem. It is often our duty to find fault, but it is more often our duty to stop finding fault. To cease speaking is as great an art as the art of speech. Better corrections many times too few than once too often. "Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay,"

applies to fault-finding as well as to expletives. Here, as elsewhere, we are not heard for our much speaking. True, "constant dropping wears away the stone," but in the matter of hearts, on the contrary, constant dropping petrifies them. "Precept upon precept, line upon line"—but not the same precept, nor the same line, nor in the same place.

The best workman uses the fewest blows. If we are seeking our dear one's amendment rather than our own glory, we shall be anxious that as much of the amendment as possible shall come from him. Nagging fails largely because it does not give the culprit a chance to improve of his own motion. See how carefully God has preserved the free agency of mankind, refraining from forcing upon us either good or evil; and shall we not be as wise in dealing with each other? If you want a man to do the right, point it out, and leave him alone long enough for him to make willing choice of the right, and label his deed with his own name.

In fact, fault-finding always finds failure if it considers the fault rather than the man. We speak, and then look for results, for amendment, instead of looking for the will to amend. This proves the shallowness of our own desire, that it regards exteriors, and is not prompted by the Spirit, since it does not look to the spiritual for its success. Our correction will produce righteousness only when it produces love for righteousness; and if it seeks first to inspire this love, everything else will be added to it.

And not only will love be the object sought by admonition; it will also be the tool that is used. Diamonds are cut only by diamonds, and hearts are formed to beauty only by loving hearts. "Liking cures;" that is the law of spiritual homeopathy. Admonition, like charity, endures all things, because it hopes all things; nagging endures nothing, because it hopes nothing and has no love. The first requisite of a good corrector is that he be a good lover. If you want to find fault, first find hearts. Words do not reach your brother's will except along the telegraph wires of heart-strings. If he won't do it for your heart, he won't do it for your tongue.



## Oriental Archæology, the Vindicator of the Old Testament

By Professor A. H. Sayce, LL.D., F.R.S.

In this busy nineteenth century nowhere has research been more active or discovery more fruitful than among the monuments of the ancient civilized East. In Egypt, in Assyria and Babylonia, in Palestine and Asia Minor, even in Arabia, the history of the past, which had seemed dead and forgotten, has risen once more into life. Thanks to the explorer, the excavator, and the decipherer, we can now trace its general outlines, and even fill in many of its details. The fables which Greek and Roman writers had given us in the place of Oriental history have been swept away, and we can now read the contemporaneous inscriptions of monarchs who lived before the days of Abraham, can study the novels which amused the Egyptian masters of the Israelites in the age of the Exodus, and unravel the policy which led to Sennacherib's invasion of Judah. The Bible no longer stands alone like some solitary menhir on a desolate heath; we can compare it with other literary monuments of the same age and the same region of the world, and examine it in the light which texts of undoubted genuineness and antiquity are casting upon it.

And it is passing unscathed through the ordeal. A few years ago those "higher critics" who would not admit the authenticity and historical character of the earlier records of the Old Testament seemed to have it all their own way. There was nothing to check their conjectures and conclusions, or disprove the *a priori* assumptions with which they started. The Hebrew Scriptures were treated as they had been compiled by a modern German professor and the result was exaggerated skepticism. The critic counted the words he found in them, and declared them to be a sort of literary mosaic in which he could with the