

Board of Trade, in answer to a question in the House of Commons, produced figures showing that the value of British exports for 1902, if based on the prices of 1873, would have been £416,000,000, instead of the £278,000,000 actually reported—that is, an increase over 1873 of 153 per cent., in place of a paltry 23 per cent. What shall be said of a man who juggles facts and figures in a way like this, and who says to-day that "retaliation" is a necessity, in spite of his powerful denunciation of such a policy in 1881?

THE PRESENT SIGNIFICANCE OF KANT.

Immanuel Kant the Königsberg philosopher, and the most influential thinker in the history of German thought, was born April 22, 1724, and died February 12, 1804. The hundred years that have passed since his death have been marked by many very great advances both in science and in the other fields of human activity in which he took especial interest, but Kant still remains a thinker of contemporary interest and of living influence. A prominent German philosophical periodical, the *Kantstudien*, is to-day devoted not only to the interpretation of his thought, but to the discussion of its bearings upon contemporary problems. Pope Leo, in one of his later encyclicals, deplored the wide influence that the Kantian philosophy has been recently exerting upon the teachings of a notable school of philosophers which has sprung up within the Catholic Church. And this particular form of Neo-Kantianism which Leo deplored has flourished, in certain Catholic and clerical circles, in the very country where an uninitiated person might least have expected to find such a movement—namely, in France. In England and in this country nobody seriously studies philosophy without taking careful account of Kant. Courses more or less exclusively devoted to the exposition and criticism of his views are an indispensable feature in a well-developed modern university curriculum. And both within and outside of academic circles the interest in Kant's thought is shared both by theologically disposed students, and by those who are, on the contrary, mainly interested in the examination of the philosophical bases of science. For Kant is a thinker who has his word to say both to the skeptic and to the believer; both to the constructive idealist, and to the empiricist; both to the man who wants to build "beyond Kant," and to the critical doubter who, despairing of the success of cloud-piercing systems, soberly desires to "return to Kant." Whoever refutes Kant, only stimulates his readers to new studies of the original text; whoever condemns Kant, only shows thereby how necessary it still is to take account of him; whoever, as disciple, "returns to Kant," is obliged all the more to interpret the master in the light of modern problems; and whoever attempts to "build beyond Kant," must nevertheless attempt to expound afresh what Kant meant.

In consequence, Kant means a great deal to the thought of the present time, even when this thought seems farthest removed from his formulas. Here is no place to set forth Kant's doctrines in any technical

way; but it is worth while to review, very briefly, two of the principal reasons why Kant still keeps so living an influence, and why it is that the coming century of philosophy, like the past, is likely to be very frequently busy with the task of defining its relations to his teachings.

Kant's influence, then, in the first place is that of a very winning and wholesome personality. The world justly admires the man who in difficult tasks keeps his head. Kant never lost his self-possession in presence of the most baffling problems. The world wisely prizes the man who can be mercilessly critical, both of himself and of current dogma, and of the individual caprices of his fellow-men, and who nevertheless is never flippant, never cynical, and always humane. Kant accomplished this difficult union of humanity with critical acumen, and did so with a serenity of temper, a freedom from bias, and a sanity of judgment which in such a union are almost without a parallel. The world honorably pays tribute to unquestionable personal virtues. And of Kant's faithfulness to his own high ideals, of his moral health and devotedness, there can be no doubt. His worst personal faults seem to have been a certain narrowness of emotional experience, a certain lack of sympathy with some of the more romantic aspects of life, and a certain pedantry. These faults, such as they were, were incidents of his frail physical constitution, of the hard-won and unvarying regimen whereby he was able so long to retain his physical hold on life, of his provincial education, of the fact that he never travelled far from his birthplace, and of the conditions of his academic training and career. But no man ever made more than Kant did of such resources as our philosopher's physical weakness and narrow range of personal experience still left open to him. If he could not understand some of the more romantic aspects of life, he was nevertheless sensitive to the influence of Rousseau, and profited greatly thereby. If his rigorism as an ethical teacher often seemed to make him relatively indifferent to the significance of even the noblest sentiment as a practical guide to action, yet his mind was open, so far as keen vision, kindly personal intercourse with other men, and wide reading, could make it, to the effort to appreciate the most various types of mankind and the most wayward forms of human wilfulness. If he was no traveller, yet he was widely read in the literature of travel, and was a loving and tolerant student of the varieties of human nature as they were exhibited by different peoples. His correspondence, as it has lately been reëdited, now shows us, as we never knew before, how various were the sorts of men who appealed to him for sympathy or for guidance, and how much they confided in his humane spirit. As to his pedantry, that was illuminated in his case by a certain delightful humor, which appears little, to be sure, in his best-known and strictly technical works, but which was a prominent feature in certain of his courses of lectures, and a constant resource in his social intercourse.

He stands before us as a lifelong invalid who still never wearies by complaints; a keen critic of human nature who yet is never unkindly; a rigorist in ethics whom people meanwhile loved for his geniality of nature; a man trained in pedan-

try whose ideas are nevertheless far richer than are the forms in which they are expressed; a great thinker who, for all that, prized nothing so much as his daily duties; a man of narrow experience whose wealth of insight constantly surprised his contemporaries. Although his experience of the fine arts was limited to what his own native city could show him, his theory of the beautiful is the most influential, as it appears to be in many respects the sanest, of all the distinctly philosophical theories of modern æsthetics. Although his philosophical teachings appear at first sight so negative, yet one of his principal interests lay in attempting to give a sound foundation and a definite office in life to religious faith; and his influence has been nowhere more felt than in the recent developments of the philosophy of religion. Theologians and skeptics, students of science and idealists, thus join in finding him a guide.

The many-sidedness and the remarkable balance and dignity of Kant's personality constitute one ground for the permanence and the strength of his influence. A second ground, and, of course, a still more important one, lies in his doctrine. This doctrine, namely, unites such various motives, allies itself with such different historical tendencies and influences, and bears upon so many types of modern problems that it stands, so to speak, at the great meeting-place, or at the crossroads, of recent speculation, so that, whatever one's personal decision may be regarding the problems at issue, and whatever the road that one travels, one is sure to be reminded that these problems were Kant's, and that this road leads one through, or at least close to, his system of doctrine.

Surveyed in its connections, this doctrine involves three essential theses: First, the world as it is in itself is unknowable; and only the realm of human experience is the just object of human theoretical science, question, and research. Secondly, every lawful and orderly aspect of human experience is due to the working of our own understanding, so that, apart from our intelligent interpretation of experience, sense shows us only chaos, while what we get out of our study of nature exhibits to us only those types of law which our own understanding has—not capriciously, indeed, but of its own necessity—first thought into nature. Thirdly, our "pure thought," our reason proper, can reveal to us no theoretical demonstrable absolute verities about the nature of things, but can only show us, on the one hand, what our moral duty is, and, on the other hand what, as rational beings, we are bound practically to assume as true, not as a matter of knowledge, but as faith. Thus, as Kant holds, the limits of possible human knowledge, and the sphere of necessary and rational faith, are marked out, justified, and rendered unmistakable.

Our concern here is not with the truth, but with the historical significance, of these philosophical definitions and theses. Their influence has been, as a stimulus, as a challenge to critics and to opponents, enormous. As a defence of the essential rationality of certain admittedly indemonstrable faiths, Kant's theory has become a bulwark of defence to very various defenders of modern forms of religious belief and practice against the assaults of the opponents of all faith. As a criticism of the

limits of human knowledge. his work is the inexhaustible source of new attempts to define the scope to which our human insight is limited. As an analysis of the part which our intellectual processes play in defining our whole conception of phenomenal nature, as an investigation of the dependence of all our knowledge of what we take to be the external world upon the constitution of our own intelligence, Kant's theory at once excites permanent admiration for its ingenuity, and provokes us to constantly renewed analyses of the logic of experience.

The influence of such opinions and of the inquiries which they have provoked has also extended, however, far beyond the range of technical philosophy, and still extends. Such methods of study inspire freedom of opinion, keenness of critical self-examination, an effort to unite conflicting tendencies by higher syntheses, a disposition to be just to various sides of human nature, a union of skepticism with reverence; and these tendencies, in our time, have received application in many regions of activity which seem remote enough from philosophy. Many profit by the spirit of Kant who know little or nothing of his letter. His doctrine, as he stated it, will have henceforth few literal disciples; but whenever and wherever the lovers of their kind are interested in the great task of teaching man how to become, in a conscious and rational sense, without anarchy and yet without fear, the spiritual master of his own world, the memory of Kant will be honored, his guidance will be felt, and his personality will inspire.

GREECE REVISITED.

ATHENS, January 15, 1904.

Returning to Greece after an absence of twenty years one finds many changes. To begin with, the place of landing is different. Twenty years ago there was no Peloponnesian railway, and all travellers from Europe came by sea to the Peiræus. Now almost everybody lands at Patras, where passengers for Athens take the train. By this change the traveller both gains and loses. Some time is saved, which may or may not be important; but the trip round the Peloponnesus by sea and the entrance into the harbor at Peiræus are well worth the extra day's travel. On the other hand, the railway from Patras to Athens offers some of the most beautiful scenery in the world. From Patras to Corinth the road lies along the southern shore of the Gulf of Corinth, and across the blue water one sees clearly the sharply outlined mountains of Ætolia, Acarnania, Locris, Phocis, and Bœotia, among which Parnassus and Cithæron are especially prominent. Soon after passing Corinth, the train crosses the ship-canal that cuts the Isthmus, and skirts the shore of the Saronic Gulf, affording beautiful views of the Peloponnesian mountains and the islands of Salamis and Ægina. The aspect of the Gulf is that of a mountain lake; but no mountains outside of Greece are so sharply outlined against so blue a sky or so beautiful in their violet purple color. Upon closer acquaintance with the Greek mountains, one finds them for the most part bare and gray; but when seen from even a moderate distance they take on a violet hue quite unlike the color of the mountains of other countries.

Upon reaching Athens, one finds one's self

in an outlying part of the city near the ancient Colonus, where Sophocles was born; a district which twenty years ago lay quite outside the life of the city. There the stranger is at once surrounded by a horde of screaming and pushing hotel agents and cabmen, through whose midst he has to struggle, unless he resigns himself and his belongings at once to the tender mercies of some one of their number. This ordeal is, if anything, even more trying than the struggle with the boatmen who transfer the passengers from the steamer to the quay at the Peiræus. But the nature of the ordeal is the same. The cabmen are the brothers of the boatmen, merely transferred to dry land.

The city of Athens itself has grown in twenty years to something like twice its former size, and general improvement has kept pace with growth. It is more European than it used to be, and the number of fine buildings has increased greatly. The streets, though still very dusty in summer and muddy after rain, are cleaner than they once were, and there is a greater appearance of thrift, or perhaps one should say a less general aspect of shiftlessness. In the streets of the capital the national costume is far less often seen than in earlier times, and even in the country one sees European clothing much more frequently than in former days. It is said that the increase in the population of Athens is due less to an influx of people from the country than to the increasing number of Greeks from Egypt and other regions who have chosen Athens as their place of abode. At any rate, the villages seem little less populous than formerly, in spite of the comparatively large number of emigrants to America in recent years.

There is a marked difference in the language spoken in the streets. Evidently the teaching of the schools is affecting the speech of the people. Now, as formerly, the spoken language differs materially from the semi-classic written dialect, but even in the spoken language ancient forms are becoming established. The genitive case, which was little used as a separate form, except in pronouns, is now often heard in the mouths of simple folk, and even the dative case occasionally appears. So, too, some ancient verb forms are more commonly employed. Whether the result will be a real improvement or the reverse, remains to be seen. For the present it looks as if the development or deterioration of Greek into an analytic language were arrested. Naturally enough the Greeks look back with veneration and longing to the classic period of Hellenic greatness, and the desire of many among them to restore the ancient language, or, at least, to approximate to it, is easily understood. So far as the exclusion of Turkish and other foreign words is concerned, the attempt to purify the language is neither hopeless nor unjustified, but it is doubtful if success can or should attend the efforts of those who are trying to restore the forms or syntax of the ancient speech.

The language question is not always regarded as a matter merely for calm academic discussion. A few months ago the "Oresteia" of Æschylus was produced at the Royal Theatre, in a translation and adaptation by G. Soteriades, the ephor of antiquities, whose excellent work of excavation on the site of the ancient Therman

is well known. In his translation he made use of words and expressions belonging to the colloquial language, and thereby aroused the indignation of the students at the University. They met at the University building, and decided upon a demonstration to put a stop to the performance. In the evening a large body of students paraded the streets, gathering the mob of the city in their train. The ordinary police could not cope with the disorder, troops were ordered to the scene, and, before the disturbance ended, one man was killed. Compared with some of the riots that have broken out in our American cities at various times, this was a mild affair, but it shows how strongly some of the Greeks feel about the language question. Undoubtedly the desire to embarrass the Ralli ministry led some to encourage the spirit of disorder, and there were also other motives at work; but the fact remains that the trouble was ostensibly due to the production of the "Oresteia." To an American, one of the unpleasant features of the whole affair was the alliance of the students with the mob. Our own students sometimes disgrace themselves, but they do not invite the mob of the city to join in their processions and help them to attain their ends.

Of much more practical importance than the perennial language question is the equally perennial Eastern Question. The Greeks seem to be firmly persuaded that the disorders in Macedonia are not a genuine popular uprising, but are the work of Bulgarians, who are, to be sure, for the most part, inhabitants of Macedonia, but who are assisted by Bulgarians from over the border with the purpose of making Macedonia more and more Bulgarian by terrorizing, driving away, and killing the Macedonians who are not of Bulgarian blood. This is, of course, intended merely as a prelude to the ultimate annexation of Macedonia by Bulgaria. It is evidently difficult to determine the racial affinities of the mixed population of Macedonia so as to assign to each race its proper numerical position. The statistics given in Greek newspapers make the Macedonian Greeks much more numerous than the statistics given by most authorities; but it is not necessary to accept their figures in order to understand the eager interest with which the Greeks follow events in Macedonia. Even accepting the least favorable statistics, one finds the number of Greeks settled in Macedonia so great that the Greeks of the Kingdom of Greece cannot look on with indifference while Bulgarian influence is spreading, especially when it spreads by fire and sword. There seems to be no expectation that the acceptance by the Porte of the Austro-Russian proposals concerning Macedonia will prevent renewed outrages in the spring, and what the end will be no one can foretell. Meanwhile, the Greek Government is urged to take care of its army, that it may make a good showing when the time comes, for the success of the Bulgarians in Macedonia would not only bring disaster upon the Greeks now settled there, but would put an end to all hope of the expansion of the Kingdom of Greece toward the north. Unfortunately, the necessary measures for the improvement of the Greek army after the recent war with Turkey were neglected or badly carried out.

In the last few days the old discussion