

THE MILL NEWS LETTER

JOHN M. ROBSON, editor

Published by University of Toronto Press
in association with Victoria College



Please address communications to the Editor, Victoria College, University of Toronto, Toronto, 5, Canada

Volume V, Number 1

Fall, 1969

Sometime I hope to start an issue without an apology. Here is my current one: the last issue, Spring 1969, was erroneously numbered Volume IV, Number 1; it was, of course, Volume IV, Number 2. Please renumber your own copy, so that you won't have two different versions of Volume IV, Number 1. I can assure everyone that I too suffer from the results of these blunders; requests are still coming in for Volume III, Number 2, which does not exist.

This issue (properly numbered, I hope, as Volume V, Number 1) has been prepared ahead of time, as I shall be in London during the fall term, completing the editorial work on JSM's Logic; I shall report on that work in the Spring issue.

The first item is an analysis of On Liberty as a work of art, by John Grube. This article reflects the renewed interest of literary scholars in Mill's work, seen in N.N. Feltes' article on "Bentham" and "Coleridge" in MNL, II, 2; in the continuing discussions of the effect of JSM's criticisms of Pauline on Browning's poetic career; in F.E.L. Priestley's Introduction to Volume X of the Collected Works; in the various anthologies and articles listed in recent numbers of this News Letter; and especially in F. Parvin Sharpless's The Literary Criticism of John Stuart Mill (which I hope to have reviewed in the next number).

Following next is an article by Dennis A. Rohatyn, in which the frequent appearance of my name would be embarrassing, were it not for the context, and the importance of the issues it raises. Not least of these are the matter of interdisciplinary strife concerning method, and the uses of secondary as well as primary materials; I hope some of you will comment on these questions. I recall a brief exchange I had with a very distinguished political scientist who advised a graduate student not to read any secondary works on Mill for his thesis, as nothing worth reading had been written. I couldn't quite accept that, and I also am unrepentant about my comments on the footnote from Professor Ebel (MNL, II, 2) to which Mr. Rohatyn takes exception.

Next comes the usual list of recent publications, and then a note by Marcia Allentuck on a Yiddish translation of On Liberty, and a comment by Francis E. Mineka on Anna J. Mill's article in the last number. The issue concludes with the "S" and "T" sections of the continuing bibliography of writings on JSM, and it raises some questions about the future of this News Letter.

The bibliography will be completed in the next number, and probably

thereafter we should publish a list of addenda and corrigenda, most of which have been supplied by readers to whom we now offer our grateful thanks. The first question is: would it be valuable to proceed, as Mr. Haskell and I have already proposed, to prepare a separate publication of these lists, in revised and corrected form? If so, would readers be content with its present checklist form, with cross-indexes to subjects? How much should be included, both of what we have listed and what we have (intentionally) omitted? Should theses (both M.A. and Ph.D.) be included, if they have not been superseded by publications by their authors? Should we try to cover all languages? Should there be annotation? (We know the answer to this, but in view of the immense labour involved, we are really asking whether, with a subject index, readers would be satisfied to do their own annotation.) Should anthologies, if their introductions are in effect essays on JSM, be included? Should works with less than a chapter on JSM be included if we consider the comments or materials not to be duplicated elsewhere? And so on. We really want your answers to these questions before going any further; if the readers of this News Letter (and future generations who, despite the gap, may be represented by present scholars) find what we have already done adequate, then it obviously would be best to stop now.

The second question is this: once the bibliography, which, judging from your letters, has been the most valuable part of the News Letter, is completed, is it worth while to continue the News Letter? Should it be reduced in size, altered in format (mimeographed, perhaps), and issued only once a year, or when sufficient material accumulates? I trust it has been of some use (though not as much as I had anticipated) in preventing overlap of work by notifying people of what is going on in various disciplines. Certainly the queries section has not lived up to my expectations, though many of them have been quite interesting. The notes on recent publications are duplicated (though not in full) in PMLA, Victorian Studies, and the Victorian Newsletter, and perhaps all of you can easily find the references there. While the quality of the articles has, I think, been high, that very quality may be insurance enough that they could have appeared elsewhere.

In short, I am asking you for candid comments on the utility of the News Letter, and I shall be guided by your responses (especially if I don't receive any). And may I close with an open request to those who have promised to submit articles, notes, etc., to send them soon, please.

* * * * *

ON LIBERTY AS A WORK OF ART

John Grube,
University of Windsor

Mill's celebrated essay is rarely examined as a literary masterpiece. It is mentioned in Political Science courses, discussed in Philosophy seminars, included by English departments in surveys of nineteenth-century thought. But however potent Mill's ideas, it is his literary

techniques that have given On Liberty its wide and enduring readership. These techniques deserve careful examination.

Consider his opening discussion on the origin of kings.

"To prevent the weaker members of the community from being preyed upon by innumerable vultures, it was needful that there should be an animal of prey stronger than the rest, commissioned to keep them down. But as the king of the vultures would be no less bent upon preying on the flock, than any of the minor harpies, it was indispensable to be in a perpetual attitude of defence against his beak and claws."¹

Mill is describing the dawn of history. It is appropriate that he should start off with the imagery of folk-tale ("the king of the vultures") and ancient myth ("the minor harpies"). The passage could almost begin: "Once upon a time...." The reference to "harpies" sets the reader to wondering what other Greek myths underlie the passage. Who was "preyed upon by innumerable vultures"? Who was "in a perpetual attitude of defence"? The answer of course is Prometheus. The harsh sound of "beak and claws" indicates that the great heretic of Greek mythology is not to be wrapped in the protective mist of Romantic poetry, but is here a highly vulnerable and almost human figure.

It must be so because the essay has a "hero." He is the nameless human "heretic" (30,39,44 et passim), often "chained up" (79) and in "mental slavery" (45), but always trying to "burst the bonds" (60) so that his "spontaneity and individuality" will be "encouraged to unfold" (78). He is the human for whom Prometheus stole the celestial fire, and he too must fight and suffer as does his heavenly patron.

This heretic's world is the "battlefield" (11). He is "in constant peril of being subverted by foreign attack" and "even a short interval of relaxed energy and self-command might so easily be fatal" (18). For him there is no Patroclus, no Myrmidons, no intervention of favourable gods; he must have "confidence in his own solitary judgment" (24). And he has experienced the artillery of the enemy, "the engines of moral repression have been wielded" against him "strenuously" (18), although he fights back with the power of ideas which "explode like bombshells" (62). He is always "standing sentinel" (54) and must never "go to sleep" at his "post" (56), for if he does, he knows that the "dungeon and the stake" (38) await him.

This is a composite picture. Yet it is a picture of all those who have suffered martyrdom for their ideas in the course of human history. It is this historical perspective, which Mill proceeds to elaborate, that gives hope to the individual heretic, just as a roll-call of former warriors gives courage to an individual soldier. Mill's epic list is impressive, starting with Socrates (32) and Christ (33). As we pass from Luther to the unsung heroes of early Protestantism, the prose rhythm becomes hypnotic, like a chant (37):

"To speak only of religious opinions: the Reformation broke out at least twenty times before Luther, and was put down. Arnold of Brescia was put down. Fra Dolcino was put down. Savonarola was put down. The Albigeois were put down. The Vaudois were put down. The Lollards were put down. The Hussites were put down."

The list of enemies, too, is impressive. They have been subtle and hard to detect, such seemingly benign thinkers as Auguste Comte (18) or such apparently rational rulers as Marcus Aurelius (34). In spite of obstacles, there have been periods when the good prevailed, and Mill specifies them (46):

"Europe during the times immediately following the Reformation...though limited to the Continent and to a more cultivated class, in the speculative movement of the latter half of the eighteenth century...in the intellectual fermentation of Germany during the Goethean and Fichteian period....The impulse given at these three periods has made Europe what it now is. Every single improvement which has taken place either in the human mind or in institutions, may be traced distinctly to one or other of them."

That there have been such periods when large groups of free men have overturned the intellectual establishment is important encouragement to the individual heretic. But it is equally important for him to know that in each concrete revolutionary situation a distinct pattern will emerge. Mill indicates this pattern in his discussion of English press law (21):

"Though the law of England, on the subject of the press, is as servile to this day as it was in the time of the Tudors, there is little danger of its actually being put in force against political discussion, except during some temporary panic, when fear of insurrection drives ministers and judges from their propriety."

Embedded in this standard prose is a curious sequence of nouns: servile, danger, force, political discussion, panic, insurrection. In reality, this sequence establishes Mill's view of the origin and course of civil disturbance. When a people are "servile"--and the word suggests suppressed hostility--the rulers will sense "danger." They use "force." This stimulates very real "political discussion." The rulers "panic" and commit irrational and hostile acts. As this mutual process escalates, it tends towards active "insurrection." The very form of Mill's style here--standard prose concealing a paradigm of revolution--itself indicates the actual "Condition of England," and the condition in which most "heretics" find themselves: facing a smooth exterior that conceals active and hostile forces.

But the rulers are not the hero's only obstacles; he is usually surrounded by the unthinking mass who are mentally "inert and torpid" (76). He must be concerned for them, since "the greatest harm done is to those who are not heretics, and whose whole mental development is cramped, and their reason cowed, by the fear of heresy" (45). They need not only mental freedom, but also energy and exercise: "The mental and moral, like the muscular powers, are improved only by being used" (75). (One might call this Mill's muscular rationalism.) Not only are these people "cramped," but "withered and starved," society "crushing out" (79) and "wearing down into uniformity all that is individual" (81) until they are "cramped and dwarfed" enough to become "the pinched and hidebound type of character" (80). The image of "cramping" is developed

and made concrete. "A man cannot get...a pair of boots to fit him, unless they are...made to his measure...are human beings more like one another in their whole physical and spiritual conformation than in the shape of their feet?" (87.) The cramped foot as a symbol of the cramped mind is taken to the most extreme known example, the bound foot of a Chinese lady. Mill is describing the conformist effect of public opinion (89):

"Its ideal of character is to be without any marked character; to main by compression, like a Chinese lady's foot, every part of human nature which stands out prominently, and tends to make the person markedly dissimilar in outline to commonplace humanity."

The cramped foot is a simple and stark image that strikes home to every reader who has ever worn uncomfortable shoes.

Mill brilliantly integrates this developed image--the Chinese lady's "maimed" foot--into the large historical perspective he has previously elaborated by taking, as his classic example of a society that was once spontaneous and inventive but is now arrested, the very example of China (92):

"We have a warning example in China--a nation of much talent, and, in some respects, even wisdom, owing to the rare good fortune of having been provided at an early period with a particularly good set of customs, the work, in some measure, of men to whom even the most enlightened European must accord, under certain limitations, the title of sages and philosophers....Surely the people who did this have discovered the secret of human progressiveness....On the contrary, they have become stationary--have remained so for thousands of years."

Mill gives the reason, and applies the lesson to contemporary England: "They have succeeded beyond all hope in what English philanthropists are so industriously working at--in making a people all alike, all governing their thoughts and conduct by the same maxims and rules."

The hero-heretic, then, "solitary" as his battle with the forces of received opinion will always be, knows that he exists in a grand historical framework that goes back to the dawn of time, that there have been periods when the forces of light have won and have awakened those who once lay "inert and torpid." There are thus grounds for cautious optimism (43): "Socrates was put to death, but the Socratic philosophy rose like the sun in heaven, and spread its illumination over the whole intellectual framework." This powerful light-fire imagery of "the sun in heaven" is reflected in terrestrial terms when Mill describes modern heretical ideas surviving in what we would now call an intellectual "underground" (43): "With us, heretical opinions...never blaze out far and wide, but continue to smoulder in the narrow circles of thinking and studious persons among whom they originate."

In a final glimpse of the hero, we see first a man "in a perpetual attitude of defence," crucified daily like his celestial exemplar, Prometheus. Surrounded by "gambling or drunkenness or incontinence or idleness or uncleanness" (103), and oppressed by the "moral police" (108) and "intrusively pious members of society" (111), he takes his

solitary way. Instructed in the history and possible future of his race, ideas of freedom will "continue to smoulder," making possible, as he becomes a fearless individualist, what might just be called a "Paradise within." Mill's essay is a celebrated defence of liberty, but it is also a very great work of art. As one begins to respond to the essay in this way, it becomes the "objective correlative" to his Autobiography and thus equally touching and moving--the stark, military images suggest real battle scars. In the same way one can read Paradise Lost with Areopagitica (or other writings of Milton--the divorce pamphlets, De Doctrina Christiana) hovering just under the surface of the conscious mind. Both men shared something of the same fierce independence and even something of the same tradition. England is fortunate when her great writers concern themselves with the liberty of the subject.

NOTE:

¹John M. Robson, ed., John Stuart Mill, A Selection of his Works (Toronto, 1966), 4. All citations are from this edition. The original idea for this paper came from Mrs. Gail Devlin--it belongs to her as much as to me.

* * * * *

ON BEHALF OF EBEL AND BERLIN

Dennis A. Rohatyn,
City University of New York

Recently Professor John M. Robson delivered himself of an attack on two Mill scholars: Mr. Henry Ebel, who was Mr. Robson's direct target, and Sir Isaiah Berlin, at whom an indirect volley was hurled.¹ While I am sure that both Mr. Ebel and Sir Isaiah are capable of taking care of themselves, I feel impelled to say a word in defence of them both. At stake is a question of method whose implications for the historian of ideas cannot be overestimated.

In essence, Mr. Robson's bark is directed at the alleged failure of both Mr. Ebel and Sir Isaiah, the latter by implication, to stick to the text (of On Liberty). Mr. Robson, noting how often the accusation of inconsistency is flung at Mill, is tired of hearing this charge used as a banner. Moreover he deplores the lack of fastidiousness with which the indictment of Mill is made; he finds that the label of self-contradiction is spat out with no effort to justify it; that it is a mere derogation unaccompanied by a scrupulous examination of text. Mr. Robson then calls for more of the latter procedure, and less of the former until and unless vindicated. In passing, Mr. Robson admits that Mr. Ebel is "generally sympathetic" to Mill; about Berlin Mr. Robson is silent, although anyone who has read what Sir Isaiah has to say² knows that he is in Mill's corner entirely.

Ordinarily I should agree with Mr. Robson's sentiments entirely.

They represent the credo of the conscientious scholar. But I feel that Mill is a special case and is deserving of special treatment, and hence that Mr. Robson's indignation is uncalled for. Mr. Robson may not concur, but I think that it has been adequately established by this time, thanks to the voluminous literature on Mill, that there are, if not inconsistencies, then at least severe problems with which the reader of On Liberty (not to mention the System of Logic, Utilitarianism, or Representative Government) must grapple, often awkwardly, even when his intentions with respect to Mill are the highest. After a while, it becomes pointless to continue to search for them, save for the fact that one of the unwritten laws of intellectual history is that every generation likes to rediscover for itself what its predecessors already knew. But in this instance there is no question of learning afresh the lessons of the past; there is ample literature and discussion in our own time to convince us that all is not well in Mill-land. Perhaps what Mr. Robson seeks is a closer, more tightly-knit approach; but it is difficult to see what more he could demand, considering the onslaught of highly technical articles on such topics as Mill's Proof that have deluged the learned journals for nearly two decades now.

Both Mr. Ebel and Sir Isaiah recognize that Mill is what I have just called a special case. In Mr. Ebel's writing this idea has gone reflective on itself: hence he speaks of looking for the wood rather than the trees, and approvingly cites Berlin in this context. Mr. Robson, on the other hand, finds such a principle simplistic. I beg to differ: in need of unpacking, yes, but artless, definitely no. Mill needs the hand of a sympathetic and experienced critic more than any other philosopher I can think of; and this is precisely because the complexities (to use the mildest of terms) of Mill's text do not permit unraveling. Readers of the edition of Mill's works which the University of Toronto Press is in the course of publishing will find it hard to deny as much. This does not mean that we should not applaud the effort which both a critical edition and the kind of "careful analysis" which Mr. Robson desires imply; but there is a point at which saturation is achieved, and diminishing returns set in.

That point has long since been reached and surpassed by the contemporary literature on Mill, which is why the ideas of Berlin and Ebel are such a welcome antidote. One may describe theirs as a knack both for the history of ideas and for the intentions of their author, which is hard to convey, let alone transmit as a technique to others. I know that I should be hard pressed if called upon to explain it. But it is there; it is the same gift that Lovejoy and Boas had, and just as elusive of verbal capture. It seems to me that what Mr. Robson protests against is a certain kind of scholarship which departs from the safety of a wealth of footnotes and the attendant caution which that promotes. I should not like to imply that forcefulness and interest are compromised by scholarly habits, nor that weight means pedantry. Conversely, I do not hold that to be captivating one must be inaccurate, or exaggerated, or divert wildly from the licence granted by the author's words on the subject. But I do think that there is an alternative to Mr. Robson's method. I should pare it down to this: in order to do someone justice, in this case Mill, it is not required that strict fidelity to the written word be maintained at all times. Mr. Robson does not go

along with this, which means that he must to some degree not recognize as valid other forms of scholarship that to my mind merit equal place.

When I say strict fidelity, I do not mean that one has the right to ignore or fly in the face of a particular text. I mean something much more important but at the same time harmless: that for scholarship to be, in Mr. Ebel's term, "profitable," it is not required that one keep plugging away doggedly at a particular source. In the case of Mill, ruminations are likely to be much more successful if the method by which Freud translated Mill is used: read a chapter, close the book, organize mentally, think, then write without taking recourse during that time to the printed word. Then compare. Yes, the text is an ultimate check; but it is not everything. Mr. Robson considers the text sacrosanct; I merely respect it, without thinking it hallowed. If I thought as Mr. Robson does I should find myself rapidly becoming shackled and my thoughts, whatever value they might have had in the past, stifled. I know, because I have been through a period of thinking the way he did, and it happened to me. I want to emphasize that this is not universally true; one can gain an immense amount by studying almost any author in the way that I imagine Mr. Robson to be doing. Aristotle is a good illustration. But even Aristotle suffers if he's confined to a minute-- I do not say, pedantic--examination of texts, leaving aside the purely philological problems which converge on us there. Much about Aristotle that is valuable is then left out, although once again it takes a certain indescribable (at least I find myself at a loss to account for it) skill in one's approach to be able to avoid the commonplace as well as the downright stupid (e.g., statements of a kind such as "Aristotle defended slavery because he was a typical fourth-century Greek").

If one persistently refuses to take even one eye off the printed page, one will find oneself severely hampered in saying anything valuable. The text is a check, but it should not be a limitation. In the case of Mill, it assumes the proportions of an obstacle, the best witness whereof is the enormous bulk of simply worthless material that has been penned on him over the past several years. Without wishing to impugn Mr. Robson, I submit that wherever flat, stale and unprofitable writing occurs, it is linked to an attitude about what is proper scholarship that Mr. Robson champions. Again, I do not mean that such an outlook inevitably produces dull material; only that it encourages it, at least where Mill is concerned.

Then, too, it is possible that individual styles must have sway, and that no one rule about what constitutes competent scholarship applies. Then Mr. Robson can have his approach, and Berlin and Mr. Ebel theirs. But I for one am not content with such a proposal, for many reasons. First, it implies a kind of principle of toleration, and I should hope that among colleagues we could hope for something more than toleration, even given the pluralism of beliefs and the present deep-seated divisions both in and between disciplines. Second, it implies that no genuine standards exist by which good scholarship can be measured. This is false, and sufficient to dismiss the proposal, even though it must be admitted that we are rather bad at articulating those standards even where there is consensus. Mr. Robson appears to be an exception.

On the other hand, I am not a proponent of uniformity--unlike Mr. Robson. His scheme is neater but, as I have indicated, can lead to

desultory results. To have one prevailing tenor with regard to method is not a good thing, if only because such a reign cuts us off automatically from the valuable contributions which can be made by a loyal opposition. This word loyal is to be stressed. As I mentioned at the outset, both Mr. Ebel and Sir Isaiah are in Mill's camp. Consequently they are in Mr. Robson's, as well. Hence there are no really adequate grounds for his outburst. Not that it mystifies me; as I said, it hangs on a vital question of method.

If I may be permitted to couch my polemic in the boldest terms, it seems to me that Mr. Robson has mistaken creativity for laxness, and originality for unscrupulousness. I understand how he feels; but in this debate I side with his opposition, as yet unspoken for. What Whitehead once said about philosophy applies here: it ought not to be a ferocious debate among warring professors, but an exploration of possibilities. To ask for one law in Mill scholarship is to insure a further outpouring of mediocrity, from which Sir Isaiah and Mr. Ebel are a happy if all too infrequent escape. To insist on adherence to a rigid code of professional ethics sounds uplifting, but in reality only deprives us of novel and worth while experiences. There is room for other trends than the ones advocated by Mr. Robson. There had better be, if scholarship is to avoid plunging itself in aridity, with Mill the unfortunate victim.

NOTES:

¹John M. Robson, editor, The Mill News Letter, Vol. II, No. 2 (Spring, 1967), p. 1.

²Isaiah Berlin, John Stuart Mill and the Ends of Life (London, 1960).

* * * * *

Recent Publications.

Cohen, George. "The Categories of J.S. Mill." Dissertation, Columbia, 1968 (DA, 29, 288A).

Dryer, D.P. See Robson, below.

Negro, Dalmacis. "Tocqueville Y Stuart Mill," Revista de Occidente, 19 (1967), 103-14.

Park, Roy. "Hazlitt and Bentham," Journal of the History of Ideas, 30 (July-Sept., 1969), 369-84.

Priestley, F.E.L. See Robson, below.

Robson, John M., ed. John Stuart Mill, Essays on Ethics, Religion, and Society. Vol. X of the Collected Works. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969. With an Introduction by F.E.L. Priestley, and an Essay on Mill's Utilitarianism by D.P. Dryer.

Sheridan, Sister Mary Q. "John Stuart Mill's Concept of Class." Dissertation, St. Louis, 1968 (DA, 28, 3126A).

Ten, C.L. "Mill and Liberty," Journal of the History of Ideas, 30 (Jan.-Mar., 1969), 47-68.

Thomas, William. "James Mill's Politics: The 'Essay on Government' and the Movement for Reform," Historical Journal, 12 (1969), 249-84.

* * * * *

AN UNREMARKED YIDDISH TRANSLATION OF MILL'S ON LIBERTY

Marcia Allentuck
City University of New York

In 1909, the New York publisher, A.M. Evalenko, brought out a now rare Yiddish translation of John Stuart Mill's On Liberty, in his series of internationally famous volumes on literature and social philosophy. The Yiddish translator, a Dr. Y.A. Merison, about whom I have been able to learn nothing, did a superb job of rendering Mill's detached, objective prose into a tongue conspicuous for its concern with highly emotive phraseology calculated to involve the reader first emotionally and psychologically, and only second intellectually. In addition, Merison prefixed an extended account of Mill's life and writings to the translation, while explicating his ideas intelligently and persuasively. What is of most interest in this translation, however, is the Introduction by Dr. Chaim Zhitlowsky, one of the most distinguished social critics of the day. After some seminal general comments about the role of Mill in western thought, Zhitlowsky 'specifically states that one of the primary reasons for this translation was to demonstrate to the Jewish radicals the folly of their ways, and to urge them to follow instead in the paths of their more liberal brethren. He castigates the radicals for their intolerance of dissenting opinion, for their fanaticism in the pursuit of truth as they understand it, and for their description of their opponents as "Am Haratzim," a Hebrew term with the literal meaning of "men of the earth," but with the actual meaning of "uncultivated boors." It is his hope that the example of the concepts of Mill's treatise will cause a more liberal spirit to prevail, and thus limit the power exercised by a small minority over a majority of workers and thinkers. Of the sweatshops and other gross labour abuses of the time Zhitlowsky does not speak, nor does he manifest the understanding that by and large the radicalism which concerned him was not world-wide in its involvements, but largely local and topical. The full citation of the volume in transliterated Yiddish follows:
Di Internatzionale Bibliothek./Freiheit/Fun/John Stuart Mill./Iberzetztois dem Englishen Originel,/Mit a Biografieh fun Ferfasser/Fun Dr. Y.A. Merison./Mit an Hakadmeh fun Dr. Ch. Zhitlowsky./Aroisgegeben fun/A.M. Evalenko/New York./ (1909)

A NOTE ON "SOME NOTES"

Francis E. Mineka

All of us who are interested in Mill are grateful to Professor Anna J. Mill for her article, "Some Notes on Mill's Early Friendship with Henry Cole," in the Spring number of the News Letter. The article brings to light the first new information on Mill's activities as a young man that we have had for a long time, and it gives us some welcome insights into the range of his interests, particularly in music.

Professor Mill has written with her usual grace and precision, but in one of her footnotes (no. 10) I fear that an attractive conjecture has led her astray. She suggests redating Letter 76 in the Earlier Letters as of July 3, 1833 instead of Wednesday, [June] 1833. Mill may well have missed meeting Tennyson on July 3 because he went to see Harriet instead, but Letter 76 could scarcely have been written on that day. The July number of the Monthly Repository referred to in the Letter was advertised as to be published on July 1 in both the Examiner of June 30 and the Spectator of June 29. And though advertised dates of publication of periodicals are not always fully to be relied upon, in this instance we have some corroboration. In the very next published letter (no. 77), dated July 4, Mill has already read the July number of the Repository. He must have completed his article on Alison referred to in Letter 76 some time before the end of June.

* * * * *

Bibliography: S.

- Sabine, George Holland. A History of Political Theory. London: Harrap, [1937].
- Saenger, Samuel. "John Stuart Mill als Philosoph," Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, 9 (May, 1896), 344-60.
- . John Stuart Mill: Sein Leben und Lebenswerk. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1901.
- . "Mill's Theodizee," Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, 13, No. 3 (1900), 402-29.
- Sampson, R.V. "J.S. Mill: An Interpretation," Cambridge Journal, 3 (Jan., 1950), 232-9.
- Samson, François. La conception doctrinale de Stuart Mill sur la coopérative de production et ses rapports avec les socialistes associationists. Aspects économiques et philosophiques. Dissertation, Paris, 1950.
- Sanderson, David R. "Metaphor and Method in Mill's On Liberty," Victorian Newsletter, 34 (Fall, 1968), 22-5.
- Sangar, James Mortimer. Episcopal Vows; What do they mean? A Letter to the Lord Bishop of St. David's on his Recent Endorsements of the Alleged Infidelity of J.S. Mill. London, [1866].
- Scanlan, James P. "J.S. Mill and the Definition of Freedom," Ethics, 68 (Apr., 1958), 194-206.
- Schapiro, Jacob S. "Comment [on Lewis Feuer on Mill and Marxian Socialism]," Journal of the History of Ideas, 10 (Apr., 1949), 303-4.
- . "John Stuart Mill, Pioneer of Democratic Liberalism in England," Journal of the History of Ideas, 4 (Apr., 1943), 127-60. Reprinted in Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1949, 256-89.
- . "Utilitarianism and the Foundations of English Liberalism," Journal of Social Philosophy, 4 (1939), 121-37.
- Schatz, Albert. L'individualisme économique et social. Paris: Colin, 1907, 216-57.
- Schauchet, Pauline. Individualistische und Sozialistische Gedanken in

- den Lehren John Stuart Mills. Giessen, 1926.
- Scheffler, Israel. The Anatomy of Inquiry. New York: Knopf, 1963.
- Scherer, Edmond Henri Adolphe. Etudes critiques sur la littérature contemporaine. Paris: Levy, 1863, I, 290-320. Tr. G. Saintsbury as Essays on English Literature. New York: Scribner's, 1891, 13-35.
- Schiel, J. Die Methode der Inductiven Forschung als die Methode der Naturforschung in Gedrängter Darstellung, hauptsächlich nach J.S. Mill, etc. Braunschweig, 1865.
- Schmid, J. von. "John Stuart Mill's Logica der Geesteswetenschappen," Algemeen Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Wijsbegeerte en Psychologie [Assen], 37 (1943-4), 11-20.
- Schneewind, Jerome B., ed. Mill: A Collection of Critical Essays. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968.
- . "Moral Problems and Moral Philosophy in the Victorian Period," Supplement to Victorian Studies, 9 (1965), 29-46.
- Schneider, H.W. Mill's Methods and Formal Logic. Columbia University Department of Philosophy Studies in the History of Ideas, Vol. III.
- Schoenwald, Richard L., ed. Nineteenth-Century Thought: The Discovery of Change. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Schörry, Otto. Lohnfondstheorie und Ehernes Lohngesetz; Eine Untersuchung der Lohntheorien von Adam Smith, Malthus, Ricardo und John Stuart Mill. Dissertation, Mannheim, 1934.
- Schwartz, Pedro. "Distribucion e Instituciones en J.S. Mill," Anales de Economía (Madrid), n.s. 8 (Oct.-Dec., 1964), 709-40.
- . "John Stuart Mill and Laissez Faire: London Water," Economica, n.s. 33 (Feb., 1966), 71-83.
- . "John Stuart Mill y el 'laissez-faire,'" Moneda y Crédito (Madrid), 91 (Dec., 1964), 59-130.
- . La nueva economía de J.S. Mill. Madrid: Tecnos, S.A., 1968. (Based on "Aspects of the Theory of Economic and Social Policy in the Works of J.S. Mill." Dissertation, London, 1964.)
- Seal, Horace. "The Individual Always the Unit," Westminster Review, 147 (Jan., 1897), 5-10.
- Secombe, John Thomas. Science, Theism, and Revelation, considered in relation to Mr. Mill's Essay on Nature, Religion and Atheism. London, 1875.
- Sée, Henri. "Stuart Mill et la propriété foncière," Revue Internationale de Sociologie, 32 (1924), 606-19.
- Selem, Alessandro. "La Teoria Dell' Induzione di J.S. Mill," Studia Patavina, 6 (1959), 524-39.
- Semmel, Bernard. The Governor Eyre Controversy. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1962.
- Senn, Peter R. "The Earliest Use of the Term 'Social Science,'" Journal of the History of Ideas, 19 (Oct., 1958), 569-70.
- Seth, James. "The Alleged Fallacies in Mill's 'Utilitarianism,'" Philosophical Review, 17 (Sept., 1908), 469-88.
- . English Philosophers and Schools of Philosophy. London: Dent, 1912, 246-78.
- . A Study of Ethical Principles. Edinburgh and London: Blackwood, 1894.
- Shannon, E.F. Tennyson and the Reviewers. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952.

- Sharpless, F. Parvin. The Literary Criticism of John Stuart Mill.
The Hague: Mouton, 1967.
- "William Johnson Fox and Mill's Essays on Poetry," Victorian
Newsletter, 27 (Spring, 1965), 18-21.
- Shee, William Archer. My Contemporaries. London: Hurst and Blackett,
1893.
- Sheridan, Sister Mary Q. John Stuart Mill's Concept of Class.
Dissertation, St. Louis, 1968 (DA, 28, 3126A).
- Shine, Hill. "J.S. Mill and an open letter to the Saint-Simonian Society
in 1832," Journal of the History of Ideas, 6 (Jan., 1945), 102-8.
- Shorey, Paul. "Mill Revealed in his Letters," Dial, 48 (June, 1910),
417-9.
- Shoul, Bernice. "Similarities in the Work of John Stuart Mill and Karl
Marx," Science and Society, 29 (1965), 18-21.
- Shumaker, Wayne. English Autobiography: Its Emergence, Materials, and
Form. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1954, 142-6.
- Sidgwick, Henry. "John Stuart Mill," Academy, 15 May, 1873, 193.
----- The Methods of Ethics. 6th ed. London: Macmillan, 1901.
- Sidgwick, Rose. "The Library of John Stuart Mill," Cornhill Magazine,
n.s. 21 (Nov., 1906), 674-82.
- Simcox, Edith. "Influence of J.S. Mill's Writings," Contemporary
Review, 22 (July, 1873), 297-317.
- Smith, H.B. "Mill's Examination of Sir Wm. Hamilton," American
Presbyterian Review, 15 (1866), 126ff.
- Sorley, W.R. A History of English Philosophy. Cambridge: University
Press, 1920, 249-63.
- Souday, P. "La correspondance de Stuart Mill et d'Auguste Comte,"
Le Temps, 31 Jan., 1899.
- Spence, G.W. "John Stuart Mill, an Imperialist with a Philosophy of
History," Cambridge Review, 89A (19 Apr., 1968), 380-2.
----- John Stuart Mill on Sociology and "the Art of Life."
Dissertation, Cambridge, 1968.
- "The Psychology behind J.S. Mill's 'Proof,'" Philosophy, 43
(Jan., 1968), 18-28.
- Spencer, Herbert. "Mill versus Hamilton--The Test of Truth," Fortnightly
Review, 1 (July, 1865), 531-50.
----- "His [J.S. Mill's] Moral Character," in H.R. Fox Bourne (ed.),
John Stuart Mill, 38-42.
- Spiegelberg, Herbert. "A Defense of Human Equality," Philosophical
Review, 53 (Mar., 1944), 1-124.
----- "J.S. Mill on 'Accident of Birth,'" Journal of the History
of Ideas, 22 (Oct.-Dec., 1961), 475-92.
- Spitz, David. "Pure Tolerance: A Critique of Criticisms," Dissent, 13
(1966), 510-25. (See also ibid., 729-39.)
- Sprague, A.P. "Mill and Agassiz," National Quarterly Review [New York],
28 (1873), 234ff.
- Stammhammer, Josef. "John Stuart Mill," Handwörterbuch der Staatswissen-
schaft, 3rd ed. Jena: Fischer, 1910, VI, 707-9.
-----, and Meitzel, C. "John Stuart Mill," Handwörterbuch der Staats-
wissenschaft, 4th ed. Jena: Fischer, 1925, VI, 583-4.
- Stamp, Lord. "New Letters of John Stuart Mill," Times, 29 Dec., 1938,
9-10.

- Stebbing, William. Analysis of Mr. Mill's System of Logic. London: Longmans, 1864.
- Steglich, A. John Stuart Mills Logik der Daten. Dissertation, Leipzig, 1908.
- Stephen, James Fitzjames. Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. London: Smith Elder, 1873.
- "Mr. Spencer on Mr. Mill," Saturday Review, 12 Aug., 1865, 199-201.
- Stephen, Leslie. The English Utilitarians. 3 vols. London: Duckworth, 1900.
- "John Stuart Mill," Dictionary of National Biography, (1837-8), 13, XIII, 390-9.
- "Some Early Impressions," National Review, 42 (Oct. 1903) 208-24.
- Stevenson, Lionel. "1859: Year of Fulfillment," The Centennial Review, 3 (1959), 337-56.
- Stewart, H.L. "J.S. Mill's 'Logic,' A Post-centenary Appraisal," University of Toronto Quarterly, 17 (1947), 361-71.
- Stigler, George J. "The Nature and Role of Originality in Scientific Progress," Economica, 22 (Nov., 1955), 293-302. Reprinted in his Essays on the History of Economics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965, 1-15.
- Stillinger, Jack. "The Text of John Stuart Mill's Autobiography," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 43 (Sept., 1960), 220-42.
- Stirling, James. "Mr. Mill on Trades Unions," in Alexander Grant (ed.), Recess Studies. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1870.
- "De quelques opinions de Stuart Mill sur l'Unionisme Ouvrier" (tr. T.N. Bernard), Journal des Economistes, 20 (Oct., 1870).
- Stocks, John Leafric. "The Empiricism of John Stuart Mill," in Reason and Intuition, and Other Essays. London: Oxford University Press, 208-17.
- Stokes, Eric. The English Utilitarians and India. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Störing, G.W. J. Stuart Mill's Theorie Über den Psychologischen Ursprung des Vulgärglaubens an die Aussenwelt. Halle: 1889.
- Stout, George F. "Belief," Mind, 16 (Oct., 1891), 449-69.
- "The Genesis of the Cognition of Physical Reality," Mind, 15 (Jan., 1890), 22-45.
- Strachey, A. "J.S. Mill's Philosophy Tested by W.S. Jevons," Mind, 3 (April, 1878), 283-7.
- Street, Charles Larrabee. Individualism and Individuality in the Philosophy of John Stuart Mill. Dissertation, Columbia, 1926.
- Strong, Edward W. "William Whewell and John Stuart Mill; Their Controversy about Scientific Knowledge," Journal of the History of Ideas, 16 (April, 1955), 209-31.
- Stuart-Glennie, J.S. "James and John Stuart Mill: Traditional and Personal Memorials," Macmillan's Magazine, 45 (April, 1882), 490-8. Reprinted in Eclectic Magazine, 99 (July, 1882), 74ff., and Living Age, 153 (April, 1882), 236-43.
- "The Principle of the Conservation of Force and Mr. Mill's System of Logic," Nature, 7 April, 1870, 583.
- Summers, R. "John Stuart Mill and Liberty," Adelphi, n.s. 20 (Jan.-Mar. 1944), 39-45.

- Sutherland, J. "An Alleged Gap in Mill's Utilitarianism," Mind, 11 (Oct., 1886), 597-9.
- Syford, Ethel. "Recent Letters of John Stuart Mill," New England Magazine, n.s. 43 (Feb., 1911), 643-8.
- Szerec, Mieczyslaw. "Żywot Człowieka Mądrego [The Life of a Scientist]," Droga. Abstract in Social Science Abstracts, 4 (1932), 1733 (18119).

Bibliography: T.

- Taine, Hippolyte Adolphe. "La philosophie. Stuart Mill," Histoire de la littérature anglaise. Paris: Hachette, 1864, IV, 339-429.
Tr. H. van Laun as History of English Literature. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1871, II, 477-517.
- "John Stuart Mill et son Système de Logique," Revue des Deux Mondes, 32 (Mar. 1, 1861), 44-82.
- Le positivisme Anglais, Etude sur Stuart Mill. Paris: 1864.
Tr. T.D. Haye as English Positivism. A Study on John Stuart Mill. London: Simpkin, Marshall, 1870.
- Tanesse, Georges. "La Philosophie pratique de John Stuart Mill," Revue de l'enseignement philosophique, 14 (Oct.-Nov., 1963), 12-24.
- Tarozzi, G. John Stuart Mill. 2 vols. Milan, 1929-31.
- Taussig, Frank William. Wages and Capital; An Examination of the Wages Fund Doctrine. London: Macmillan, 1896.
- Tawney, Guy Allan. John Stuart Mill's Theory of Inductive Logic. Cincinnati University Press, 1909.
- Taylor, Algernon. Memories of a Student. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent, 1895.
- Taylor, Henry. Autobiography. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1885
----- Correspondence of Henry Taylor. Ed. Edward Dowden. London: Longmans, Green, 1888.
- Taylor, Mary. "Mrs. John Stuart Mill: A Vindication by her Granddaughter," Nineteenth Century, 71 (Feb., 1912), 357-63.
----- "Some Notes on the Private Life of John Stuart Mill," in H.S.R. Elliot (ed.), The Letters of John Stuart Mill. 2 vols. London: Longmans, 1910, I, xxxix-xlvi.
- Taylor, Robert H. Authors at Work. New York: Grolier Club, 1957.
- Ten, C.L. "Mill and Liberty," Journal of the History of Ideas, 30 (Jan.-Mar., 1969), 47-68.
----- "Mill on Self-Regarding Actions," Philosophy, 43 (Jan., 1968), 29-37.
- Thibaudeau, A.W. (ed.). Catalogue of the Collection of Autograph Letters and Historical Documents Formed between 1865 and 1882 by Alfred Morrison. London: 1890, IV, 252-7.
- Thieme, Erich. Die Sozialethik John Stuart Mills. Leipzig: Wiegandt, 1910.
- Thilly, Frank. "Individualism of John Stuart Mill," Philosophical Review, 32 (Jan., 1923), 1-17.
- Thom, John H. (ed.). The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White. 3 vols. London: Chapman, 1845.
- Thomas, M.H., Jr. "J.S. Mill's Theory of Truth; a Study in Metaphysics and Logic," Philosophical Review, 56 (May, 1947), 273-92.

- Thomas, Powell Stackhouse. John Stuart Mill's Problem: the Unsuccessful Reconciliation of the Individual to Society. Dissertation, Pennsylvania, 1961 (DA, 22 [1961], 1163.)
- Thompson, Daniel G. "President Porter on Mill," National Quarterly Review [New York], 41 (Oct., 1880), 377-414.
- Thornton, William T. "Anti-Utilitarianism," Fortnightly Review, n.s. 8 (Sept., 1870), 314-37.
- "His [J.S. Mill's] Career in the India House," in H.R. Fox Bourne (ed.), John Stuart Mill, 30-7.
- Old-Fashioned Ethics and Common-Sense Metaphysics, with some of their Applications. London: Macmillan, 1873.
- Thouvenez, Emile. Stuart Mill. Paris: Bloud, 1905.
- Thwing, Charles Franklin. "Education According to John Stuart Mill," School and Society [Garrison, N.Y.], 3 (Jan., 1916), 1-8, 49-58.
- "The Grave of Mill," The Nation, 127 (Aug., 1928), 201.
- Todhunter, Isaac. William Whewell. An account of his writings, with selections from his correspondence. London, 1876.
- Tonsor, S.J. "John Stuart Mill's Essays on Politics and Culture," National Review [New York], 13 (Nov., 1962), 396-8.
- Torrens, Robert. The Budget. On Commercial and Colonial Policy. With an Introduction in which the Deductive Method, as Presented in Mr. Mill's System of Logic, is Applied to the Solution of some Contradictory Questions in Political Economy. London: Smith, Elder, 1844.
- The Principles and Practical Operation of Sir Robert Peel's Bill of 1844, Explained and Defended against the Objections of Tooke, Fullarton, and Wilson. With Additional Chapters on Money, The Gold Discoveries, and International Exchange; and a Critical Examination of the Chapter 'On the Regulation of a Convertible Paper Currency,' in J.S. Mill's 'Principles of Political Economy.' 2nd ed. London, 1857.
- Towers, C. Marion D. "John Stuart Mill and the London and Westminster Review," Atlantic Monthly, 69 (Jan., 1892), 57-74.
- Towry, M.H. "On the Doctrine of Natural Kinds," Mind, 12 (July, 1887), 434-8. Replies by F. and C.L. Franklin. Mind 13 (1888), 83-5.
- Trevelyan, George Macaulay. The Life of John Bright. London: Constable, 1913.
- Trilling, Diana. "Mill's Intellectual Beacon," Partisan Review, 19 (Jan., Feb., 1952), 115-16, 118-20. (Rev. of F.A. Hayek, JSM and Harriet Taylor.)
- Trimen, Henry. "His [J.S. Mill's] Botanical Studies," in H.R. Fox Bourne (ed.), John Stuart Mill, 43-8.
- Tuell, Anne Kimball. John Sterling. New York: Macmillan, 1941.
- Tufts, James H. "John Stuart Mill," Encyclopedia Americana (1957), XIX, 110-2.
- Turgeon, Charles and Charles-Henri. La valeur d'après les économistes Anglais et Français. 2nd ed. Paris: Sirey, 1921, 202-50.
- Turgeon, Charles-Henri. La valeur d'après les économistes Anglais depuis Adam Smith jusqu'à nos jours. Dissertation, Rennes, 1913.
- Tyurin, Sergei Petrovich. Nicholas Chernyshevsky and John Stuart Mill. London: Eyre and Spittiswoode, [1930]. Reprinted from Slavonic Review, 9 (June, 1930).