

## PERPLEXITIES

At an early stage in the planning of the *Collected Papers*, the decision was made to annotate any allusion that might be puzzling. This decision was made partly on the grounds that since Russell is so multi-dimensional, an allusion that poses no problems to a specialist in one field may not be clear to a reader with a different background. While there is little disputing the rightness of the determination to annotate fully, in practice it creates challenges. One problem is to know where to stop. Philosophical terminology is among the most difficult, and the editors decided not to put themselves in the position of teaching philosophy to non-philosophers. Real courage would be required to explicate, let us say, "monism", for a readership that would include non-metaphysicians. After finding Russell making the following comment to Alys, the effort would have required not only courage but temerity:

My remarks about Bradley and Spinozistic monism were a little tag of metaphysics which it would be impossible to explain adequately to a non-metaphysician—*some* day, in the far future, I will do my best conversationally, but it is impossible to attempt it in a letter. (30 Oct. 1894)

In this case, the editors contented themselves with quoting the later Russell when he writes about "Spinozistic monism" in the *History of Western Philosophy*.

If certain concepts are by Russell's reckoning "impossible" to explain, other matters he would consider too obvious. This latter case may be illustrated by a comment he made in a critical review of a book by Edmond Goblot called *Essai sur la classification des sciences*. Russell wrote in this review (to be included in *Collected Papers* 2):

The work appears to have few merits except an unusually scrupulous acknowledgement of sources. On p. 43, for example, it is asserted that knowledge is

power, and M. Egger is cited as having anticipated M. Goblot in the discovery of this novel and weighty aphorism.

In an essay early in Volume 1, Russell himself used this novel and weighty aphorism. At least in this case, the impulse to provide a commentary has, happily, been resisted.

Russell is unlike M. Goblot in that he does not always make a scrupulous acknowledgement of sources. As a result, many hours are spent attempting to find the sources of quotations he knew from memory, and for one reason or another felt no obligation to document. What makes the situation even more complicated is that Russell occasionally uses quotation marks around material of his own composition for the sake of rhetorical flourish. In these instances, he creates a dialogue with an imaginary antagonist or, more rarely, provides himself with a supporting voice. Although it is usually safe to assume that such passages are Russell's invention, they generate the nagging fear that they too may be quotations requiring annotations.

Besides documenting quotations, the annotations explain references to events that would have been clear enough in their day, but are now obscure, except to highly specialized historians. The annotations also identify people in Russell's personal and public spheres of interest. The materials in the Russell Archives are a rich resource for this information. In particular, the private correspondences provide masses of invaluable data. Usually, with patience and effort, the necessary data do come to light. For the "Locked Diary" alone, 193 annotations have been completed. Occasionally, however, some references cannot be found.

In the last issue of the newsletter a number of perplexities were outlined so that our readers might be informed about some of our struggles and also challenged to help find the answers. Since then a few of those puzzles have been at least tentatively solved, but new ones have arisen. We have long been baffled by the people in the "Locked Diary" who are referred to as tennis partners without any accompanying clues to their identity. Particularly, "Fred", Fred's friend Dickens and Miss Fraser were problematic. There are now two possible candidates for Fred. One of these is Frederick Morshead, a house master at Winchester, where Frank Russell went to school. What makes him seem a reasonably credible choice is that he must have been acquainted with Henry Compton Dickins who had been a tutor there. Later, as vicar, he maintained close contact with the school. He officiated at the wedding of Mabel Edith Scott and Frank Russell. Both Fred and Dickins are remembered affectionately in Frank Russell's *My Life and Adventures*. The other candidate for Fred is Frederick Fraser. Some credence is given to this

alternative because Russell speaks of having played tennis with Miss Fraser. If she is correctly identified, then Fred might be her brother. Unfortunately, it seems unlikely that these identifications can be established with certainty.

With far less hesitation, we are able to report the following discovery. In a 1904 letter to the editor of *The Spectator* about free trade, Russell said that Seddon, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, described "Protectionist countries as heaven and England as hell for workmen." We were unable to find the source of this quotation until we received information from a researcher in England. The *Morning Post* of 20 November 1903 reported that Seddon had stated: "The 'Open Door' policy of fifty years had resulted in an open Hades for British workmen and British manufacturers, while foreign workers and manufacturers made secure behind fiscal barriers were enjoying heavenly prosperity."

All other perplexities mentioned last time remain unsolved. Your assistance with any of them would be greatly appreciated. What follows are some of the new puzzles that have arisen.

1. In "Science as an Element in Culture" (1913) Russell wrote:

My eyes saw not the men of old;  
And now their age away has rolled.  
I weep—tô think I shall not see  
The heroes of posterity

So says the Chinese poet; but such impartiality is rare in the more pugnacious atmosphere of the West, where champions of past and future fight a never-ending battle, instead of combining to seek out the merits of both.

The problem here is the identity of this "Chinese poet". Might he be a persona for Russell?

2. In "Dramatic and Utilitarian Ethics" (c.1912), this passage occurs:

"Le sage qui passe interrompt mille drames", says Maeterlinck; this is one reason why the sage is hated.

From what work by Maeterlinck is Russell quoting? He claims in a letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell to have read Maeterlinck's entire corpus.

3. We would be grateful for any data at all about George Chatterton-Hill. We know only that he taught at the University of Geneva. Russell wrote two reviews of his book *Heredity and Selection in Sociology*: one for the *Albany Review* in 1907, and the other for the *London Nation* in 1908.—M.M.