Water-surface is, for the needs of man, so unlike land-surface, that it is natural enough to include all water-basins under the single geographic term, 'lakes.' Wherever they occur, — in narrow mountain-valleys or on broad, level plains; on divides or on deltas; in solid rock or in alluvium, — they are all given one name. But if we in imagination lengthen our life so that we witness the growth of a river-system as we now watch the growth of plants, we must then as readily perceive and as little confuse the several physiographic kinds of lakes as we now distinguish the cotyledons, the leaves, the galls, and the flowers, of a quickly growing annual that produces all these forms in appropriate order and position in the brief course of a single summer. W. M. DAVIS.

Cambridge, Mass., Sept 7.

Corruption of American Geographic Names.

MR. MURDOCK'S friendly criticism and confirmatory note on the pronunciation of 'Arkansas,' in the last *Science*, is gratifying from the fact that it will help disseminate a proper understanding of that word. But 'Arkansas' is only one of hundreds of geographic names which have been corrupted under our very noses, so to speak, and I believe it behooves all educators to assist in their correction. In the West we have many classes of descriptive geographic names, — first, words in the Indian language, which the Spanish, French, or English (and sometimes all) have endeavored to represent phonetically in their own language, such as 'Ouachita,' 'Washita,' 'Wichita,' etc., all derived from the name of a tribe of Indians first noted by La Salle, and which has now been applied in its modifications to six rivers (not including creeks) in Indian Territory, Arkansas, and Texas, two mountain areas, and innumerable political divisions, such as counties, post-offices, etc.; second, descriptive names. To the credit of the Spaniards, it must be said that they seldom adopted Indian names, but gave either descriptive names, such as 'Sabinas,' 'Ulmas,' 'Puercos,' 'Colorado,' often of the forest-growth and character of sediment of rivers; or religious names, such as 'Corpus Christi,' 'Vera Cruz;' or sometimes a combination of both, such as 'Sangre de Cristo' Mountains.

Most of our American names in the West, and especially the South-west, are simply abominable. They are either corruptions of the French, Indian, or Spanish, or indefinite appellatives, often of lewd and repulsive meaning. This is especially true of the names given by my fellow-southerners, as they followed the law of migrations along degrees of latitude. In central and western Texas there is another corruption which is more misleading than that of mispronunciation or misspelling. The generic topographic terms are all erroneously used for the subgeneric, such as 'river' for 'creek' (or what can only be properly expressed by the Spanish *arroyo*), and 'mountain,' 'peak,' etc., for 'knolls,' 'buttes,' or 'mesas.' For instance: while there is not a true mountain in Texas east of the Pecos River, there are no less than a dozen 'Round Mountains,' 'Pilot Peaks,' 'Comanche Peaks,' 'Hog and Packsaddle Mountains,' etc., in central Texas, none of which in any way are entitled to the dignity of the terms, and which can only be described as buttes and mesas of secondary proportions. The creeks and rivers are either 'Hog' creeks, 'Muddy,' 'Snake,' 'Buffalo,' 'Dry,' 'Indian,' or 'Post Oaks.'

Not only have these corruptions been going on in the past, but they are being perpetrated at present, and our government publications are innocently the chief instruments in so doing. A remarkable instance came under my observation two years ago. While sitting upon the stone that marks the north-west corner of the State of Kansas, examining some geological specimens, and conversing with Texan cowboy friends who had 'wintered' near there a year or two, I inquired the nearest post-office. One of them informed me that a [tent] village had just been established a few miles distant, and that its name was 'Bueno.' This word, from my past experience on the Texan frontier, I knew to constitute nine tenths of the cow-boy's knowledge of pigeon Spanish (the other tenth being 'cuss' words), and that it had been imported from the Rio Grande by him into Kansas, and that the 'short-horns' (the cowboys' term of inferiority for the Kansas settler) had been fascinated by it, and applied it to their new town. A capital idea, I thought, until I looked up the name of the town in the latest post-office guide, when, to my horror, I found my pet Spanish word 'bueno' anglicized into 'Wano.' The other instance of governmental perpetration is on the topographic maps of both the Post-Office and War Departments, and Geological and Coast Surveys, where these dry creeks continue to appear as rivers, and buttes as mountains, etc.

Since my arrival in Arkansas, I have been delighted to find numerous minor French geographic names which have not been corrupted, such as 'L'Eau Frais,' 'Terre Noir,' 'Antoine,' and other streams; and from the oldest Anglo-American inhabitants I learn that nearly every geographic feature of southern Arkansas was named, not by French missionaries, but by the trappers and *voyageurs*, who had traded with the Indians for a hundred years or more, and who dominated here almost until the State was admitted to the Union (1836). Many descendants of these old French pioneers inhabit south-eastern Arkansas, and it is a source of gratification that the Anglo-American settlers here, however illiterate, pronounce the names with approximate correctness, even if their attempts at spelling them are oftentimes ridiculous. ROB'T T. HILL.

Ouachita River, Ark., Sept. 8.

Romantic Love and Personal Beauty.

THE latest contribution to the theory of evolution is the attempt of Mr. Finck to show that the phase of human character known as romantic (pre-nuptial) love is strictly modern, having developed within the last 1,000 years. The book in which the argument is set forth, recently reviewed in this magazine, is a remarkable combination, which one hardly knows whether to accept as a joke or in earnest. In this one work we find a scientific discussion of love as found in plants and animals, theories as to its origin and import; we find many surprising statements concerning modern society, such as that there can never be too much of flirtation, since it is one of the most valuable discoveries of the English people; that beauty in children is dependent upon the pre-nuptial love of their parents; we find directions to the maiden how to win her lover, directions to the love-sick swain as to his cure, directions to the lover how to kiss, etc.; the whole making such a curious combination that we hardly know whether to set the book aside with a laugh, or to regard it as an important contribution to knowledge. The latter feeling, however, predominates. The fundamental proposition of the discussion, viz., the strictly modern nature of romantic love, is one of great importance, giving as it does entirely new thoughts upon certain phases of modern life. It certainly merits the discussion given it, as well as the further discussion which is sure to follow the study of Mr. Finck's argument.

One cannot read this discussion of romantic love without acknowledging that Mr. Finck has made out a very strong case. The facts which are brought out plainly show that there has been a gradual but great change in the pre-nuptial relations of the sexes, and as a result a great change in the sentiments which precede marriage. A romantic love, which was curbed and repressed by the customs of ancient nations, has, under the influence of modern society, expanded into a greatly exaggerated form, until now it is the theme of about all novels, plays, and poems, occupies largely the thoughts of all young people, and is perhaps the most powerful lever for influencing the lives of mankind. But while we may go thus far with the theory, and recognize that ancient life and literature had very little of love, though modern life and literature are full of it, and that it is only modern society that recognizes the desirability of love-matches, the interpretations which may be drawn from the facts are varied. Mr. Finck interprets these facts as representing the development of a new factor in man's nature, and one which was not and could not have been present in earlier periods of history. It is at least questionable whether this interpretation be the true one.

The author is doubtless right in pointing out the impossibility of any feeling akin to the higher phases of love in the lower races of men. Romantic love is a feeling of high sensitiveness, and only those with highly developed sensibilities can experience it in its fullest degree. Indeed, the bulk of civilized people to-day are not capable of having very lofty experiences in this line. The love which Mr. Finck is writing about is largely ideal rather than actual. It belongs to emotional poets rather than to the common people.

Dante, Goethe, and Heine are exceptional, and their works do not represent the true feelings of mankind. It is the lot of very few to love as did Romeo, and most of us poor mortals cannot understand the feelings of Dante for Beatrice. Highly wrought loves are mostly found in fiction and poetry, seldom in actual life. And yet the average person of to-day is doubtless better able to appreciate such feelings than the average Greek or Roman, both because he is more capable of loving, and because women have been permitted to become more lovable. Society to-day has, then, a much higher development of this feeling than in past times. There has been an increase in the quantity of romantic love, and doubtless in the depth of it. But that romantic love of modern times is a new feeling, is not so evident.

There are many considerations which immediately suggest themselves as enabling us to understand these facts, and they may lead us to believe that romantic love can be traced back much further than 1,000 years, and that it was even in ancient times essentially the same in its nature as now. First, we must notice the change which has come over the spirit of literature in modern times: it is by no means fair to compare modern literature with the ancient upon this subject. At the time when the classics were written, books were great rarities, laboriously copied by hand, possessed only by the rich, and read only by scholars. In modern times printing has thrown all literature open to every one in civilized communities. The classical authors thus wrote to the few; the modern authors to the many. The former wrote from love of the art simply, and were supported by the patronage of rich men: the latter write for a living from the sale of their works. While the former were, therefore, free to follow wherever art led them, the majority of authors to-day must write that which will best please their readers. In former times it was only the genius who could hope to acquire any thing by writing: to-day many a writer of mediocre ability makes his living by the use of his pen. It is clear enough why such writers, wishing to obtain as many readers as possible, should choose the most common and yet most delightful experience of life as a theme. It is to these facts largely that we owe the great development of the love-literature of modern times, and partly at least the dearth of it in ancient times. If modern writers thought that only scholars would read their works, and common people know nothing about them, is it not certain that most of our love-literature would disappear? Now, it is, we believe, the development of the modern love-story and poetry, and not the isolated masterpieces of Dante and Shakspeare, which gives us the impression of the great prevalence of romantic love to-day. Blot out all our modern light fiction and other works inspired by money-getting, and Romeo and Juliet would seem as strained and out of place to-day as Mr. Finck thinks the works of Ovid were in the day in which they were written. Indeed, there are few of us now who do not regard this play of Shakspeare as much overdrawn.

We cannot, then, expect love-stories in the literature of early times, and what few references we may find to love here have for this reason the more significance. Now, the very citations used by Mr. Finck in support of his proposition seem to us to go far toward showing that romantic love was by no means an unknown experience in the ancient nations. Ovid was certainly a love-poet, and, even though he was ahead of his age, it is hardly credible that he would give directions to lovers if lovers were unknown. Modern literature gives few more romantic love-stories than that of Cleopatra. Virgil's account of the love of Æneus and Dido could not have been written by one who lived before the time of the birth of romantic love. Even Mr. Finck admits that the Hetære inspired the Greeks with feelings akin to love. Was it not, indeed, exactly the same feeling as modern love applied to a different end? Modern love does not go beyond the extent to which the love of Paris and Helen went to involve a whole nation in war. More significant still, both Greeks and Romans recognized a goddess of love, Venus; and, though perhaps they did not rigidly distinguish between romantic and conjugal love, nothing is plainer than that Venus was not the goddess of conjugal love. The whole account we have of her shows that romantic love was much more closely the idea associated with her than conjugal love. Again, Solomon's Songs, after all that is said about them, could not have been written by one of a nation who knew nothing about love. Did not Jacob serve seven extra years for Rachel because he loved her more than Leah? This is a case which shows that in these early times romantic love existed, and manifested itself in spite of established custom, which compelled the wedding of the elder daughter first.

Or look at the matter in a different way: romantic love at all ages refuses to be trammelled by custom. The French, as Mr. Finck tells us, being unable to find love in courtship, owing to the influences which surround French girls, find it in the greater freedom of women after marriage. This gives us the numerous illicit loves of the French novel. Love leaps beyond the bounds of custom and law. Now, have we not abundant evidence that the same has been true at all times? As our author shows, the customs of ancient nations have been such as almost to preclude romantic love before marriage; but that the feeling has shown itself in other ways seems evident from the universal existence of laws against adultery, the numerous instances of conjugal unfaithfulness, and the care with which husbands have always considered it necessary to guard their wives from contact with other men. And it is suggestive that this care is the greatest where pre-nuptial love is the most strictly prohibited. Such extra-marital loves, which are implied by these facts, though sometimes nothing more than sexual passion, are in many cases the same feeling which Mr. Finck calls romantic love, only applied in a different direction. If the various 'overtones' of romantic love, which Mr. Finck has drawn up, be considered, it will be found that they all apply to this species of love, except perhaps the 'pride of conquest,' which is impossible owing to the necessary secrecy of the matter.

I suspect, therefore, that Mr. Finck has been tracing not so much the birth of a new sentiment as the growth of the institution of courtship; not so much the development of love as the gradual improvement of the condition of woman. In all cases he has drawn a parallel between the stage of development of romantic love and the freedom of woman. His argument has shown the impossibility of courtship in ancient times, rather than the impossibility of love. Where wives were stolen, or bought and sold, or where marriages are merely a matter of business, *mariages de convenance*, it is plain enough that romantic love could seldom exist in connection with marriage. But even under these circumstances the feeling existed, as is shown by the conception of the goddess of romantic love among the Greeks and Romans, the few love snatches of ancient literature, and as is shown by the numerous extra-marital loves of all times. But when in modern times and among civilized nations women have been gradually acquiring freedom and independence, and a right to appear in public before marriage, this feeling of love between the sexes, which had hitherto been usually an unlawful feeling, gradually became directed toward its legitimate end, as a precursor to wedlock. Courtship is therefore a modern institution, which has resulted from the improvement in the condition of woman. But it is more than doubtful whether the love which accompanies it is any thing more than the same feeling between the sexes which has always existed, but applied to a different condition of society.

It may seem that the above is a distinction without a difference, and indeed these suggestions are not given in criticism of Mr. Finck's work, which is certainly to be regarded as one of the valuable contributions to the history of mankind; but there is certainly room to doubt whether Mr. Finck has put the right interpretation on his facts. That Dante was the first love-poet, and that Romeo was the first love-hero of literature, may be true in a sense; and that romantic love has come to fill a place in courtship which it did not formerly hold, may be also true; but we can hardly accept the conclusion that romantic love is of strictly modern birth. The fact of the undoubted existence of extra-marital, though perhaps not pre-nuptial loves at all times, the fact that the literature and mythology of the ancients did contain references to romantic loves, the fact that such loves could not have been then regarded as ennobling owing to the marriage customs, — these, taken with the fact that literature had a different purpose then and now, seem to the present writer rather to indicate that romantic love is nothing new, but that its application to courtship as a preliminary to wedlock is a new phase of life, found only in the customs of a few of the most advanced of modern civilized races.

H. W. Conn.

Middletown, Conn., Sept. 6.