Henry F. Fullenwider

Paul Carus as an Intermediary of German Literature in the United States

Upon hearing of Paul Carus's death on 11 February 1919, Professor Julius Goebel of the University of Illinois wrote the following words in the *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter:*

> Among the scholars of German descent who during the recent decades, the period of greatest intellectual growth and achievement in our history, contributed the best of their intellect, their character, and their training to the development of higher American civilization, Paul Carus takes one of the foremost places.[1]

In spite of this tribute, the eulogizer is probably better known in the field of German-American studies than is the man whose career was being so highly praised.

For some thirty years, Paul Carus (1852–1919) was editor of two successful, internationally circulated journals: *The Monist* and its less scholarly counterpart, *The Open Court.* In this function and as author of more than eighty-seven monographs and 1,200 articles, Carus was a very significant mediator of German literature and thought in the United States near the turn of the twentieth century. Born and educated in Germany (Dr. phil., University of Tübingen, 1876), Carus taught for several years in Dresden before emigrating to the United States in 1884. By 1887 he was living in New York where he was employed as coeditor of Zickel's *Novellenschatz und Familienblätter.* On 17 February 1887, only a few months after the appearance of the first issue of *The Open Court* in Chicago, its founder, the German-American industrialist Edward C. Hegeler, called Carus to become its editor. Under Carus's indefatigable and capable leadership this journal came to occupy an important place in American intellectual life as an international forum for the reception and discussion of current issues in philosophy, religion, psychology, politics, and literature. Its counterpart, *The Monist,* celebrated its centen-

nial in 1988 as one of the leading journals devoted to the philosophy of science. In measuring the extent of Paul Carus's achievement, it has been customary to see him as a cultural intermediary in the history of religion and philosophy[2] with each page of *The Open Court* and *The Monist* bearing witness to his long-term goal: the establishing of ethics and religion on a scientific basis. What has not yet emerged in the assessment of Carus's achievement is his keen awareness that literature is an important medium for the expression of ideas of a philosophical nature. In keeping with this awareness, Carus devoted considerable attention to a select group of German writers whom he wished to present to an American public as thinkers and as poets whose ideas were compatible with his own monist views.

Before exploring the role which German literature played in the fulfillment of Carus's goal in *The Open Court,* it is important to recall that the course which his periodical would later sail under his leadership had already been determined and expressed by its founder and financial backer, Edward C. Hegeler, in a series of articles which appeared in the very first issues of *The Open Court.* In its inaugural number, Hegeler expressed the hope that his readers would convince themselves "that the future of our souls, their preservation and evolution, lies in our posterity" (*OC* 1: 21). This notion, which strikes us today as an empty platitude, Hegeler owes in a much more specific way to the nineteenth-century novelist and journalist Gustav Freytag. According to Hegeler, this understanding of the immortality of the soul is the main idea of Freytag's novel *Die verlorene Handschrift.* Hegeler has in mind an extended passage in this novel in which Freytag has something to say about what we might call the great chain of knowledge as it is preserved in books. This passage concludes with the following statement:

> So bildet der Inhalt aller Bücher ein großes Geisterreich auf Erden, von den vergangenen Seelen leben und nähren sich alle, welche jetzt schaffen. In diesem Sinne ist der Geist des Menschengeschlechts eine unermeßliche Einheit, der jeder einzelne angehört, der einst lebte und schuf, und jetzt atmet und Neues wirkt. Der Geist, den die vergangenen Menschen als ihren eigenen empfanden, er ging und geht jeden Tag in andere über.[3]

Later that same year, in the lead article of the 16 September 1888 issue of *The Open Court,* Hegeler set forth his concept of "soul" *(Geist)* in terms of Freytag's definition, and it is not surprising to discover that this view of existence was also, by logical extension, the driving motivation for the founding of the Open Court Publishing Company as the vehicle for Hegeler's own immortality.

When Hegeler died on 4 June 1910, Carus eulogized the career of his employer and benefactor by describing his philosophy of life in the following words:

> Mr. Hegeler took great interest in psychology and found the key to its problems in the proposition, "I am my ideas." He argued that a man is

> wherever his ideas are. Our ancestors survive in us, and we shall survive wherever future generations think our thoughts and act as we would have acted. He deemed it the highest duty of every man to work out his own immortality. In his own conception, though he has ceased to be with us in the flesh, he has not passed from us. He is with us in spirit, and his soul remains a potent presence so long as his work, his thoughts, his ideals will persist. (*OC* 24: 389)

Such words, particularly the final sentiment, when taken outside the context of Hegeler's admiration for Gustav Freytag, will inevitably recall the pat phrases which we have come to expect in every eulogy. Taken within that context, however, they reveal the fundamental impact which a single idea from Freytag's novel—that the future of our souls, their preservation and evolution, lies in our posterity—had on the founding of the Open Court Publishing Company and the journal which bears its name.

Under these circumstances, it was to be expected that Hegeler would immediately use the Open Court Publishing Company as an instrument for the popularization of the novel he so much admired. The format of *The Open Court* gave preference to brevity, and even longer articles rarely required more than several installments. The publication in installments of entire book-length works such as Freytag's biography of Martin Luther in English translation is almost unique. *The Open Court* presented to its readers only one work of fiction during its entire history: Freytag's *The Lost Manuscript*, which was issued in regular installments from December 1887 until September 1889. The only basis for such a deviation from general editorial policy, as Hegeler explained in a "Publisher's Note" announcing the publication of the first installment, was simply his wish to bring this work to as large an American readership as possible.[4] Freytag's novel is characterized in this note as depicting magnificently "the grand connection, which links the individual soul of a man to the souls of others—to the present as well as to the past and future generations" (*OC* 1: 641).

Although it would seem that Freytag had other purposes in writing *Die verlorene Handschrift*, he was not unsympathetic to Hegeler's point of view. This emerges clearly from a hitherto unpublished, carefully-phrased letter sent by Freytag from Wiesbaden to his enthusiastic fan in Illinois on 20 February 1890:

> Hochverehrter Herr.
>
> Was Ihnen, dem begeisterten Förderer freier Bildung der Roman, "Die verlorene Handschrift," zunächst empfohlen hat, war seine Sendung, welche einigermaßen den hohen Gesichtspunkten entspricht, nach denen Sie die Lesestoffe der Zeitgenossen beurtheilen.
>
> Dem Dichter freilich war nicht die Lehre, welche seinem Buche entnommen werden kann, die Hauptsache, sondern das freudige Gestalten von Characteren und von Ereignissen, welche durch die geschilderten Persönlichkeiten möglich und verständlich werden. Alles Einzelne fügte er unter dem Zwange einer poetischen Idee zu

künstlerischer Einheit. Jetzt aber darf ich Ihnen auch sagen, wie sehr ich mich der Überraschung freue, welche zwischen dem ethischen Inhalt der Erzählung und zwischen der Weltanschauung besteht, welche Sie durch Leben und Lehre verbreiten, und daß ich Sie mit herzlicher Hochachtung als Gesinnungsgenossen begrüße. Gustav Freytag[5]

Hegeler had asked Freytag to supply a dedicatory motto which Freytag enclosed with this letter. Designed to reflect Hegeler's understanding of the novel, it has the following text:

Ein tüchtiges Menschenleben endet auf Erden
nicht mit dem Tode, es dauert in Gemüth
und Thun der Freunde, wie in den Gedanken
und der Arbeit des Volkes.
Wiesbaden. 20/2 90. Gustav Freytag.

Publication by the Open Court Publishing Company of *The Lost Manuscript* in book form, with a translation of Freytag's motto on the title page, was completed later that same year.[6] In a "Publisher's Preface" to this edition, Hegeler provided his American readership with a series of remarks which Freytag had made in his *Erinnerungen aus meinem Leben* (1887) in connection with *Die verlorene Handschrift*. He repeats the view, expressed in his *Open Court* article, "The Soul," that "we become aware of the invisible threads that interconnect our thoughts and the actions prompted by our thoughts. We observe the after-effects of our ideas and our deeds. Ideas live and develop not only in single individuals, but from generation to generation."[7] This notion of continuity of tradition was certainly one of the central tenets of that form of philosophical monism which Hegeler and Carus espoused and which breathes in various formulations throughout the first thirty years of *The Open Court* and *The Monist*.

In the three decades of his association with the Open Court Publishing Company, Carus wrote many hundreds of articles for publication in these two journals. Although most of these dealt with subjects in philosophy, psychology and religion, the background of Hegeler's interest in Gustav Freytag's *Die verlorene Handschrift* enables us to place in perspective Carus's efforts to popularize certain German literary figures in English translation and in easily understood articles of literary criticism.[8] Hegeler and Carus understood literature primarily as philosophy, as a vehicle for the transmission of ideas, and it is to the preservation and popularization of these ideas as a living tradition that Carus devoted his life's work.

Carus's Schiller studies provide a good starting point for an examination of Carus's interests in German literature. In these articles, Carus took the opportunity to discuss the problem of philosophical poetry in general in a way which reveals much about his assessment of other German writers. In a lengthy article entitled "Friedrich Schiller" (*OC* 19: 260–318), Carus acknowledged the controversial nature of the question "whether philosophical or scientific poetry is possible" (293); but since he was nevertheless satisfied that such poetry exists, the question

became moot. He was much more interested in the difficulty which philosophical and scientific poetry must overcome because it restricts its subject "to an extremely limited public." This is the reason why "philosophical poetry does not find the all but universal recognition of love songs" (293).

Poetry, for Carus, was not limited to meter and rhyme; nor was philosophical poetry simply rhymed philosophy. Poetry, instead, "is sentiment expressed in words; thus, anything that effects sentiment can become a fit subject of poetry." After rejecting all formal criteria in his definition of philosophical poetry, Carus put forth the following view:

> A mathematical theorem and its demonstration are prose. But if the mathematician is overwhelmed with the grandeur and wondrous harmony of geometrical forms, of the importance and universal application of mathematical maxims, or, of the mysterious simplicity of its manifold laws which are so self-evident and plain and at the same time so complicated and profound, he is touched by the poetry of his science; and if he but understands how to give expression to his feelings, the mathematician turns poet, drawing inspiration from the most abstract domain of scientific thought. (293–94)

Having emphasized the role of sentiment and, secondarily, rhetoric in distinguishing between prose and poetry, Carus was free to lament that there are not enough mathematicians in the world to form an audience large enough to make the mathematician of poetic sentiments a real poet: "A poet," Carus argued, "is known as one only when he voices such sentiments as will find an echo in the hearts of large multitudes that recognize in him the prophet who can find words for that which they themselves feel but vaguely" (294). From this point of view, we can better understand why Carus devoted some of his energies to the popularization in the United States of the best German philosophical poetry: without a readership there is no such thing as a "real poet."

Carus's "Friedrich Schiller"—noteworthy also for a biographical sketch and his translations of several of Schiller's most enduring philosophical poems—took up the entire May 1905 number of *The Open Court* in commemoration of the poet's death on 9 May 1805. "Schiller's Religion," an article contributed by William H. Carruth, professor of German at the University of Kansas, arrived too late to be included in the May issue and was published the following month (*OC* 19: 321–36). Later that same year Carus used his May 1905 article as the basis for a monograph entitled *Friedrich Schiller: A Sketch of His Life and an Appreciation of His Poetry.*[9]

If not always as a reader, then certainly as a translator, Carus showed a pronounced preference for the terse, epigrammatic statement of poetic wisdom. This general predisposition is evident also in Carus's appreciation of the works of Wilhelm Busch. Although Carus was well aware of Busch's reputation as a humorist in such works as *Max und Moritz*, *Eduards Traum* particularly appealed to him on account of "its humor and satirical criticisms not less than for the truths it contains" (*OC* 8:

4266). In three installments, published in late October and early November 1894, Carus published in a free translation portions of this book in which Busch "presents to the reader a number of philosophical problems which he either solves in an aphoristic way, or, having touched upon them, passes by to other problems" (*OC* 8: 4266). This abridged translation was published in book form in 1909.

The year 1909 also saw the publication of *Angelus Silesius: A Selection from the Rhymes of a German Mystic.* This little anthology of epigrammatic verses was translated, as was Carus's habit with all of his translations of poetry, "in the original meter" from Johannes Scheffler's *Cherubinischer Wandersmann* (1657). Much of the introductory material, as well as most of the epigrams, had been previously published by Carus in two articles in *The Open Court* and in *The Monist.*[10] Again, as was his custom, Carus was at pains to make poems accessible which had either not been previously translated at all or which had been inadequately translated.

In view of Carus's repeatedly professed rationalism, the fact that he devoted time to mystical poetry is surprising and requires some explanation. At the beginning of the introduction to his *Philosophy as a Science* (1909), Carus announced as the aim of all his writings "the endeavor to build up a sound and tenable philosophy, one that would be as objective as any branch of the natural sciences."[11] Elsewhere Carus states explicitly that "the short cut taken by the emotions for the sake of rightly attuning the soul to God is a very helpful expedient by which those natures that lack intellectual power may gain a substitute for truth."[12] Why, then, in view of these and other explicit statements of opposition to mysticism, did Carus publish that same year a selection of Scheffler's epigrammatic verses as an example of German poetic mysticism?

Carus disarmed this question by positing two kinds of mysticism in a discussion published in *Philosophy as a Science*. Here he clearly desired to put as much distance as possible between philosophy, a rational undertaking requiring clearness of thought, and mysticism which, while laying claim to philosophical rigor, is nevertheless characterized by sentiment and haziness of thought:

> Mysticism is banished from the domain of science, but science is not the only mode of approach to truth. There are other avenues which lead to the ideal realm; one is art, the other sentiment.
>
> Art attempts to picture life *sub specie pulchritudinis,* viewing the world in the mirror of beauty. The mystic, however, is swayed by sentiment; he endeavors to feel the solution which he deems too deep for the intellect.[13]

Elsewhere, Carus attempts again to find some justification for mysticism as another legitimate path to truth. He seems to confirm that at least a certain kind of mysticism is very useful "as a short cut of sentiment to reach a truth which under the circumstances may somehow be unattainable by the intellect." But this positive assessment is contradicted in the same breath by the assertion that, "sentiment is no proper criterion of truth," for which reason "it appears that science will after all be

indispensable."[14] In the final analysis Carus leaves us with the wholly inadequate conclusion that "the best instance of a wholesome mysticism is the conscience of a simple-minded but well-intentioned man."

Compared with these three literary figures—Schiller, Busch and Scheffler—Johann Wolfgang von Goethe occupied a much more important place in Carus's intellectual life for obvious and compelling reasons. One of the main concerns of the Open Court Publishing Company during its early years was, as we have seen, the formulation and defense of its monistic philosophy. While being receptive to opposing opinions for the sake of furthering open discussion, Carus scanned the entire horizon of intellectual history in order to find support for his fundamental philosophical monism. One of the fruits of this search was the discovery in the United States of the scientific writings of Goethe and their popularization under the banners of monism and Darwinism. Soon after his appointment as editor of *The Open Court,* Carus began to examine Goethe's philosophical poetry from this point of view as well. While several German writers interested Carus as philosophical poets, only Goethe represented a philosophical point of view which was congenial to Carus's monism. In a brief article entitled "Goethe's Monism" in the 1 March 1888 issue of *The Open Court,* Carus found proof of Goethe's monism in the poem "Allerdings" and, in particular, in the lines:

> Natur hat weder Kern
> Noch Schale,
> Alles ist sie mit einem Male.

Of course, this view of Goethe did not originate with Carus. Earlier German monists, led by the Darwinist biologist Ernst Haeckel, had embraced Goethe's unified view of nature, convinced that his scientific studies in plant morphology were seminal for modern biology. When Haeckel's monism became a popularized view of the world, influential Goethe scholars voiced their objections to the use which Haeckel had made of the great poet.[15] The monism which was so popular in Germany from about 1850 until 1880 was often in actuality a kind of disguised materialism in which all the facts of the universe are held to be explainable in terms of matter and motion. In response to this criticism, Carus proclaimed his allegiance to a rather broad view of monism which, for example, was able to accommodate spiritual knowledge without justifying such knowledge in terms of matter and motion. This distinction was made clear in a letter to Ernst Haeckel which Carus published on 17 September 1891:

> You [Haeckel] confess monism but you identify the latter on the one hand with Goethe's and Spinoza's pantheism, on the other hand with Lange's and Büchner's materialism. In my opinion, Goethe's pantheism is radically different form Büchner's materialism. I am ready to accept the former but I cannot adopt the latter. Materialism as I understand the term attempts to explain everything from force and matter. Goethe

> would never have considered sensations or thoughts as material things. By monism I understand solely the unity of the universe. (*OC* 5: 2957)

Later that same year in a philosophical manifesto entitled "Immortality and Science," Carus characterized Goethe's view of life as "an harmonious and consistent monism" (*OC* 5: 3026). Carus's translation of the Goethean poem "Die Natur," first published in July 1894 (*OC* 8: 4135–36), as well as his translation of Goethe's "Teilen kann ich nicht das Leben" under the title "Always One" (*OC* 8: 2477), also stands within the context of Carus's efforts to appeal to the monistic tendencies in Goethe's thought in support of his own views.

Almost all of the articles which Carus wrote about Goethe, whether written specifically in connection with Carus's monism or not, were eventually incorporated into the monograph *Goethe with Empahsis on his Philosophy* (1915). A notable exception is "Goethe the Buddhist" which appeared in *The Open Court* on 5 March 1896. Here, as elsewhere, Goethe appears as the fountainhead of nineteenth-century thought; however Carus finds also in Goethe "striking examples of Buddhistic modes of thought . . . incredible though it may appear to those who persistently misunderstand the spirit of Buddhism." Goethe is

> the Darwinist before Darwin, the prophet of monism and positivism, the naturalist among bards and the bard among naturalists. . . . He proclaimed the principle of genuine positivism, saying: "Das höchste wäre: zu begreifen, daß alles Factische schon Theorie ist." "Die Bläue des Himmels offenbart uns das Grundgesetz der Chromatik." "Man suche nur nichts hinter den Phänomenen: sie selbst sind die Lehre." (*OC* 10: 4833)

Carus musters several of Goethe's poems in support of this view. Most are not cited in their entirety, and almost all are unidentified. Except for three examples of verse translated by Bayard Taylor, J. S. Dwight and Edgar Alfred Bowring, respectively, the other samples are translated by Carus, including parts of "Eins und Alles" (the first stanza) and "Prometheus."

In spite of these and other frequent reminders of Goethe's congeniality to a philosophy of monism, Carus was able to appreciate his poetry in other contexts, but almost without exception only as expressions of profound thoughts or far-reaching moral principles. Very early we find a discussion of the *Xenien* which Goethe and Schiller had written and published in 1796. Carus gave first notice of his interest in these distichs in 1887 just after he had accepted the editorship of *The Open Court*. A sampling of three xenions was published the following year. However in 1894, Carus published an account of the literary controversy which surrounded them at the time of their initial publication and published over one hundred of them in his own English translation, not only because most of them had not been previously translated into English, but also because he viewed them as "gems of permanent value" which "reflect in a few words flashes of the deepest wisdom" (*OC* 8: 3940). These preliminary studies culminated in 1896 in

the publication in book form of a selection of *Goethe and Schiller's Xenions* in English translation "for the sake of making them, as they deserve to be, a part of English literature."[16]

Carus's *Goethe with Special Consideration of his Philosophy* (1915) assembled material from about a dozen articles published separately over a span of almost thirty years in *The Open Court* and *The Monist*. The book contained nothing new for the specialist then, nor does it now. Its value lies elsewhere. Though revision and reorganization of the articles for publication in book form had been envisioned as early as in 1909, the handsomely illustrated volume appeared at a time when public opinion in the United States was turning against the very cultural heritage which Carus sought to preserve. Some of the dramatic works and novels which captivated Goethe's contemporaries and which have fascinated modern readers, works such as *Götz von Berlichingen* and *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre,* are given only passing mention. The novel *Die Wahlverwandtschaften* is dismissed with outright disapproval. Though a great number of subjects relating to Goethe are discussed—his relation to women, his personality, and other matters pertaining to his biography—the main emphasis still rests on Goethe's "philosophy" as expressed in *Faust* and in his philosophical poems. As Carus states in the preface:

> Though Goethe cannot be called a philosopher proper, though he had a positive aversion to philosophy as a specialized study, he may fairly well be called a philosopher in the broad sense of the term. He was a thinking man who had a definite world conception which dominated not only his particular life but also his poetry.[17]

The monograph on Goethe was Carus's last major undertaking on behalf of German literature, and a few scant years later he joined many other German-Americans in experiencing the sudden demise of German culture in the United States as a result of World War I. Nevertheless, there is no reason to doubt that Carus's studies of German literature gave many of his readers their first introduction to major German philosophical poetry in English translation. In the case of Goethe, this poetry was transmitted and interpreted within the context of an important, if diffuse, philosophical system—namely monism—for whose discussion and dissemination the Open Court Publishing Company had been created.

University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas

Notes

[1] Julius Goebel, "Paul Carus," *Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter* 18/19 (1918–19): 356.

[2] Cf. William H. Hay, "Paul Carus: A Case-Study of Philosophy on the Frontier," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 27 (1956): 498–510. Hay sheds light on Carus's various attempts to define his particular brand of monism (504–6). Carus consistently denied that his monism is a claim that there is only one substance. In his *Primer of Philosophy* (Chicago:

The Open Court Publishing Company, 1896), 50, Carus claims that "there is one law only in the world which in its purely formal relations is the condition of all uniformities in the world." For other discussions of Carus's thought see also Carl T. Jackson, "The Meeting of East and West: The Case of Paul Carus," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 29 (1968): 73–92; Donald H. Bishop, "The Carus-James Controversy," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35 (1974): 509–20. For a discussion of Leo Tolstoy's appreciation of *The Open Court*, see Henry F. Fullenwider, "Leo Tolstoy and Paul Carus' *The Open Court*," *Russian Literature Triquarterly*, no. 22 (Summer 1988): 221–37.

[3] Gustav Freytag, *Die verlorene Handschrift*, vol. 1, part 1, of *Gesammelte Werke*, (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, and Berlin-Grunewald: Hermann Klemm [1915?]), 254–55.

[4] This "Publisher's Note" is reprinted in *OC* 4: 2628–30.

[5] This letter, available in a copy in Carus's hand, is preserved on microfilm in the very extensive Open Court Collection at the Morris Library of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale. Although a letter from Carus to Hegeler dated 14 April 1890 indicates that Carus had written to Freytag acknowledging receipt of the letter and dedicatory motto, neither his letter to Freytag nor any subsequent correspondence between these three men has been found. A portion of Freytag's letter was published in English translation in the unpaginated "Publisher's [Hegeler's] Preface" to *The Lost Manuscript* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1890).

[6] The title page of Katherine M. Hewett's textbook edition of *Die verlorene Handschrift*, published in 1911 by Macmillan in New York, also has this motto.

[7] Cited from Hegeler's unpaginated "Publisher's Preface" to *The Lost Manuscript* (1890).

[8] On very rare occasions Carus published English translations of German lyric poetry, such as Mary Morgan's series of apparently unrelated German poems in English translation in five issues of *The Open Court* beginning in May 1889. Articles of literary criticism not authored by Carus, such as John Firman Coar's summary of eighteenth and nineteenth-century German literary history in two installments (*OC* 18: 733–60; *OC* 19: 227–43) were also very rare.

[9] Carus is referring to his article "Schiller as a Prophet" (*OC* 11: 214–20). Later Carus mentioned that an article entitled "Schiller the Dramatist" had also been incorporated into the monograph. However, I have been unable to verify that such an article was actually published.

[10] "Mysticism," *The Monist* 18 (1908): 75–110; "Angelus Silesius," *OC* 22: 291–97.

[11] Carus, *Philosophy as a Science* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1909), 1.

[12] Carus, "Introduction" in *Angelus Silesius: A Selection from the Rhymes of a German Mystic* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1909), xxi.

[13] *Philosophy as a Science*, 65.

[14] "Mysticism," *The Monist* 18 (1908): 82.

[15] Cf. Rudolf Steiner, "Über den Gewinn unserer Anschauungen von Goethes naturwissenschaftlichen Arbeiten durch die Publikationen des Goethe-Archivs," *Goethe-Jahrbuch* 12 (1891): 191, 207. See also Steiner, "Zu dem Fragment 'Über die Natur,'" in *Das Journal von Tiefurt*, ed. Eduard von der Hellen, Schriften der Goethe-Gesellschaft, no. 7 (Weimar: Verlag der Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1892), 393:

> Als Ernst Haeckel zum Beleg dafür, daß Goethe einer der ersten Propheten einer einheitlichen (monistischen) Naturauffassung war, eine besonders charakteristische Arbeit desselben an die Spitze seiner "Natürlichen Schöpfungsgeschichte" stellen wollte, da wählte er den Aufsatz: "Die Natur". Hiemit ist aber gar nichts anderes ausgesprochen, als was Goethe selbst in hohem Alter, als ihm der aus seinem Gedächtnisse längst entschwundene Aufsatz vorgelegt wurde, für das Richtige gehalten hat.

I have touched on this question in my article, "The Goethean Fragment 'Die Natur' in English Translation," *Comparative Literature Studies* 23 (1986): 170–77.

[16] *Philosophy as a Science*, 67.

[17] Cited from Carus's unpaginated "Preface" to *Goethe with Special Consideration of His Philosophy* (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1915).