

Josiah Royce's
1909 Pittsburgh
Loyalty Lectures

Josiah Royce's 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures

Edited and Introduced by

Mathew A. Foust

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Josiah Royce's 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures

Edited and Introduced by Mathew A. Foust

This book first published 2021

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2021 by Mathew A. Foust and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-7416-4

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-7416-8

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Editor's Introduction	xi
Figure 0-1	xliv
Directions to the Twentieth Century Club in Royce's hand	
Lecture I	1
The Conflict of Loyalties	
Lecture II	21
The Art of Loyalty	
Lecture III.....	39
Loyalty and Individuality	
Bibliography	59
Index.....	65

PREFACE

Josiah Royce (1855-1916) is a philosopher of the Classical American tradition. This tradition includes thinkers of such renown as Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, William James, and John Dewey. Although he has often lived in the shadow of these figures, in the past several years, scholars have increasingly turned their focus to Royce. The titles of two recent volumes—*Josiah Royce for the Twenty-First Century* and *The Relevance of Royce*—effectively announce this surge in interest.¹ Remarkably, the revival of Royce’s philosophy emanates beyond the boundaries of academia. In his widely acclaimed book, *Being Mortal*, Atul Gawande quotes from Royce’s *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908) in discussing the importance of seeing oneself as part of something greater—achieved through one’s loyalties.² Royce’s philosophy has even been the subject of a recent opinion piece in *The New York Times*. In “Your Loyalties Are Your Life: The Philosopher We Need Today,” David Brooks suggests that insights drawn from Royce’s *The Philosophy of Loyalty* can help us to think through how the individual fits into the community and how the community fits into the whole.³ While contemporary popular references to Royce have sometimes taken me by surprise, I find it entirely unsurprising that it is his philosophy of loyalty that has attracted attention. *The Philosophy of*

¹ Kelly A. Parker and Krzysztof Piotr Skowronski, eds., *Josiah Royce for the Twenty-First Century: Historical, Ethical, and Religious Interpretations* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2012); Kelly A. Parker and Jason Bell, eds. *The Relevance of Royce* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014).

² Atul Gawande, *Being Mortal* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2014), p. 127.

³ David Brooks, “Your Loyalties Are Your Life: The Philosopher We Need Today.” *The New York Times*. January 24, 2019. Accessed July 16, 2021.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/24/opinion/josiah-royce-loyalty.html>.

Loyalty is arguably Royce's most distinctive and enduring contribution to the history of philosophy.

I have been engaging with Royce's philosophy of loyalty since I first encountered excerpts from *The Philosophy of Loyalty* as an undergraduate enrolled in a course in American Philosophy at John Carroll University taught by Elizabeth Segars McRae. At the time I was enamored of the philosophy of John Dewey, but Royce's description of the nature and the need of loyalty made an indelible impression. I would revisit Royce at Texas A&M University, where I earned a Master's degree guided by the mentoring of the inimitable John J. McDermott. Again, Royce was not at the center of my gaze, as my MA thesis focused on the philosophy of William James. However, in a gap year between completing my MA and commencing my PhD, I read with intrigue Royce's history of California, and formed the hypothesis that his philosophy of loyalty was nascent in his telling of that history more than twenty years prior to the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. Generously, McDermott sponsored my travel to present this research at the Josiah Royce Sesquicentennial Celebration at Vanderbilt University in 2005. At this conference, I met several scholars of Royce, including my soon-to-be mentor at the University of Oregon, Scott L. Pratt.

It was at the University of Oregon, under Pratt's sedulous supervision, that I developed into a Royce scholar in my own right. A revised version of my PhD dissertation would be published by Fordham University Press in 2012, *Loyalty to Loyalty: Josiah Royce and the Genuine Moral Life*. In this book, I defended Royce's view that rather than being one virtue among others, loyalty is central to living a genuinely moral and meaningful life. Since then, Royce's philosophy of loyalty has occupied a central place in my research. I am convinced by much of what Royce has

to say on the subject of loyalty and believe more than ever that Royce is a philosopher for our times.⁴

With the manuscript of Royce's 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures housed in archives at Harvard University, this publication makes accessible writings by Royce that have been inaccessible to most readers. Delivered ten months following the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, Royce distills much of the content of that book in the space of three lectures. But Royce does more than simply recount what he had already said in print. He presents examples and principles not found in the pages of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, extending the theories articulated therein. Royce continued to refine and apply his philosophy of loyalty until his death in 1916. In this context, the 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures are pivotal in the development of his philosophy. Removed from this context, the lectures remain cohesive and incisive. Anyone can learn something about loyalty—and perhaps even about themselves—from considering the lectures contained in these pages.

The Introduction preceding Royce's lectures is my own. It revises and expands upon some of my previous writings on Royce's 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures. I am grateful to Cornelis de Waal on behalf of the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, and David Pfeifer on behalf of the Josiah Royce Edition, for permission to duplicate content previously published in those venues. Harvard University Archives granted permission to publish the lectures and reproduce directions to the Twentieth Century Club in Royce's hand (Figure 0-1). I would like to give special acknowledgment to the late Fr. Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J., whose idea it was that I should publish Royce's 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures as a book. Oppenheim's loyal spirit has been a fitting inspiration, and this book would not exist if not for his encouragement. Finally, I would like to express gratitude to my wife, Jephrie, whose support through this and other projects has exemplified loyalty.

⁴ As an illustration, see Mathew A. Foust, "Loyalty, Justice, and Rights: Royce and Police Ethics in Twenty-First-Century America," *Criminal Justice Ethics*, Vol. 37, No. 1, April 2018, 1-19.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION¹

Situating Royce's Pittsburgh Lectures: Time and Place

Contained among the Josiah Royce Papers, housed at the Harvard University Archives, are three lectures on the topic of loyalty that Josiah Royce delivered at the Twentieth Century Club in Pittsburgh in February 1909. Facsimiles of the lectures and transcriptions have been posted online as part of "The Writings of Josiah Royce: A Critical Edition," but the lectures have never been published as a book until now. The titles of the lectures, in the sequence in which they were delivered, are: "The Conflict of Loyalties," "The Art of Loyalty," and "Loyalty and Individuality." For generations of Royce scholars, the precise location and dates of the lectures were longstanding mysteries, with conjectures of the dates of the lectures many and varied. Atop the first page of "The Conflict of Loyalties" is written, in the red pencil of archivist Edgar Franklin Wells, "1908? 1910?"² Royce's student, Jacob Loewenberg dates the

¹ This Introduction revises and expands upon some of my previous writing on Royce's 1909 Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures. Permission has been granted for duplication of content by both the *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* and the Josiah Royce Edition. Mathew A. Foust, "What Can I Do for the Cause Today Which I Never Did Before?": Situating Josiah Royce's Pittsburgh Lectures on Loyalty," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter 2011): 87-108; and Mathew A. Foust, "Pittsburgh Lectures Introduction," the Josiah Royce Edition. October 2015. Accessed July 16, 2021. <https://royce-edition.iupui.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/Pittsburgh-Lectures-Introduction1.pdf>.

² As Patrick Dugan's introduction to the online transcription of Royce's "Richmond Lectures" of 1904 details, as a Ph.D. candidate in 1940, Wells was hired by the Harvard Philosophy Department to help organize the Royce papers. Patrick Dugan, "Introduction to the 'Richmond Lectures' of 1904," the Josiah Royce Edition. March 2014. Accessed July 16, 2021.

lectures at 1910 in his bibliography of Royce's unpublished writings.³ James Harry Cotton dates the lectures at "1910?" in *Royce on the Human Self* (and erroneously claims there to be five lectures in the series rather than three).⁴ In *The Loyal Physician*, Griffin Trotter dates the lectures at 1908.⁵ Where, exactly, in Pittsburgh the lectures occurred has not elicited such guesswork in print, though this is just as much an indication of a lack of sureness on the part of scholars.

The question of when the lectures took place is significant for at least three reasons. First, an apparent gap in Royce's biography needs to be filled. Biographies of Royce, including John Clendenning's authoritative account, have not as much as acknowledged Royce's visit to Pittsburgh.⁶ Second, knowing where these lectures stand chronologically among Royce's other writings helps us to understand better their significance with respect to Royce's corpus and to understand better Royce's corpus in relation to these lectures—particularly with respect to the development of

<https://royce-edition.iupui.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Royce-Richmond-Lectures-Intro-dp-edited.pdf>. In a previously published writing on the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures, I misidentified Edgar Franklin Wells as Ronald A. Wells (the historian who published on Royce). Mathew A. Foust, "What Can I Do for the Cause Today Which I Never Did Before?": Situating Josiah Royce's Pittsburgh Lectures on Loyalty," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter 2011): 87.

³ Jacob Loewenberg, "A Bibliography of the Unpublished Writings of Josiah Royce," *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 26, No. 5 (September 1917): 580.

⁴ James Harry Cotton, *Royce on the Human Self* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954), 307.

⁵ Griffin Trotter, *The Loyal Physician: Roycean Ethics and the Practice of Medicine* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1997), 287.

⁶ John Clendenning, *The Life and Thought of Josiah Royce*. Revised and Expanded Edition. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1999). For another biography of Royce, see Robert V. Hine, *Josiah Royce: From Grass Valley to Harvard* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1992). For intellectual biographies of Royce, see Vincent Buranelli, *Josiah Royce* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1964) and Bruce Kuklick, *Josiah Royce: An Intellectual Biography* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1985).

Royce's philosophy of loyalty. Third, knowing when the lectures took place can also play a role in interpreting Royce's points of emphasis in the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures. Whatever differences we find between the printed pages of *The Philosophy of Loyalty* and the handwritten pages of the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures might be inspired by events that transpired in the time between their respective presentations. The question of where the lectures took place is of interest for historical purposes. Just as a gap in time waits to be filled, so too does a void in place. Confirmation of the venue for Royce's lectures will enrich accounts of the history of Pittsburgh in general, and the history of the venue that hosted Royce in particular.

Clues as to the time and place of the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures appear within the first lecture, "The Conflict of Loyalties." In his opening remarks, Royce alludes to having been asked, "through your secretary, to tell this club"⁷ of his views concerning wisdom, duty, and problems concerning duty. Royce then mentions that the philosophy lying at the base of the content of his lectures has been elaborated elsewhere at greater length, namely in *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (1908). Later in the lecture, Royce prefaces examples of conflicts of loyalty by indicating their source; Royce was in the habit of soliciting such examples from his students and hearers of his lectures. Some examples that will be shared in these lectures were provided "[l]ast year, when as visiting professor, I taught a class in Ethics at Yale University."⁸

From these comments we can conclude the following. The Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures occurred after the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, which we know to have occurred on April 8, 1908.⁹ Knowing that the Pittsburgh Lectures occurred after the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, and that the class at Yale occurred "last year," the earliest that this class at Yale could have

⁷ "The Conflict of Loyalties," 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁹ Josiah Royce to Alfred Deakin, April 18, 1908. In *The Letters of Josiah Royce*, edited by John Clendenning (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 521.

occurred was 1907. In fact, Royce refers to this class in the “Preface” to *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, as occurring “in the present academic year, 1907–1908.”¹⁰ So, Royce must have lectured in Pittsburgh during the 1908–1909 academic year. This means that the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures occurred earlier than 1910. As for where the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures occurred, we know now that they were given to a “club,” and that the secretary of the club invited Royce. This information is not as helpful as it may sound, however, as many clubs with secretaries existed in Pittsburgh at the time. My own searches focused on combinations of the terms ‘club,’ ‘secretary,’ ‘Royce,’ ‘Pittsburgh,’ and ‘loyalty,’ were painstakingly thorough and painfully futile.

Another clue as to the dates of the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures arises in the correspondence of Royce’s Harvard colleague, William James. The letter in question is from John Kershaw, addressed from Braddock, Pennsylvania, and dated February 20, 1909. It reads, in part,

We have a class of over 200 in Pittsburgh studying [Thomas] Troward. We have had occasional lectures from ‘foreigners’—only lately Prof. Royce of Harvard.— We have not mustered courage to even hint to you that the ‘Smoky City’ would like to have you come and clarify its atmosphere.¹¹

¹⁰ Josiah Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. [1908] (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1995), p. xxiv. Two of these lectures are extant: Josiah Royce, “The Yale Undergraduate Ethics Course (1907),” Josiah Royce Papers, Harvard University Archives, HUG 1755, Box 77.

¹¹ John Kershaw to William James, February 20, 1909, William James Papers, Harvard University Archives, MS Am 1092.1 (110a). In a previously published writing on the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures, I conflated Kershaw with Troward, mistakenly referring to this letter as Troward’s letter to James. Mathew A. Foust, “‘What Can I Do for the Cause Today Which I Never Did Before?’: Situating Josiah Royce’s Pittsburgh Lectures on Loyalty,” *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 47, No. 1 (Winter 2011): 89. In a letter to James dated

Although it is unlikely that Kershaw references Royce's Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures—which were delivered to a *club*, not a *class*—this letter offers an upper limit to the time during which Royce could have been in Pittsburgh. Kershaw reports on February 20, 1909 that Royce had “lately” lectured in Pittsburgh. Because the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures happened sometime after the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, they must have taken place sometime between April 1908 and February 1909, and in all likelihood a date late within this range.

During a visit to the Harvard University Archives in the summer of 2008, I uncovered a clue that soon led to the desired details. In a folder titled, “Unarranged Notes,” one finds assorted miscellany, much of which does not admit of a tidy home among other folders or boxes comprising the Josiah Royce Papers. Sifting through this stack of loose and tattered odds and ends of paper, a small slip could easily be lost in the shuffle. I suspect that this is what has happened over the years with our clue, a 4”x5” square upon which is written, in Royce's hand:

Take Penn Ave. car—
 Get off at 6th St. walk to 5th turn to right—&
 go as far as the river—
 Then turn to left—into
 Duquesne Way the
 4th house No. 428 is
 Twentieth Century Club—¹²

My excitement mounted as my eyes scanned across “Penn Ave.,” “The river,” “Duquesne Way,” and “Twentieth Century Club.” My immediate thought—which I desperately hoped to be right—was that Royce had led me directly to the doorstep of the building at which he gave these three lectures on loyalty. I envisioned Royce holding this very fragment of paper in his own hands, exiting the

February 26, 1909, Kershaw expresses regret at James's declining his invitation, “and especially that bad health be the cause.”

¹² Josiah Royce Papers, Harvard University Archives, HUG 1755, Box 116, Folder 15: Unarranged Notes [Accordion Folder].

Penn Ave. car, nearing the river, and making his way conscientiously to the place of his appointment. I soon learned that the image I conjured very likely did occur, over a century ago.

The address, 428 Duquesne Way, is technically situated in Braddock, Pennsylvania—the town from which Kershaw's letter to James is addressed. Braddock is a borough of Pittsburgh, ten miles upstream from the mouth of the Monongahela River. It was an early¹³ home to the Twentieth Century Club, established in 1894 as a women's philanthropic and social club. George T. Fleming's account of 1922 describes it as "an association of the most cultured women of the city, founded not upon any community of business, art, literature or music, nor to collect those that do not nationally belong together."¹⁴ In 1910, members purchased land at 4201 Bigelow Boulevard, where the club remained until its dissolution. The University of Pittsburgh purchased the building in 2020.¹⁵

The next step was to contact the Twentieth Century Club in search of evidence of Royce's lectures having been given in front of them. Not long after sending a missive to the club, I received verification that Royce had indeed given the lectures to the Twentieth Century Club at its former location on Duquesne Way. Moreover, record of the dates of the lectures had been preserved. In

¹³ The club rented space in downtown Pittsburgh until establishing a permanent residence. According to George T. Fleming, "its first home was on Penn avenue, later on Duquesne Way." George T. Fleming, *History of Pittsburgh and Environs*, Vol. III, edited by Special Contributors and Members of the Editorial Staff (New York and Chicago: American Historical Society, 1922), 608.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ For a report of the sale of the Twentieth Century Club to the University of Pittsburgh, see Mark Belko, "'A Very Difficult Decision': Twentieth Century Club Sells its Oakland Building to Pitt," *Pittsburgh Post Gazette*. May 28, 2020. Accessed July 16, 2021.

<https://www.post-gazette.com/business/development/2020/05/28/University-of-Pittsburgh-Twentieth-Century-Club-Oakland-Bigelow-Boulevard/stories/202005280085>.

a bulletin listing a roster of the club's events for the year of 1909, we find:

Feb 1 "The Conflicts of Loyalty"
 Feb 3 "The Art of Loyalty"
 Feb 10 "Loyalty and Individuality"¹⁶

We are thus now able to affirm with certainty that Royce's Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures were delivered before the Twentieth Century Club in February 1909.¹⁷

Who was the club's secretary who issued the invitation to Royce? The club's directory of Executive Board and Committees for 1907-1908 lists a Miss Bradley as Recording Secretary.¹⁸ She is also listed as one of eight members comprising the Lecture Committee. Assuming that Royce was invited more than a month prior to his arrival, it was in all likelihood Miss Bradley who invited him. Miss Bradley's full name was Miss Jennie D. Bradley, though she would, after nuptials, take on the moniker, Mrs. Frank M.

¹⁶ "Monthly Bulletin of the Twentieth Century Club," 28. Note that the title of the first lecture, in Royce's manuscript, is "The Conflict of Loyalties," rather than "The Conflicts of Loyalty," as found in the Twentieth Century Club bulletin. I have elected to refer to the lecture by the title found in Royce's manuscript. I thank Karen Greb of the Twentieth Century Club for locating and providing the bulletin.

¹⁷ Royce's having given the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures in February 1909 may provide a layer of context to his remark in a letter of March 9, 1909 to Richard C. Cabot: "I lecture more constantly than ever, and am more devoted to logic than ever. And thus I live,—in good health, but without much leisure." Josiah Royce to Richard Clarke Cabot, March 9, 1909. In *The Letters of Josiah Royce*, edited by John Clendinning (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 534. Between the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures and whatever lecture(s) he delivered to the "class" referenced by Kershaw, Royce kept busy in Pittsburgh. At the time of the letter to Cabot, Royce was back home in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and in addition to his usual duties, teaching an evening course at Harvard Medical School—with which Cabot was affiliated—twice a week. Royce refers to his absorption in modern mathematical logic in Lecture III, "Loyalty and Individualism" (57).

¹⁸ "Membership Directory of the Twentieth Century Club," 12–13.

Roessing.¹⁹ Whether Bradley personally knew Royce ahead of the invitation is unclear, however, her own writings soon after Royce's lectures reflect theoretical sympathy, if not influence.²⁰

Situating Royce's Pittsburgh Lectures: Development of Royce's Moral Philosophy

In the past, unpublished materials of Royce's pertaining to loyalty have been made available, that add appreciably to our picture of Royce's moral philosophy. For example, Peter Fuss's publication of the first two of Royce's Urbana Lectures (1907)²¹ and

¹⁹ For evidence that Miss Bradley is Mrs. Roessing, see her signature in *The Hand Book of the National American Woman Suffrage Association and Proceedings of the Forty-Eighth Annual Convention Held at Atlantic City, N.J., September 4–10 (inclusive), 1916*, edited by Hannah J. Patterson. (New York City: National American Woman Suffrage Association, 1916), 88.

²⁰ See, for instance, the contribution of Mrs. Roessing in the "Session on Athletics for Girls" in *Proceedings of the Third Annual Playground Congress, Pittsburgh, Pa., May 11–14, 1909* (New York City: Playground Association of America, 1909), 366–369. Therein, it is argued that allowing girls to participate in various forms of athletics and play awakens and cultivates "the joy of unconventionalized self-expression, independence, strength, success," while at the same time, girls should participate in "games involving the encouragement of communal energy, interdependence and that exhilaration which comes from being part of a larger and more powerful unit" (367–368). "For the complete development of girls, then," she writes, "they should have play" (369). In the first of the Pittsburgh Lectures (among other places), Royce cites childhood play, and specifically team-play, as a first instance of uniting individualism and conformity in the form of loyalty. In this publication, Mrs. Roessing is listed as Vice-President of the Pittsburgh Playground Association. She is best known for her activism for women's suffrage, having held offices in the Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association and the National American Woman Suffrage Association.

²¹ Peter Fuss, "Royce's Urbana Lectures: Lecture I," *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 5, No. 1 (1967): 60–78; Peter Fuss, "Royce's Urbana Lectures: Lecture II," *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (1967): 269–286.

Frank M. Oppenheim's publication of Royce's Berkeley Conferences (1914) and Extension Course on Ethics (1915–1916)²² make accessible bookending glimpses into Royce's philosophical occupation with loyalty. These publications reveal, respectively, an early explicit formulation of Royce's moral philosophy and late explicit applications of that philosophy. Royce delivers the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures ten months after the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. While it would be true to say that much of the content of the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures would have been familiar to readers of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, Royce refines and adds to the arguments presented in that text. New principles are presented, and new illustrations of “cases of conscience”—conflicts of loyalty—are introduced. Far from a rehash, these lectures represent the phase of the development of Royce's philosophy of loyalty most immediately following the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*.

Whereas the Lowell Institute series culminating in *The Philosophy of Loyalty* comprised eight lectures delivered across three weeks, Royce gave three lectures in ten days in Pittsburgh. Concision was in order, for Royce could not feasibly reiterate all that he had said in his recently published book. Still, an astonishingly great deal of the content of *The Philosophy of Loyalty* finds representation in Royce's remarks in these lectures. Least represented are discussions drawing from the two closing lectures of *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, “Loyalty, Truth, and Reality” and “Loyalty and Religion.” This is very likely by design. Royce was clearly deliberate in *The Philosophy of Loyalty* to wait to enter what, without proper preparation, would have been perceived as esoteric territory. Like the Lowell Institute lectures, the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures were aimed at non-specialists, and with only three chances, the pressure incumbent upon Royce to retain his audience was amplified. Royce's use in these lectures of illustrations

²² Both the 1914 Berkeley Conferences and the 1915-1916 Extension Course on Ethics appear in Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J., ed. *Josiah Royce's Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works*. Vol. 2 (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2001).

provided to him by previous audiences suggests *their* spirited engagement. Royce's audience in Pittsburgh was likely no less captivated. Few are without opinion about the importance of loyalty, as few are unaware of the ambiguities presented by treacherous loyalties, on one hand, and conflicts of loyalties, on the other.

Each of the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures features important developments of Royce's philosophy of loyalty. Here, I enumerate just one example from each of the three lectures. In Lecture I, "The Conflict of Loyalties," Royce treats the relationship between loyalty and rights in more detail than he had in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, examining "the principle of the sanctity of private rights" in addition to "the principle of the freedom of private judgment." In Lecture II, "The Art of Loyalty," Royce presents a novel formulation of the method by which conflicts of loyalty are to be navigated, outlining a set of principles not articulated in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. This set of principles includes "the principle of the prior loyalty," a principle that Royce believes can solve many of the conflicts of life. In Lecture III, "Loyalty and Individuality," Royce discusses the relationship between loyalty and benevolence in more detail than he had in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, explaining why the former is more properly conceived as a duty than the latter. This discussion is demonstrative of one of the more striking claims of Royce's philosophy of loyalty—that all the commonly recognized virtues are, in fact, aspects of loyalty. The following synopses provide elaboration on these and several other facets of the lectures.

Lecture I: The Conflict of Loyalties

Royce opens "The Conflict of Loyalties" with a brief statement concerning the role of the philosopher or teacher of philosophy. Such a person should reflect, formulate, and inquire upon matters that most people choose not to reason about, accepting one position or another uncritically. These matters are often, as Royce calls them, commonplaces. Royce muses that the habit of philosophers is to render such commonplaces hopelessly mysterious.

Though we might expect Royce here to distance himself from this practice, he states his hope that he and his company would see that philosophers are right in doing so, for “nothing is so deep and so mysterious as are the most commonplace matters in our lives....”²³

Royce continues to delimit his role as a philosopher, insisting that his purpose in speaking to his audience is not to make authoritative pronouncements or to persuade them of any particular position but to help them to think for themselves and to think clearly about what their ideals and their duty are. As in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, Royce cites the fluctuating nature of moral traditions and variance among the pronouncements of those recognized as moral leaders as resulting in complexity and confusion. Cutting through these entanglements, Royce aspires to “to help my students, and my hearers and readers generally, to group the various special values of life about” a “the central value of our personal human life.” Doing so will help his audience “to see how best to unify their undertakings, and how thus best to live their own personal sort of wise and good life.” The “central value” is, of course, loyalty.

Sharpening his motivation, Royce identifies the conflict between the individual and various forms of social authority and social tradition as particularly problematic. “It was especially this great problem,” Royce reveals, “that my philosophy of loyalty undertook to solve.”²⁴ That Royce identifies this particular problem as the primary one that he intended to solve in *The Philosophy of Loyalty* is illuminating not only of that text, but of texts composed after the Pittsburgh Loyalty Lectures. By Royce's later account, *William James and other Essays on the Philosophy of Life* (1911) and *The Sources of Religious Insight* (1912) deal, in part, “with the same problems” addressed in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*.²⁵ Continuing this lineage, Royce conceives of *The Problem of*

²³ Royce, “The Conflict of Loyalties,” 1.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 3.

²⁵ Josiah Royce, *The Problem of Christianity* [1913] (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 37.

Christianity (1913) as an attempt to apply “to the special case of Christianity”²⁶ principles put forth in the “The Religion of Loyalty” chapter of *The Sources of Religious Insight*. And in *War and Insurance* (1914), Royce acknowledges that his definition of loyalty “as a willing and practical devotion of a self to a community” has formed the theme of “several of my own recent philosophical discussions,” including the one found in the pages of that text.²⁷ In sum, Royce continually seeks to dissolve the distinction between self-assertion and social conformity, locating the highest interest of the individual in the community to which he belongs.

Next, Royce describes the character of the attitude of individualism in morals. The description given here is more compact than that found in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, and lays emphasis on a term used sparingly in that text—“rights.” Royce cites two “principles” of individualism, that of the freedom of private judgment and that of the sanctity of private rights. The principle of private judgment has it that the individual is guided not by tradition or authority but by “his own independent judgment,—by his private intuitions, by his own inner voice, by his personal reason,—or perhaps simply by his mere determination to be free, to assert himself, and to win power.”²⁸ The principle of the sanctity of private rights has it that “every individual has inalienable personal rights of his own, and that whatever duties he has must be in some sense made consistent with, and perhaps subordinated to these rights.”²⁹ The problem arises, of course, when such individualism runs up against social will. Royce reemphasizes that his philosophy of loyalty is meant to alleviate the complexity and confusion that this conflict engenders, describing its task as that of harmonizing the demands on the side of each the individual and the social. Royce’s allusion to harmonization in this context echoes remarks in *The*

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Josiah Royce, *War and Insurance* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914), 85.

²⁸ Royce, “The Conflict of Loyalties,” 4.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

Philosophy of Loyalty,³⁰ and anticipates the harmonizing nature of the Community of Interpretation in *The Problem of Christianity*³¹ and *War and Insurance*.³²

Royce begins his account of his philosophy of loyalty by describing the moral individual as made rather than born. Royce then discusses the development of loyalty in the child, much earlier than he broached this topic in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, where this subject is discussed in the sixth lecture, "Training for Loyalty."³³ A number of reasons why Royce may have made this adjustment come to mind. First, there is the practical matter of having only the space of three lectures. Second, there is the fact that the development of loyalty in children is an issue he had just engaged in the concluding essay to *Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems* (1908), "Some Relations of Physical Training to the Present Problems of Moral Education in

³⁰ For example, Royce describes a "harmonious plan of life," occasioned only by the "happy sort of union takes place between the inner and the outer, between my social world and myself, between my natural waywardness and the ways of my fellows" (Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 19). For consistency in reference, Royce ought to have transposed the terms in the middle phrase to read "between myself and my social world." Similarly, Royce states that until an individual's desires are "harmonized by some definite plan of life, happiness is...a mere accident" (Ibid., 39). Moreover, "the finding of a harmony of the self and the world...alone can content any human being" (Ibid., 58).

³¹ "When a man's affairs deeply concern other people besides himself, the only way to deal justly with the case is to interpret this man's own individual views and interests to some fitting representative of the social will, in order that the matter may be arbitrated, or in order that the wills of all concerned may be, as far as possible, both harmonized and expressed. A Community of Interpretation must exist or must be formed" (Royce, *The Problem of Christianity*, 325).

³² In the Community of Interpretation, the function of the interpreter is "to transform the essentially dangerous pair into the consciously and consistently harmonious triad (Royce, *War and Insurance*, 54, emphasis in original).

³³ Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 117-139.

America.”³⁴ Third, there is the likelihood that Royce was sensitive to the concerns of his audience and wished to appeal to their interests. Remember that the Twentieth Century Club was a women’s intellectual and social club, and that the welfare of the children of Pittsburgh was something in which many in attendance were likely invested—a cause to which they were loyal.³⁵ Whatever his motivation, what Royce says here is familiar. The child first learns to harmonize individual and social impulses in the context of some socially suggested cause that arouses loyalty, such as a club or friendship. Invoking one of his favorite examples—loyalty learned in the context of team play—Royce imagines an otherwise “bad boy” who transforms into an individual who delights in self-sacrifice and cooperation via involvement in team play. The transformation has the potential to be lifelong, if the child is encouraged toward reinforcement of the newly cultivated habit of loyalty.

Delight in self-sacrifice is a mark of loyal service to a chosen cause. Loyal self-sacrifice is not tantamount to slavishness or self-abnegation. Rather than “giving up of your private will to a restraining outside force,” obeying the requirements of one’s cause amounts to “winning of what you yourself most want.” Indeed, “your cause is just your own self writ large.” Consequently, it is a mistake to view service and duty as opposed to rights and freedom.

³⁴ Josiah Royce, *Race Questions, Provincialism, and Other American Problems* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1908), 227-287.

³⁵ At the least, this is true of the woman who invited Royce to speak. According to an account given three years prior to the Pittsburgh Lectures, “The ethical and moral, as well as the physical advantage of playing and the necessity of play, have come to be realized, so that in the last few years there has grown up a committee to superintend ‘The Pittsburgh Playgrounds, Vacation Schools, and Recreation Parks.’” Listed as the Secretary of this committee: Miss Jennie D. Bradley. Sarah Hutchins Killikelly, *The History of Pittsburgh: Its Rise and Progress* (Pittsburgh: B.C. Gordon & Montgomery Co., 1906), 336.

“Your dearest right is the right to serve,” and moreover, “the service of your cause is perfect freedom.”³⁶

It is useful to consider a remark from Royce in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. There Royce says, “It is my right to protect my service, to maintain my office, and to keep my own merely in order that I may use my own as the cause commands. But rights which are not determined by my loyalty are vain pretence.”³⁷ Royce’s description of rights in “The Conflict of Loyalties” is quite similar, but here we find Royce uses a familiar example in a new way, holding that the parable of the talents³⁸ “defines, for the loyal, the whole significance that they can attach to the word rights.”³⁹ One owns one’s rights, Royce clarifies, only as the servant owns his talent. That is, one’s cause (analogous to the Lord) confers one’s rights (analogous to talent) to the loyal servant, for safekeeping and proper use. “When the Lord—your cause—comes again,” Royce explains, “that Lord will require the talent of you with usury. That is why you defend your rights, because they are entrusted to you by and for the sake of the cause.”⁴⁰ In other words, one defends one’s rights because rights can only come from a cause, and one protects one’s cause, for a cause is the only object of loyalty. And, as we have seen, one finds in loyalty the harmonization of one’s tendencies toward individuality and conformity. Thus, “Your rights are your duties to the cause; and your duties are, in the end, your only rights.”⁴¹

It is at this point that Royce imagines an interlocutor asking, “To what cause should I be loyal?” In familiar form, Royce uses this question as a springboard to introducing the principle of

³⁶ Royce, “The Conflict of Loyalties,” 9.

³⁷ Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 68.

³⁸ Royce uses the example of the parable of the talents in the first section of the “Loyalty, Truth, and Reality” lecture of *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 142). He cites this parable again in *The Problem of Christianity* (Royce, *The Problem of Christianity*, 174).

³⁹ Royce, “The Conflict of Loyalties” (emphasis in original), 9.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 10.

loyalty to loyalty. Nobody can choose your cause for you, but you are to be sure that your cause is chosen and served such that you are loyal to loyalty; in other words, your loyalty promotes loyalty among humanity, and is thus not destructive of loyalty. Connecting loyalty to loyalty with his earlier discussion of rights, Royce states, "I have the one inalienable right to be loyal, in my own way, to the cause of the furthering of universal loyalty amongst mankind."⁴² Distinguishing loyalty from love, Royce notes that loyalty is always directed to a cause, never to an individual. A cause is "something which binds many individuals in the unity of one spirit, as the family or as the church does."⁴³ While we may love an individual, we are loyal to the tie that binds us to the individual.

Finally, Royce confronts the matter of conflicting loyalties. Again, as in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, loyalty to loyalty is implemented as a tool for dealing with such "Cases of Conscience."⁴⁴ Royce shares several such cases that he had culled from students over the years, as well as from his own experience. Although different in detail from scenarios found in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, the Mason letters,⁴⁵ or his Extension Course on Ethics,⁴⁶

⁴² *Ibid.*, 13.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 11. This treatment of causes prefigures Royce's more detailed elaboration on the nature of causes in "Loyalty and Insight" (Royce, *William James and Other Essays on the Philosophy of Life*, 49-95).

⁴⁴ Royce uses this phrase in *The Philosophy of Loyalty* (Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 33) and again in the Mid-Year Examination of his 1915–1916 Extension Course on Ethics. For the latter, see "Mid-Year Examination: A Case Involving Problems of Loyalty." In *Josiah Royce's Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works*, edited by Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J. Vol. 2 (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2001), 132.

⁴⁵ John Clendenning and Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J., "Letters of Josiah Royce to Daniel Gregory Mason, Mary Lord Mason, and Edward Palmer Mason, 1900–1904," *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (Winter 2005): 13–45.

⁴⁶ "Mid-Year Examination: A Case Involving Problems of Loyalty" and "Comments Upon the Problem of the Mid-Year Examination Paper [or "Principles of the Art of Loyalty"]." In *Josiah Royce's Late Writings: A*

their general character is, on the whole, consistent. Royce discusses a number of conflicts regarding truth-telling, a variety of familial conflicts, a personal conflict concerning a change in one's religious belief, a conflict experienced between lovers, and professional and public conflicts.

Royce ends this lecture by stating that the way of dealing with these conflicts will be described in his next lecture, under the heading, "The Art of Loyalty." If loyalty to loyalty is to be the guiding principle for dealing with such conflicts, then we can understand the art of loyalty as guidance concerning how to be loyal to loyalty.

Lecture II: The Art of Loyalty

The title of this lecture is itself intriguing. Although the term "the art of loyalty" appears in the *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, its use is limited to the remark, "We constantly need, all of us, individual training in the art of loyalty"⁴⁷ and the observation, "Much of the art of loyalty...depends upon training yourself to observe the loyal who are all about you, however remote their cause is from yours, however humble their lives."⁴⁸ Royce's thinking about loyalty following the publication of *The Philosophy of Loyalty* seems to have coalesced around this term,⁴⁹ as evidenced by a letter written by Royce to George Platt Brett, of the Macmillan Company—the publisher of several of Royce's books, including *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. In his letter, Royce raises the possibility of "a further book on 'The Art of Loyalty.'"⁵⁰ Although this book

Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works, edited by Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J. Vol. 2 (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2001), 132–171.

⁴⁷ Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 125.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 134.

⁴⁹ For example, in *War and Insurance* (1914), Royce envisions "a community of interpretation formed to teach the nations, by the potent devices of mutual insurance, the art of loyalty to the community of mankind." Royce, *War and Insurance* 78-79 (emphasis in original).

⁵⁰ Josiah Royce to George Platt Brett, N.D. [August, 1911?] in *The Letters of Josiah Royce*, edited by John Clendenning (Chicago: University of

never came to fruition, it is a virtual certainty that material drawn from this lecture would have featured prominently in the manuscript.⁵¹

Royce begins this lecture by stating that the several cases of apparently opposed loyalties that he considered motivate an important comment about the nature of duty. Royce asks his audience to eschew the popular notion of a formulaic moral code such that when one is confronted with such a conflict, one need only consult one's formula or code in order to determine how to act.⁵² The problem cases presented in the previous lecture instead demand implementation of what Royce calls "the art of loyalty." Here, Royce explains the aptness of his term:

Now I believe that art of loyalty to be beautifully simple in its spirit, and like all fine arts, endlessly complicated in its details. I believe that its complexity is simply due to the wealth and to the mysterious situations,

Chicago Press, 1970), 558. Clendenning's estimated date of August, 1911 is supported by a number of details in the letter, as well as the date and content of a letter from Brett to Royce—August 10, 1911—that is clearly subsequent to Royce's letter (*Ibid.*, 559 n.257).

⁵¹ Including the further book on "The Art of Loyalty," Royce shares with Brett ideas for three future books, stating that he has "progressed as to all the topics in question" (*Ibid.*).

⁵² See also Royce's comments upon the mid-year examination of his 1915–1916 Extension Course: "Loyalty, if it is anything, is or ought to be in all of us a growing doctrine about life, and a growing method of trying to solve the problems of life. The doctrine of Loyalty does not consist of a collection of formulas which you can memorize verbatim, and apply mechanically to all cases as they come up." Josiah Royce, "Comments Upon the Problem of the Mid-Year Examination Paper [Or "Principles of the Art of Loyalty"]" in *Josiah Royce's Late Writings: A Collection of Unpublished and Scattered Works*, edited by Frank M. Oppenheim, S.J. Vol. 2 (Bristol: Thoemmes Press, 2001), 138. Although Royce uses the terms 'moral code' and 'formula' to refer to the moral philosophy put forth in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, he seems to use these terms loosely, holding "my loyalty will be a growing loyalty." Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 63.

sometimes beautiful, situations sometimes tragic and terrible, situations in which life daily places us. I believe that the loyal, without being in the least infallible, can be as clear and simple and reasonable in spirit in dealing with all these mysteries and with these complexities, as the consummate artists can be who somehow adapt their fine art to undertakings which appear to the inexpert hopelessly confusing.⁵³

The one difference between fine arts and the art of loyalty, however, is that anybody can be skilled at the practice of the art of loyalty. This is a point that Royce insists upon in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, holding that loyalty is “no aristocratic gift for the few.”⁵⁴ In “The Art of Loyalty,” Royce assures, “The plainest of souls, if only steadily faithful, can become a great artist in loyalty.”⁵⁵ Given the significance of loyalty for Royce—in loyalty lies, as he tells us, “the fulfillment of the whole moral law”⁵⁶—this assertion is of no small moment.

Three principles comprise the art of loyalty. Because Royce states these principles in a number of fashions throughout the lecture, I quote his summarization of them at the lecture's end:

First the principle: Steadfastly train yourself to the resolve that your various causes shall be harmonized; Secondly the principle: In case of the appearance of conflict, look beneath the superficial conflict to find if possible the deeper common loyalty, and act in the light of that common loyalty; Thirdly, the principle: If conflict cannot otherwise be resolved, act in consistency with your prior loyalty, remembering that, if a change of flag may indeed be sometimes required by some transformation of your insight, fickleness itself is never

⁵³ Royce, “The Art of Loyalty,” 22.

⁵⁴ Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 54.

⁵⁵ Royce, “The Art of Loyalty,” 22.

⁵⁶ Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 9 (emphasis in original).

a part of loyalty. Your cause, once chosen, is your larger self. Fickleness, if deep and deliberate is moral suicide.⁵⁷

This set of principles is not stated in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. It is useful to compare Royce's elaboration upon each of these principles to relevant passages from *The Philosophy of Loyalty*. Doing so demonstrates that this set of principles—particularly the inclusion of the third principle—represents an important advancement in Royce's thought.

While it is true that Royce does not state this set of principles in *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, the first and second principles are more or less articulated there. In the lecture on "Loyalty to Loyalty," Royce states that all of our loyalties need to be "controlled and unified by a deliberate use of the principle that, whatever my cause, it ought to be such as to further, so far as in me lies, the cause of universal loyalty.... My causes must form a system. They must constitute in their entirety a single cause, my life of loyalty."⁵⁸ Elaborating upon this injunction, Royce claims that when conflicts arise among one's causes, abiding by this principle will "reduce the conflict to the greatest possible harmony."⁵⁹ How does one train oneself to resolve that one's various causes shall be so harmonized? First, one wants to always bear in mind the project of being loyal to loyalty. If the causes in question appear to be of equal value with respect to this criterion, then one must try to locate a central cause that unites the apparently conflicting causes. It may be that a course of action recommends itself when one sees that what was thought to be a conflict is actually not a conflict at all. For instance, in the case of a familial conflict, should one be torn between one's loyalty to each of two individual family members, one should remind oneself of one's loyalty to the family in general. So doing, Royce recommends, may very well dissolve what might otherwise appear to be irreconcilable conflict, harmonizing two apparently discordant loyalties. This, in turn, means that one's

⁵⁷ Royce, "The Art of Loyalty," 35.

⁵⁸ Royce, *The Philosophy of Loyalty*, 62.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 62-63.