

account of Locke's writings is, however, unusually good; and the insufferable sophistry of T. H. Green is well disposed of in a paragraph. Prof. Fraser pleads for a new edition of Locke's works, and it is very true that this great man, whose utterances still have their lessons for the world, with wholesome influences for all plastic minds, should be studied in a complete, correct, and critical edition.

51 (23 October 1890) 326

NOTES

Attributed to Peirce by Fisch in his *Third Supplement* (internal evidence). This note is unassigned in Haskell's *Index to The Nation*, vol. 1.

—Many minds nowadays are turning towards high philosophy with expectations such as wide-awake men have not indulged during fifty years of Hamiltonianism, Millism, and Spencerianism; so that the establishment of a new philosophical quarterly which may prove a focus for all the agitation of thought that struggles to-day to illuminate the deepest problems with light from modern science, is an event worthy of particular notice. The first number of the *Monist* (*Open Court* Publishing Company) opens with good promise, in articles by two Americans, one Englishman, three Germans, two Frenchmen. Mr. A. Binet, student of infusorial psychology, treats of the alleged physical immortality of some of these organisms. In the opening paper, Dr. Romanes defends against Wallace his segregation supplement to the Darwinian theory, *i.e.*, that the divergence of forms is aided by varieties becoming incapable of crossing, as, for instance, by blossoming at different seasons. Prof. Cope, who, if he sometimes abandons the English language for the jargon of biology, is always distinguished by a clear style; ever at his command in impersonal matters, gives an analysis of marriage, not particularly original, and introduces a slight apology for his former recommendation of temporary unions. Prof. Ernst Mach has an "anti-metaphysical" article characteristic of the class of ingenious psychologists, if not perhaps quite accurate thinkers, to which he belongs. Mr. Max Dessoir recounts exceedingly interesting things about magic mirrors considered as hypnotizing apparatus. Mr. W. M. Salter and M. Lucien Arreat tell us something of the psychology of Höffding and of Fouillée. Among the book-notices, a certain salad of Hegel and mathematics excites our curiosity and provokes an appetite for more of this sort. The writer makes much ado to state Dr. F. E. Abbot's metaphysics, certainly as easily intelligible a theory as ever was.

—It remains to explain the name *Monist*. Dr. Carus, the putative editor, says: "The philosophy of the future will be a philosophy of facts, it will be *positivism*; and in so far as a unitary systematization of facts is the aim and ideal of all science, it will be *Monism*." But this is no definition of monism at all; in fact, the last clause conveys no idea. The search for a unitary conception of the world, or for a unitary systematization of science, would be a good definition of *philosophy*; and, with this good old word at hand, we want no other. To use the word *monism* in this sense would be in flagrant violation at once of usage and of the accepted

principles of philosophical terminology. But this is not what is meant. Monism, as Dr. Carus himself explains it in his 'Fundamental Problems,' p. 256, is a metaphysical theory opposed to dualism or the theory of two kinds of substance—mind and matter—and also conceiving itself to be different both from idealism and materialism. But idealism and materialism are almost identical: the only difference is that idealism regards the psychical mode of activity as the fundamental and universal one, of which the physical mode is a specialization; while materialism regards the laws of physics as at the bottom of everything, and feeling as limited to special organizations. The metaphysicians who call themselves *Monists* are usually materialists *sans le savoir*. The true meaning attaching to the title of the magazine may be read in these words of the editor:

"We are driven to the conclusion that the world of feelings forms an inseparable whole together with a special combination of certain facts of the objective world, namely, our body. It originates with this combination, and disappears as soon as that combination breaks to pieces. . . . Subjectivity must be conceived as the product of a coöperation of certain elements which are present in the objective world. . . . Motions are not transformed into feelings, but certain motions, . . . when coöperating in a special form, are accompanied with feelings."

51 (30 October 1890) 349

Our Dictionaries, and Other English-Language Topics.

By R. O. Williams. Henry Holt & Co. 1890.

CSP, identification: MS 1365. See also: Burks, *Bibliography*. This notice is unassigned in Haskell's *Index to The Nation*, vol. 1.

This little book is mainly taken up with notes upon the use of a few words. The hasty dictum of Dr. E. A. Freeman, that the non-ecclesiastical use of *metropolis* is "slang," is easily and amply refuted. Mr. Williams well says that, "for more than two hundred years the secular meaning has been the prominent one," and the only reason for not extending the statement is that Elizabethan secular writers were not fond of the Greek forms. They often alluded to London as the "mother towne" of England.

The account of "our dictionaries" could not well be flimsier; but a discriminating guide to books of reference, useful as it would be, can hardly be looked for from American publishers. "The examples collected by Johnson," says Mr. Williams, "have formed the main stock of the citations used by subsequent dictionary-makers." This, of course, does not apply to Richardson, to say nothing of Murray. The 'Century Dictionary' has as many quotations as Johnson and Richardson together. It is no wonder that the fraction of the population which has not been engaged in the production of this world of words, has included every person capable of supervising the quotations in a really masterly way; for there was no possibility of competing with Murray and his 1,300 readers. Still, most of the 'Century' citations are judicious and unexceptionable; and if the treatment of them is less severely scientific, it is more agreeable than that of the Philological Society's vast collection.

In the first ten pages of part xvi. of the 'Century' (the latest to hand), we count 260 quotations, fewer than in the earlier parts of the work, which seems to be overrunning its limits. Quotations under *pilfer* from Dryden and Bacon, under *pilgrim* from Grew's 'Anatomy of Plants,' and under *pilotage* from Raleigh, have been taken from Johnson, apparently without verification, and quotations under *pillery* from Daniel and under *pimping* from Crabbe have been similarly drawn from the 'Imperial.' An abridged quotation and wrong definition, under *pinax*, come from Webster. We may state here that a few references appear to be either erroneous, misleading, or insufficient. Under *pile*, in the electrical sense, it might have been well to quote from Volta's own description, which was originally published in English.

1891

52 (12 February 1891) 139

NOTES

CSP, identification: MS L 159.4. See also Fisch, *First Supplement*. Fisch suggested that only a part of this might be attributable to Peirce. This is unassigned in Haskell's *Index to The Nation*, vol. 1.

—Mr. George Shea has printed a pamphlet with the title, 'Some Facts and Probabilities relating to the History of Johannes Scotus, surnamed Duns, and concerning the genuineness of the Spagnoletto Portrait belonging to the General Theological Seminary of the United States' (Cambridge: Riverside Press). Three other portraits of Duns Scotus, he says, are known, one at Windsor, one in the Bodleian, and one at Merton, and these are all admitted to be copies. The New York picture came from the shop of Mr. John Chaundy in Oxford; Mr. Chaundy had it from a gentleman who "understood that it had been brought into England from the south of France," and this gentleman's family believed it to be the original Spagnoletto. This, it must be confessed, is a somewhat indefinite pedigree. Mr. Shea adds that "the painting is recognized by connoisseurs as a genuine Ribera." Here is the gist of the question. The genuineness of the portrait can be decided on only by experts. We cannot rest on the opinion of unknown "connoisseurs"; if some acknowledged Spagnoletto authority should examine the picture, his decision would carry weight, but for the present, it will be generally felt, opinion must be reserved. The figure of Scotus, as represented in the photograph, is striking, and it will be pleasant if it should prove to be an original Ribera. The sketch of the great schoolman's life in the pamphlet is not carefully done. The author says, for example (p. 17): "So rapid was his advance that in his first year at the University [of Paris] he was appointed Regent of its Theological School." But the title "regent" belonged to any Master of Arts who chose to teach; and though there was a theological "Faculty," and the Sorbonne was in existence in 1304 (when Duns went to Paris), it is doubtful whether there was "a Theological School," for colleges had already been established, and in all of them theological instruction was given. The statement (p. 15) that "upon a vacancy occurring by the removal to Paris of his master, William Varron (A.D. 1301), Scotus was appointed to the chair of Philosophy," has too modern a tone. There was then, properly speaking, no "chair of philosophy" at Merton College; any master might lecture on any or all of the subjects of the curriculum (in which the philosophy of the time was, of course, prominent), and had to trust to his ability to attract pupils. A similar looseness of expression occurs in Mr. W. J. Townsend's 'Great Schoolmen of the Middle Ages.' Why so much space should be given to Erigena, who had nothing to do with Duns, is not clear. Mr. Shea has, however, done well to call attention to the portrait, and it is to be hoped that the authorities of the Union Theological Seminary will submit it to a competent expert who may enlighten us on the question of its genuineness.