

"A terminology is necessary at times to avoid perpetual circumlocutions that would end in reducing the reader's mind to a state of hopeless confusion. I lately came across a striking illustration of this necessity in a paper written by a distinguished physiologist (Professor Huxley) on a special point of comparative anatomy and read some months ago before the Royal Society. I quote from this paper the more readily because it not only serves to illustrate the necessity of which I am now speaking, but . . . that physiologists of our time are not a whit behind the mediæval Doctors in the invention of a technical vocabulary." (I shall for the sake of brevity give but a few phrases of the quotation) "A fourth line traversing the union of the ilium in front with the pubis and behind the ischium will be the iliopectineal axis' 'the cotyloidramus of ischium gives off a stout elongated metischail process backwards' 'the enlarged homologues of the rami of the ypsiloid cartilage' 'the ornithorynchus' etc. etc. Now as a layman in this branch of knowledge I should be the last to venture the assertion that such an elaborate terminology is either unnecessary or useless. But if we bear in mind that it centres around *one* bone in the structure of vertebrates; I think it should make men of this generation more modest in their diatribes against the Scholastic Doctors touching this matter." Father Harper proceeds by quotations from popular works on natural science to show that this is no exceptional case. He quotes a page of unpronounceable terms from the *heading of one* chapter in Haeckel's work on the *Evolution of Man* in the first chapter of which, the author states that he has striven "to present this branch of science in as popular form as possible." "I think I may safely say" adds Father Harper "there are more technical terms in this one work than in the twenty five volumes of St. Thomas or the twenty-five volumes of Suarez."

After reading that the Scholastics "were wont to dispute with extremest stretching of the brain about questions difficult indeed and acute but commendable neither by reason of their utility nor of their certitude," I happened to pick up the *Bystander* where I found the following: "He promises to connect philosophy with life. If he keeps his promise he will do what has been hardly done by any modern

philosopher except the despised Paley. The others have devoted themselves to the quest of some sanction for morality other than the will of the Author of our being, and superior to experience which, as the debate still continues, they can scarcely be supposed to have found." He is speaking of the new Professor of Moral Philosophy in Toronto University. "He promises to connect (moral) philosophy with life!" Yes the "debate" continues. Were the schools engaged in such "debates" it might with more justice be said that they discussed questions commendable neither for their utility nor for their certitude.

The origin of ideas was, and is, a fundamental question with Scholastics. Let us see how a writer living in the full blaze of modern enlightenment settles this question. Of course I do not quote him as a representative modern philosopher, but Dr. Matthews is a clever writer, and is thoroughly imbued with the prevailing contempt for the Schoolmen. "It is true, in every-day language we talk of color, smell, thickness, shape, etc., not only as sensations within us but as qualities inherent in things themselves; but it has long since been shown that they are only modifications of our consciousness. It is told of the metaphysician, Cudworth, that in reply to a person who ridiculed the doctrine of innate ideas, he told him to take down the first book that came to hand in his library, open at random, and read. The latter opened Cicero's 'Offices' and began reading the first sentences. '*Quamquam*,'—'Stop,' cried Cudworth, 'it is enough. Tell me how through the senses you acquire the idea of *quamquam*!'" Conclusive, is it not? So at least thought Mr. Cudworth and Dr. Matthews who quotes it approvingly. How in the names of all the gods at once could he get the idea of *quamquam* if he had never *seen* nor *heard* the meaning of the word. Otherwise he might gaze at it till doomsday before he would get the proper "modification of his consciousness."

By their fruits ye shall know them—The fruits of modern philosophies are pantheism, agnosticism, materialism. "We in England," says Matthew Arnold, "find ourselves with an upper class materialized, a middle class vulgarized, and a lower class brutalized."

On this continent Ingersoll reflects the