

unconscious deviations from a straight path take place. The eye does not move with equal ease in both of two opposite directions. Consequently the unconscious deviation will be greater for transversals going in one direction than for the other set, and the recently discovered unequal distortion of the different parallels will be explained. With the eye at rest, the conformation of lines is such as to establish for it certain points of easiest fixation, and their assumption, or the existence of tensions toward them, gives the distorting effect of side-fixations, which associates itself with the experiences gained during movement and supports the illusion. In the case of the Müller-Lyer illusion, the easiest fixation-point for the eye, when attention is on the end of the line, lies within the angle. If the eye actually rests on any other position of the field when the figure is under examination, there exists a muscular tension toward the point of easiest fixation. Accordingly, whether the figure is surveyed with the eye at rest, or with it sweeping over the field in any desired irregular manner, or with it following the line carefully from one point of easiest fixation to the other while attention goes from actual end to actual end, the perceived length is determined by the amount of actual movement involved in the latter case; and thus the apparent difference in length of the two parts of the figure is explained. Angles of different degrees and of different lengths of sides, and end-figures other than angles, involve different positions of the point of easiest fixation, and hence differ in the degree of illusion produced.

The most important result of this whole study is the establishment of the fact that the internal tensions of the muscles of the eyes (and of other bodily parts), apart from those involved in the execution of actual movements, are of the greatest consequence in determining the details of our spatial perceptions.

E. B. DELABARRE.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

RECENT CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE LITERATURE OF SCHOLASTICISM.

GENERAL interest in that phase of philosophic thought which is known as scholasticism may be said to date from the publication of Cousin's '*Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard*' (Paris, 1836). Since that time much, indeed, has been done towards the historical presentation of scholasticism; much, however, still remains to be done, especially in the matter of completing our fund of original literature referring to scholastic philosophy. It is the purpose of

the present paper to indicate briefly the more important lines of historical investigation in this department of the history of philosophy, and to mention some of the most recent contributions in each line.

Those who are competent to judge tell us that there still exists in the libraries of France, Italy, Germany and England a vast amount of medieval philosophical literature in manuscript, and all who are interested in scholasticism realize that the publication of material of this kind is the form of neo-scholastic activity which, before all others, recommends itself to the modern student. The difficulty of deciphering, collating and annotating medieval texts is well known; and if, on account of this difficulty, the output has been comparatively meager, we may console ourselves with the reflection that the work is being carefully done. The group of scholars who, with Dr. Clemens Baeumker, of Strassburg, as editor-in-chief, began in 1891 to edit the unpublished treatises of the medieval philosophers in the *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (Münster, 1891, ff.) have given us texts and critical studies which can not be too highly praised. Their latest publications are: Espenberger, 'Die Philosophie des Petrus Lombardus und ihre Stellung im zwölften Jahrhundert' (Bd. III., Heft V., 1901); Willner, 'Des Adelard von Bath Traktat De Eodem et Diverso'; Baur, 'Dominicus Gundissalinus, De Divisione Philosophiæ'; Engelkemper, 'Die religionsphilosophische Lehre Saadja Gaons über die hl. Schrift'; Schneider, 'Die Psychologie Alberts des Grossens' (these four titles constitute Band IV., 1903). This collection, it is hoped, will realize the plan contemplated by Barach, who in 1876 began the publication of 'Bibliotheca Philosophorum Mediæ Ætatis.' Barach's project was abandoned after the publication of three short treatises (Innsbruck, 1876-8). Next in importance to Baeumker's *Beiträge* is the collection of Belgian philosophers edited by de Wulf, of the University of Louvain, under the title 'Philosophes belges'; two volumes have already appeared, 'Le traité des formes de Gilles de Lessines' (Louvain, 1901) and 'Les quatre premiers Quodlibet de Godefroid de Fontaines' (Louvain, 1903). What de Wulf is accomplishing for the Belgian scholastics is being done for the medieval philosophers of Spain by Pelayo, who has edited several treatises of the early schoolmen in his 'Heterodoxes Españoles' (Madrid, 1880 ff.). Under the head of recent publication of original texts mention must be made of the edition of the 'Impossibilia' of Siger of Brabant, by Père Mandonnet, of the University of Freiburg in Switzerland.

After the publication of manuscript sources the most important work in the department of scholastic philosophy is the republication in critical editions of the 'Opera Omnia' of the schoolmen. This has

been done in the case of St. Bonaventure, St. Thomas, Albertus Magnus, Duns Scotus, Denis the Carthusian; and a new edition of the works of Roger Bacon is promised for the near future. Unfortunately, the older editions, unattractive as they are to the eye accustomed to modern typographical finish, and uncritical as they sometimes are in the matter of 'attribution,' are, in some instances, superior in textual accuracy to the more attractive modern editions.

The reconstruction of the educational environment in which the scholastics worked is by no means the least important part of the task of the historian of scholasticism. To this department valuable material has been furnished in recent years. First in importance is Denifle's '*Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*' (Paris, 1889 ff.), which renders accessible the original material for the history of the University of Paris—the center of scholastic philosophy and theology during the golden age of the scholastic movement. Denifle has also furnished a more general picture of medieval university life in '*Die Entstehung der Universitäten des Mittelalters bis 1400*' (Berlin, 1885). On a smaller scale Törnau's '*Rhabanus Maurus*' (Munich, 1900), Clerval's '*Ecoles de Chartres*' (Chartres, 1895) and Mignon's '*Origines de la scolastique*' (Paris, 1895) present a picture of the educational conditions which determined the development of scholasticism in the various centers of medieval culture.

Finally, critical work of a high order has recently been done in the publication and discussion of biographical material relating to the philosophers of the Middle Ages. It has long been recognized that the materials in use, consisting of chronicles and 'lives' often carelessly compiled, were in need of a thorough critical revision; it was necessary to reconstruct dates, to discuss the question of the reliableness of the chronicler, to control his exaggerations and his inaccuracies, and, generally, to apply modern methods of historical research to the vast amount of material available. Besides, new and valuable material has been discovered. Thus, to mention merely the most important, the '*Analecta Bollandiana*' published by the Jesuits at Brussels has furnished new data for the life of Albertus Magnus, the Franciscan editors of the Quaracchi edition of the works of St. Bonaventure have rewritten the life of the Seraphic Doctor from new materials, the coeditors of the *Archiv für Literatur- und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters* (Freiburg im B., 1885 ff.), Fathers Denifle and Ehrle, archivists of the Vatican, have published important materials for the biographies of Henry of Ghent, Peter John Olivi, Master Eckhart, etc.

The foregoing list will, it is hoped, give the reader some conception of the amount of original work that is being done in the department of scholastic philosophy. The attention which this work

receives is evident from the recent increase in periodical literature of the second order, namely, discussions, appreciations, résumés, which are to be found in the current philosophical magazines, especially in those which, like the *Revue Thomiste* and the *Néo-scholastique*, are specially devoted to the study of the philosophy of the schools. In a subsequent article an account will be given of the most important of these recent studies.

WILLIAM TURNER.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY, ST. PAUL, MINN.

NOTE ON THE IDEA OF A 'MORAL SENSE' IN BRITISH THOUGHT PRIOR TO SHAFTESBURY¹

THE ethical problems of the seventeenth century were stated mainly in terms of rights and duties. Natural rights and laws of nature were familiar to the readers of Hobbes, Cumberland, and Locke. The moralists of the eighteenth century, for the most part, consider rather the instincts and sentiments. The first expression of the new attitude is usually attributed to Shaftesbury. But while Shaftesbury and his more systematic follower, Hutcheson, deserve credit for the extended formulation and development of the doctrines of moral sense and benevolent instincts, we find distinct statements of the essence of the doctrine and even of the technical term in at least two divines, Tillotson and Barrow. The transition by which an old concept is made to do duty for a new idea has an interesting illustration in Tillotson's definition of the term 'Light of Nature.' This term with Descartes had borne the meaning of discernment or intellectual recognition. With Cumberland and Locke reason was a corresponding principle. But Tillotson, in sermon 101, defined 'Light of Nature' as 'a natural instinct, by which I mean a secret impression upon the minds of men, whereby they are naturally carried to approve some things as good and fit, and to dislike other things as having a native evil and deformity in them.' Here the 'light' is affirmed to be an 'instinct,' and if the phrase 'approve as good' may seem to imply a judgment which has a rational element, the term 'dislike' is purely a term of feeling; while the word 'deformity' naturally suggests the æsthetic qualities which play so large a part later. The transfer of the moral categories to the realm of feeling is thus well on its way.

Much more explicit statements are found in Barrow, whose sermons were published in 1685; and these statements take on

¹ Read at the meeting of the American Philosophical Association in Princeton, December 30, 1903.