

definition.

3. Chapter V. of Jelland's Epicureans, Stoics, and Sceptics gives some information about Stoic logic, which I have used (in connection with other information).

4. Appuleius, of the second century of our era, the author of the celebrated novel The Golden Ass, gives in the third book of his work De Dogmata Platonis ^{a treatise on logic.} The style is highly entertaining for those who like artificiality. Many words now in use there first appear.

5. One of the books of the Nuptials of Philology and Mercury, by Martianus Minneus Felix Capella, written toward the end of the fifth century, is a treatise on logic used in the cathedral schools of the early middle ages, and thus ~~was~~ was in the line of tradition. Capella's evident admiration of the style of Appuleius no doubt led to his selecting the same words. Thus, the style of Appuleius, idle and cilly as many think it, certainly gave him an influence he would not otherwise have possessed.

6. Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius wrote one of the most admired works of literature, — I do not say admired by good judges. His character was admirable; his calamities must touch every heart. He was born about A.D. 472 and died was executed about A.D. 524. The best editions of his ^{extensive} works are those of Basel, especially that of 1570. His ^{authority} influence was immense next to that of Aristotle in every part

of the middle ages; ^{for he united} having every quality calculated to impress men, learning, virtue, stupidity, wealth, and fame.

7. St. Isidorus of Seville, was the greatest scholar of his age; became bishop of Seville A.D. 600, and died A.D. 636. Among his numerous works is an encyclopaedia in 20 books, of which the second treats of logic, partly. Notwithstanding its brevity, it is by no means useless.

8. The Dialectica of Peter Abailhard (b. 1079 - d. 1142) may be mentioned, on account of the genius of its author, although it is of little use for our purpose.

9. The De Sex Principiis of Gilbertus Porretanus (d. 1154), having formed the subject of many commentaries by great Doctors, was evidently a text-book at Paris.

10. The translations of Aristotle and of the Arabian writers made during the early part of the thirteenth century had a good deal of influence.

11. Petrus Hispanus was a noble Portuguese, who having taken degrees in all the faculties in Paris, returned to Lisbon and was made appointed to the head of that school which became the University of Coimbra. He was afterward chief physician to Pope Gregory X, who made him Cardinal. He was crowned Pope 1276 Sep. 20. He began his pontificate ^{with} very grand promises; but a part of his palace fell down upon him and he died in consequence 1277 May 16.

The tradition is that this man was the author of the *Summulae Logicales*, one of the most original works of the middle ages, and used as the text-book everywhere, ^{almost} until the breaking up of scholasticism, though after 1500, editions are not very numerous. But it must be remembered that by that time so many copies on heavy linen paper were in existence that it was always easy to buy them.

There is a Greek text of this book; ~~and there has been~~ ^{it has been printed with} the name of Michael Psellus attached to it. That name was so common in Constantinople that it proves no more than John Browne would in English, even if it is really given in any old MS., which has been denied. At any rate, it is certain it is not of the age of any known Michael Psellus, and belongs to the intermediate period between Greek and Thomaic; it is filled with Latinisms and ^{writers (some of whom are mentioned)} with ideas taken from Latin authors. Some have believed this Greek text to be the original; there has been some dispute about it. Charles Fauriel has written ably to show the Latin text is the original. It seems to me all the reason is on that side.

12. The commentaries upon Aristotle by Averroes.

13. The commentaries of Albertus Magnus, (b. 1193-d. 1280), which are not remarkable.

14. The works of St. Thomas Aquinas, the great psychologist of the thirteenth century, a splendid genius (b. 1227-d. 1274)

15. The works of John Duns Scotus, one of the great scholastic

metaphysicians of all time. (d. 1308.)

16. The Logic of William of Ockham (d. 1347).

17. Among the late scholastic writings, I could have wished for a ^{somewhat} different selection; but I have had to content myself with such as I could get.

18. The Thomist commentary of Lambertus de Monte ~~regis~~ (d. 1199) recommended by the doctors of Cologne.

19. The Scotistic commentary of Petrus Tarsatus.

20. The Occamist ^{summula} ~~commentary~~ of the The Mayence doctors.

21. The nominalistic commentary of Thomas Bricot.

22. The highly esteemed late Thomist commentary of the ~~Canon~~ Doctors of Coimbra. 1606.

23. The Thomist manual of the Abbé Bensa. 1855.

24. The Aristotelian writers after the fall of scholasticism are very useful. Of these I habitually refer to two.

Eustachius à Sancto Paulo. Summa Philosophiae. 1609.

25. Franco Burgersdicius. Institutiones Logicae. 1626.

~~26. Of Cartesian treatises the most important is the~~

~~La logique ou l'art de penser.~~

26. Two books to which I refer as giving English forms

one

Thomas Wilson. Rule of Reason. 1557.

27. Thomas Blundevile. Arte of Logikes. 1599.

28. Of humanist works of the time of the revival of

learning, there are several very important; but, unfortunately, the only one which I have been able to use is the *Dialectica* of George Valla.

29. Of Cartesian treatises the most important is *La Logique: ou l'art de penser*, of the Port Royalists, 1664 (Attributed to Arnauld and Nicole.) Also, the following

30. Johannes Clauberg. *Logica vetus et Nova*. 2nd Ed. Amsterdam. Ex Off. Azeviriana. 1658.

31. Influenced by Locke is the excellent work,
J. R. de Crousaz. *Logique*. 1700.

And the good English classic,

32. Isaac Watts. *Logic*. 1724.

33. Passing by various works of interest and power which are of no consequence from the present point of view, I mention
Christian Wolff. *Philosophia Rationalis, sive Logica*.

There are other Leibnizean works which I should have been exceedingly glad to refer to if I could have procured them.

34. I. Kant. *Logic*. This work is really by Meier with extensive additions by Kant, and was edited and published (if not written out) by Jäsche.

35. Thoroughly Kantian is

Sir William Hamilton. *Lectures on Logic*
Of later date, but still contributing to the tradition.

36. Richard Whately. Logic (Revised, 1827.)

37. John Stuart Mill. A System of Logic, ratiocinative and inductive. 1843.

Aquinas divides the operations of the Understanding, from a logical point of view, into

Simple Apprehension,

Judgment, and

Reasoning or Ratiocination.

It is true that Prantl, the slap-dash historian of Logic, rejects the commentary Perthenerianised in which this passage occurs, as not the work of Aquinas. But he does not explain how it can be that the other commentaries on the books of the Organon attributed to Aquinas can be genuine (as he admits them to be) and this not. The way such works were written was for the master who was lecturing upon the work at the University to write out his lectures. He could not omit any ^{book} ~~work~~ from the Organon; for books were dear, and students generally only had ^{few except} their note-books; and for this reason the omission of one of the ^{divisions} ^{parts} ~~books~~

Organon would have excited the utmost indignation, and raised a storm the noise of which would have reached our ears. If, then, the existing commentary be not that of Aquinas, where is his? Remember, now, the worship which was paid to him while he was yet alive, and after his death;

91

and ask ^{yourself} whether his school would have consented to the suppression of one of his works and the substitution for it of another. Of course, it would easily happen that a small, less opinionous treatise should be attributed to him. But it appears that an important section of one of his main works should be excised, and something else substituted, especially when this other had contained the most pronounced and boldest departures from tradition, seems to me quite impossible. Lambertus de Monte, the ~~Conimbric~~ who, Prantl says, adheres so ~~close~~ religiously to Aquinas that his work contains nothing else, accepts this book without question. So do the learned Conimbricenses and the whole Thomist school. Moreover, it seems to me the questions of Denis Scelus upon the same treatise ought to contain phrases which show that he had been reading the commentary whose genuineness Prantl ~~at~~ denies. It must be remembered that Prantl has denied the genuineness of many ^{many} things which have been subsequently proved genuine.

definitive

3. The book Six Principia of Albertus Fortetanus.
4. The Summulae logicae of Petrus Hispanus, which Peacock with his usual stupidity considers to be a translation from the Greek.
5. The commentary of Albertus Magnus giving hints of Arabian views.
6. The works of St. Thomas Aquinas, the great psychologist of the 13th century.
7. The works of Duns Scotus, one of the greatest metaphysicians of all time.
8. The logic of William of Ockham, the Venerabilis Inceptor of the later nominalists.
9. The Compendium totius logicae of the Occamist Buridan.
10. The logic of ^{the Occamist} Albert of Saxony, also ^{and other works.}
11. The logica magna of Paulus Nicolletti of Venice.
12. The Dialectical Disputationes of Laurentius Valla, the humanist.
13. The logica of Nicolaus d'Orbelli.
14. The Official Logic of the University of Mayence. (Occamist)
15. The Formalitates of Antonius Surtius. (Scottist)
16. The entire commentaries of Thomas Bricot. (Occamist)
17. The commentary of Petrus Tatarvetus (Scottist)
18. The commentary of Joannes Versor (Thomist)
19. The commentary of Lambertus de Monte. (Thomist)
(This was the officially approved at Cologne.)

20. The book of Conrad Pschbacher.
21. The treatise of Gregory Reisch.
21. The questions of Mauritius Hibernicus.
22. The commentary of Johann Eck: (Occamist.)
23. The ^{official} commentary of the ~~students~~ University of Coimbra (Thomist).
24. The Summa Philosophiae of Eustachius à Sancto Paulo.
(Reformed Aristotelian.)
25. The logical Institutions of Fr. Burgersdicius. (Reformed Aristotelian.)
26. The Manuel de la Logique of the Abbé Bensa^{1753.} (Thomist.) 1838
27. L'art de penser, of the Port Royal's. 1664 (Cartesian. By Arnauld and Nicole.)
28. The dialectica of George Valla.
29. The logic of Clauberg (Cartesian)
29. Thomas Wilson's Rule of Reason. 1551.
30. Thomas Blundeville's Arte of Logike. 1599.
31. Isaac Watts's Logick. 1724. (Lockian.)
32. J. P. de Crousaz: Logique. 1720.
33. Wolff's Logic. 1728.
- ~~34.~~ ^{34.} Kant's logic (by Meier.)
~~Lambert's~~
35. Hamilton's Lectures on Logic
36. Whately: Logic.
37. Francis Bacon's Logic 1604.
38. Friedrich Hegel's System der Logik, 2nd Ed. 1865.

It will be understood that these books are selected simply as representing

the traditional system and terminology.

St. Thomas Aquinas divides the operations of the Understanding into

Simple Apprehension,
Judgment, and
Reasoning or Ratiocination.

True Prantl, the slap-dash historian of Logic, rejects the commentary on the Perihermeneiad in which this passage occurs as not really by Aquinas. But ^{little} attention need be paid to Prantl's freaks, after the numerous cases in which they have turned out valueless. Besides, he does not explain how it can be that the other commentaries ^{on the Organon} that bear the name of Aquinas are genuine and this not. Such works were written in the University of Paris by a master who was reading the Organon publicly. ~~The~~ His commentary was his lectures. The omission of a book ^{the price of} would be so utterly inadmissible, that it would have produced a riot ^{would} which ~~we should~~ have reached our ears. It is inadmissible to suppose that Aquinas omitted this book. If, therefore, the existing commentary is not his, where is his? And how did it come to disappear and this to replace it? How was it that Lambertus de Monte ^{and the Cologne Doctors} who follow Aquinas so ~~obediently~~ religiously that Prantl complains there is almost nothing but Aquinas in their books, how is it that they quote this spurious commentary without suspicion, as do Versor, the Comanchinus, and the whole Thomist school? How is it that

Duns Scotus, the immediate successor of St. Thomas in the position of the leader of logical thought, ~~also~~ uses expressions which show that he has consulted this commentary in making his own?