

DICTIONARY  
OF  
PHILOSOPHY AND PSYCHOLOGY

INCLUDING  
MANY OF THE PRINCIPAL CONCEPTIONS OF ETHICS, LOGIC, AESTHETICS,  
PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, MENTAL PATHOLOGY, ANTHROPOLOGY,  
BIOLOGY, NEUROLOGY, PHYSIOLOGY, ECONOMICS, POLITICAL  
AND SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, PHILOLOGY, PHYSICAL  
SCIENCE, AND EDUCATION

AND GIVING  
A TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH, FRENCH, GERMAN, AND ITALIAN

*WRITTEN BY MANY HANDS*

*AND EDITED BY*

**JAMES MARK BALDWIN**

PH.D. (PRINCETON), HON. D.Sc. (OXON.), HON. LL.D. (GLASGOW)

STUART PROFESSOR IN PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

*WITH THE CO-OPERATION AND ASSISTANCE OF AN INTERNATIONAL  
BOARD OF CONSULTING EDITORS*

IN THREE VOLUMES  
WITH ILLUSTRATIONS AND EXTENSIVE BIBLIOGRAPHIES

VOL. I

*New York*  
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
*London*  
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

1901

*distans*—whether it takes place without any intervening medium or other agency. Leibnitz objected to the Newtonian theory that a body cannot act where it is not. This negation is accepted as an axiom by many physicists, who find support for their view by the apparently well-ascertained fact that electric and magnetic attraction and repulsion act through the agency of the ether, and conclude from analogy that gravitation may be due to the same or a similar cause.

Some astronomical phenomena have recently led to the suspicion that gravitation does not vary rigorously as the inverse square, but increases more rapidly towards the sun by an amount so minute as to make its establishment difficult, except by the most refined and elaborate researches. The simplest proposed form of the modified law is that instead of being inversely as  $r^2$ , it is inversely as  $r$  to the power  $2 + x$ , where

$$x = 0.000001612 = 1612 + 10^{10} \quad (\text{S.N.})$$

**Greatest Happiness:** Ger. *höchstes Glück*; Fr. *bonheur suprême, suprême félicité*; Ital. *felicità suprema*. The greatest possible surplus of pleasure over pain in the life or lives referred to; the reference being either to an individual, a community, mankind at large, or sentient beings generally.

The ethical doctrine that greatest happiness is the ideal of conduct received formal statement in Western thought by Epicurus; but the doctrine that the greatest happiness which the individual ought to pursue is not his own happiness, but that of the community, seems to have originated in political theory, and, in its precise formulation, to be mainly due to certain English writers of the 18th century. The social content of morality was undoubtedly no modern discovery. The conditions required for a quantitative estimate of happiness are laid down by Wollaston (*Religion of Nature*, 1722); and regard for the happiness of others was made the criterion of virtue by such writers as John Gay (*Prelim. Diss. to King's Origin of Evil*, 1731, xxxvi) and Hutcheson (*Syst. of Mor. Philos.*, 1755). Hutcheson makes their 'tendency to universal happiness' the criterion of the material goodness of actions (whereas their formal goodness consists in their flowing 'from good affections in a just proportion'), and this criterion is systematically applied by him.

One of the most distinct of early statements of this criterion is in Priestley's *Essay on the First Princ. of Government* (1768): 'The good and happiness of the members, that is, the

majority of the members of any state, is the great standard by which everything relating to that state must finally be determined' (p. 17). The double phrase 'good and happiness' does not imply here that good is different from happiness, for it is immediately added that 'justice and veracity, for instance,' have 'nothing intrinsically excellent in them separate from their relation to the happiness of mankind' (p. 18). A similar view is found in Beccaria (*Dei delitti e delle pene*, originally published in 1764), who asserts that the only proper end for legislation is 'la massima felicità divisa nel maggior numero'—an expression rendered in the English translation (3rd ed., 1770) by the phrase to which Bentham afterwards gave currency, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number.' The constituents of greatest happiness are enumerated by Bentham (*Princ. of Mor. and Legisl.*), and made the basis of a hedonistic calculus. The importance, as sources of happiness, of permanent objects of interest is brought out by J. S. Mill (*Utilitarianism*, chap. ii), and still more by Sidgwick (*Meth. of Eth.*, III. xiv).

*Literature:* the authors cited; see also ETHICS, and ETHICAL THEORIES, and BIBLIOG. F, 2, 7. (W.R.S.)

**Greek Terminology** (considered in relation to Greek philosophy).

(1) The vocabulary of European philosophy has its principal source in the technical language of Greek philosophers. Of this technical language, a portion has passed directly over into our modern philosophical usage, e. g. a number of the familiar terms of the traditional formal logic, such as syllogism, enthymeme, &c. A portion, however, and in fact a very large portion, has reached us in the form of Latin translations and imitations of Greek terms. Of this part, again, there are subdivisions. The classical Roman philosophical writers began the process of 'making the dialectic art speak in Latin' (see citations in Prantl, *Gesch. d. Logik*, i. 511, at the outset of an important discussion of the Roman terminology). The words *substantia* and *essentia*, as translations of *οὐσία*, belong, for instance, to this first stratum of Latin imitations of Greek terms. A second group of Latin terms and phrases, formed under the influence of Greek originals, is found in the theological terminology of the Latin Church. The scholastic philosophy constitutes a third period during which Latin imitations or translations of Greek originals entered philosophical language. And from time to time, in modern

## GREEK TERMINOLOGY

philosophy, the coining of new compounds, of Greek origin, has gone on side by side with a continuation of the processes to which the scholastic vocabulary itself was due. The effective tendency to add to all these sources of philosophical terms the modern vernacular languages themselves has existed ever since Meister Eckhart, whose Middle German vocabulary contained many striking imitations of Greek and of scholastic terms by means of purely German words (e. g. *Istigkeit* for *essentia* = *οὐσία*). It will be seen, therefore, that the influence of Greek terminology has been manifold, and indirect as well as direct, since even the terms of vernacular origin are often more or less obviously modelled after Greek terms.

(2) The process whereby the Greek terminology of philosophy arose and became gradually more elaborate and more settled is, in outline, as follows.

First, the early thinkers, in the Pre-Socratic period, began by undertaking to discover general explanations of the origin and nature of things. In advancing their theories, they were from the start led to emphasize certain aspects of the physical world—aspects which they deemed of especial importance as furnishing, or as illustrating, their explanations. To these emphasized aspects they gave names, some of which were already familiar in popular language. So the early names of the elements, water, air, fire, were of course words in daily use. But in two ways the undertaking, thus begun, very soon led to new developments. First, certain of the aspects of the world, which the philosopher was led to emphasize, were less familiar to the popular mind, and required relatively new names, so that, before long, quite novel coinages began to appear in the technical vocabulary of philosophy, or else words before existing were given a prominence that at once, by taking them out of their more usual context, changed them into technical terms. Of the former tendency, present for instance in the Pythagorean vocabulary, the coinage of new abstract nouns by individual philosophers remains, even to the present time, a familiar example. Here is, in fact, a perennial accompaniment of abstract thought; and few systematic thinkers have failed to coin at least one or two abstract nouns. Of the words already existent, but turned into technical terms by the way in which they are isolated and emphasized, the *ἄπειρον* of Anaximander forms the first instance in the history of Greek philosophy. When Homer (*Od.* viii. 340: see Schmidt's *Synony-*

*mik d. griechischen Sprache*, iv. 512) makes Hermes speak of *ἀριθμοὶ ἀρείωνες*, the meaning of the Homeric *ἀρείωνες*, as 'numberless,' is clear. But what Anaximander meant by calling his elementary material the *ἄπειρον* (i. e. the *Infinite*, or as Burnet, in the work cited below, renders it, the *Boundless*) becomes something at once technical and obscure, about whose precise meaning there has been much discussion. The term presumably means (see Windelband, *Geesch. d. alten Philos.*, 25, and Schmidt's *Synonymik*, in the passage just cited) at once that which is *boundless in its power to originate* new products, and *boundless in its extent*; and it is thus a typical example of an early and *undifferentiated* terminology, whose meanings and usages have indeed too much of the 'boundless' about them.

(3) But next, even when the early philosopher coins no new words, and does not consciously intend any unfamiliar usage of the already existent terms, still it is his fate to find his most familiar words *altering their meaning* as he uses them. For to him these familiar words soon come to name principles and ultimate processes, rather than the objects ordinarily in question when common sense employs the words. In vain then does the thinker, anywhere in his choice of fundamentally important terms, cling to the speech of the people. His thought transforms whatever it touches. The *πῦρ αἰεὶ ζῶν* (fire ever-living) of Heraclitus is so characterized by him that it soon loses much of the seeming of the merely sensuous 'fire' of the common-sense world with which he no doubt intends to identify it. For this world-fire is 'kindled and extinguished' according to 'fixed measure'; it is intelligent; it is 'want and satiety'; and so in many other ways fire, taken as the name of the world-principle, soon alters its significance, and can no longer be conceived as *mere* fire. Here again we deal with a tendency ever since important in the history of terminology. The later vocabulary of psychology, of ethics, and of metaphysics is full of instances of the way in which technical usage has again and again come to make the familiar seem strange. Thus everybody uses the verb *to be*, and distinguishes between existence and non-existence; but a discussion of the meaning of the terms for 'being' at once seems, to the popular mind, something extremely recondite; and the most common words soon appear utterly foreign and mysterious when once they are found, in such a discussion, as technical terms. From the Eleatic philosophers down, and very

notably in Plato's ontological dialogues, such as the *Parmenides*, the *Sophist*, and the *Philebus*, this is what happens to the terms used for being.

(4) The consequence to which these often unconscious transformations of the popular usage lead is that ere long, in early Greek philosophy, each thinker comes to employ, upon occasion, conscious devices for marking off his own peculiar usage of terms. To this end: (a) He sometimes *objects to the popular view*, because it does not sufficiently observe the meanings and distinctions of its own words. In calling attention to such popular confusions, the thinker indeed intends, so far, to clarify ideas without of necessity reforming vocabulary. But the effect upon terminology is inevitable, since the distinction, once emphasized, renders impossible the naïve usage. The attack of Parmenides upon the common opinions about the relation of being and non-being involves, for instance, just such an insistence upon the importance of a distinction already known to language, but, as Parmenides holds, neglected by common sense. You *cannot truly speak* of non-being; you *must not recognize* it. For it is absolutely *different from* being. The result of such observations becomes of importance for the future of terminology. Or again: (b) The thinker, in a somewhat different fashion, is led to express his own theory of things by consciously asserting that certain terms and phrases in common use are essentially *misleading*, so that for them there ought to be *substituted* such and such other words. To make observations of this kind is to aid in the formation of a definite terminology, in case the observations are themselves at all successful. Thus the early thinkers, after Parmenides, when attention has once been called to the deeper problems about the genesis of things, are found using such expressions as that of Empedocles: 'There is no *origination* (*φύσις*) of anything mortal, nor yet any end, . . . but only *mixture* and *separation* of what is mixed (*μίξις* and *διάλαξις*). But amongst men it is called *φύσις*' (see Fairbanks, *First Philosophers of Greece*, 162). Or again, Anaxagoras declares that 'The Greeks do not rightly use the terms "coming into being" and "perishing" (*τὸ δὲ γίνεσθαι καὶ ἀπολλύεσθαι*).' As a fact, he continues, one should use the terms *συμμισησθαι* and *διακρίνεσθαι*, terms which again mean mixture and separation (Fairbanks, op. cit., 245). Efforts towards an establishment of usage which have reached this stage involve an intentional adjustment of terms to doctrines,

and herewith the history of terminology proper begins.

(5) The next higher stage is the one especially due, in Greek thought, to the influence of Socrates, and in part also of the Sophists. The undertaking to *define terms* now becomes a recognized part of the philosophical ideal. Defining terms and reflectively *clarifying ideas* are henceforth undertakings that progress side by side. The method involved becomes a very important portion of the dialectical art. The Platonic dialogues develop this art with great and conscious virtuosity. The elementary faults in definition are well recognized (see the often-quoted passages in Plato's *Theaetetus*, 146-7, 208 D; in the *Meno*, 71 B; and in the *Gorgias*, 448 B; and cf. Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, 3rd ed., Th. II. Abth. I. 617). In avoiding these faults, and in developing true definitions, one also undertakes to create a more precise terminology. By means of the processes of *classification and division* of terms and of ideas so extensively developed by Plato, one comes to arrange terms in more systematic groups, the hierarchy of classes in the case of the subdivisions of any largest class requiring *the selection of appropriate terms* for all the members of the hierarchy. Such systematic arrangements, however, often also require, for the filling out of the omissions in the scheme, the *coinage of new terms*, and this coinage is now guided by needs of which the method makes one definitely conscious. The direct influence of the art of classification upon the organization of philosophical terminology is thus from the start visible, and may be especially observed in the more technical Platonic dialogues, such as the *Parmenides*, *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, and *Philebus*. The art in question also inevitably develops its own special terminology, whereby its various processes are themselves named (see, for a general survey of the Platonic use of classification, the monograph of Lukas, *Die Methode d. Eintheilung bei Plato*, Halle, 1888. In this monograph, special summaries of the terminology used by Plato for the art of classification are given, pp. 28, 54, 85, 110, 216). To divide a larger class into its subdivisions is expressed in Plato by the verbs *τέμνειν* and *διαπέισθαι*. He uses, both for logical classes and subclasses, the terms *γένος* and *εἶδος*; but no definite distinction between these two terms, as *genus* and *species*, exists for Plato (see also Campbell, in Jowett and Campbell's ed. of the *Republic*, 300). Yet, despite this high development of the Platonic art of classifying and organizing

terms and meanings, Plato himself is led to no established system of philosophical terms, such as Aristotle undertook to develop. Plato's usage varies with the different dialogues, and in ways that have suggested to many investigators inquiries as to the chronology of the Platonic use of language in the various periods of his literary activity (Campbell, Lutoslawski, &c. See the literature in Lutoslawski's book (cited below), and the recent papers of Natorp, *Arch. f. d. Gesch. d. Philos.*, xii). These 'stylo-metric' investigations, to be sure, concern much more than matters of technical terminology. Campbell calls Plato's philosophical terminology 'incipient, tentative, transitional,' and points out that he regarded the sophistic efforts in this direction as pedantry. In fine, then, the art of defining terms is for Plato a favourite and highly elaborate art, but he applies it each time afresh; and he is never disposed to be bound by the usage involved in the results of his previous efforts.

(6) In Aristotle, terminology and the ideal of a philosophical system culminate together. At the outset of his various systematic discussions, Aristotle often engages in a more or less extended argument regarding what does, and what does not, fall within the precise scope of any particular branch of science. In such and such matters the physicist (*φυσικός*) is interested; the metaphysician (*ὁ πρῶτος φιλόσοφος*) is concerned with other aspects; and yet others are the affairs of the student of dialectics or of morals. The boundaries of the sciences thus stand as definitely named and conscious limitations of that freedom of the argument to wander wherever it will, upon which Plato, in the *Theaetetus*, had laid such stress, and of which Plato's most famous dialogues furnish so many instances. This new tendency in Aristotle is only one symptom of the general interest of that philosopher in technically distinguishing the various aspects of things, in fixing upon terms and expressions suited to each aspect, and in solving fundamental problems by means of this method of distinctions. For Aristotle's divisions of the sciences are not wholly due to the same interest which gets expressed in the modern 'division of labour,' since Aristotle himself covered the whole range of the various sciences, whose provinces he all the while divided, by their definitions, from one another. Nor yet is his interest merely that of the lover of system for its own sake; for Aristotle is no pedant. His use of the distinctions of a highly wrought terminology is, to a consider-

able extent, due to his effort to harmonize the various points of view of earlier thinkers, and to solve apparent contradictions by showing how, 'in a certain sense,' each of two apparently contradictory propositions can be true. Thus terminological organization and definiteness is, with Aristotle, a conscious instrument of his many-sidedness. In finding his various terms, Aristotle makes free use of the rich materials already prepared for him by the previous thinkers, especially by Plato. In the fifth book of the *Metaphysics* he gives us a specimen of his terminological method, in the form of a discussion of the various meanings of a series of philosophical terms and usages. This book was presumably written as a separate essay, and many of its distinctions are elsewhere more fully discussed, in their systematic places. But the device of at once appealing to general usage, while at the same time consciously purifying and altering it, is much more systematically used by Aristotle than by Plato, with the result that almost no terms pass through Aristotle's hand without, as Eucken says, retaining traces of the influence of his thought (Eucken, *Gesch. d. philos. Terminol.*, 26). Meanwhile, Aristotle freely invents new terms, in a way easily rendered possible by the facility of forming compounds in Greek. Eucken (loc. cit.) enumerates, as a mere specimen of Aristotle's construction of terminology, a list of some seventy-five new terms and expressions, but regards the philosopher's transformation and fixation of the earlier usages as of still more historical importance. A notable characteristic of the Aristotelian language, also dwelt upon by Eucken, is the setting into sharp antithesis of terms formerly either synonymous, or else less sharply distinguished. Thus *γένος* and *εἶδος* with him first assume their well-known antithesis as *genus* and *species*. Another familiar Aristotelian antithesis is that of *ἔξις* and *διάθεσις* (*permanent condition* or *established habit* on the one hand, *temporary* or *changeable disposition* on the other hand). Still more important is the antithesis of *δύναμις* and *ἐνέργεια* (*capacity* or *potentiality* on the one hand, *attainment* or *actuality* on the other); and well known is also the characteristic contrast between *πρότερον τῇ φύσει* and *πρότερον πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, which plays such a part in Aristotle's theory of knowledge (the former expression meaning the universal principle, or, as Prantl is fond of calling it, *der schöpferische Begriff*, the creative notion or form; while the latter expression refers to the individual,

## GREEK TERMINOLOGY

especially to the sensuous individual, which in *our knowledge* comes first, while in the *nature of things* the universal is prior to the individual). These are all classic instances of the *evolution of terminology in Aristotle through sharper differentiation of expressions and of meanings*.

(7) In consequence, philosophy owes to Aristotle a very large portion of its later technical terminology. In logic the debt is especially obvious and well known, since here, even where Aristotle uses expressions already employed by Plato or by other writers, their definitive meaning or usage is rightly most associated with Aristotle's name. The well-known table of Categories; the terms substance, accident, quality, quantity, relation, &c.; the classes of judgments; the names of the processes, or of the means, of inference, and of the modes and figures of the syllogism (apart from a few later additions or formal refinements of Aristotle's terminology); the names of the principal fallacies of the textbooks of formal logic; the well-known metaphysical distinction between form and matter (a distinction now very familiar even in popular language); the terminology of all the principal ontological problems—these, whether preserved to us in the original Greek terms, or represented by Latin translations, are some of the most characteristic of the Aristotelian contributions to the speech of later thought. It is true that, upon closer examination, the part played by Plato in the preparation of all these expressions appears greater than at first sight. Plato, for instance, in the *Theaetetus*, already gives what Lutoslawski ventures to call the first table of categories (*Theaet.* 185); and in the *Sophist* and the *Philebus* other efforts towards a systematic list of fundamental notions are present. In many other cases Plato has also prepared the way. But, as we have already found Eucken pointing out, Aristotle is even more important as a reformer and an establisher of previously suggested terminology, than as an inventor of wholly new terms. In the other branches of science, Aristotle's terminology is of great historical importance, although the growth of knowledge has in many regions tended to set beside his terms others of later date. Of permanent significance is his terminology, especially, in the philosophical portions of the philosophy of nature, in psychology, in ethics, and in such portion of political science as his own discussions have most affected.

(8) In later Greek philosophy the terminology of the Stoics is of the first importance. The most significant and characteristic advances of all the later Greek terminology have to do (i) with the *growth of a clearer consciousness as to the inner life, and as to the contrast between the objective and subjective aspects of reality* (see Eucken, *op. cit.*, 31; and the terminological discussions in Siebeck's *Gesch. d. Psychol.*, Th. I, Abth. II, especially Siebeck's account of the later doctrine of the *emotions*, 222-41, and the summary of later doctrines as to the *practical aspect* of mental life, 241-61, as well as the chapter on the concept of *consciousness*, 331-42). The later Greek terminology is influenced (ii) *by the relations between philosophy, and the now more or less independent developments of the special sciences*, such as medicine. Here the *psychophysical problems* connected with psychology are of especial importance for terminology. The doctrine of the *pneuma*, or '*vital spirit*,' is a typical instance where medical and philosophical speculations interacted, and influenced terminology (see Siebeck, *op. cit.*, 130-60). Here, indeed, the theories in question had their basis in very early thinking, and their place in Aristotle. But the Stoics, and Galen (who died about 200 A. D.), extended and systematized both the empirical bases and the speculative applications of this doctrine of the pneuma, and the result, in one direction, influenced even the quite modern terminology of psychological theory (e.g. in case of the Cartesian doctrine of the '*animal spirits*'); while, in another direction, through a contact with Jewish theology (in Philo and in the Jewish-Alexandrine speculation generally), the theory of the pneuma came to occupy a place of vast importance in the history of theology. The well-known popular distinction of '*body, soul, and spirit*' becomes historically intelligible only in the light of this particular development of terminology; and the doctrine of the Trinity received expression in terms belonging partly to the same historical context. On the other hand, the development of the psychophysical terminology is also seen in the later doctrine of the *temperaments*, systematized by Galen, and since very widely popularized through psychological discussions (cf. Siebeck, *op. cit.*, 278-90). Other instances of this type of terminological development are not lacking. But (iii) the later terminology expresses a constantly increasing interest in the *problems of theology*, viewed as such. Despite the growing sense

## GREEK TERMINOLOGY

of the contrasts between inner and outer, subject and object, good and evil, divine and mundane, the Stoic philosophy, which is pre-vaillingly monistic, recognizes such contrasts only in order to attempt to reduce them again to unity; and the terminology of the theories here concerned became important for all later theology. Central in this development is the doctrine of the *λόγος*. The philosophical use of this term began indeed with Heraclitus, but as a metaphysical term, for the *objective reason* in things, it had gone into the background since that thinker, both Plato and Aristotle giving other terms the preference. The Stoics revived it, and developed, in connection with it, a considerable terminology, whose applications were at first pantheistic. Later, through Philo, as well as through the inner development of certain Stoical and eclectic tendencies, the term *logos* came into relations with theistic doctrines, and attained a very important place in Christian theology. The relations between the term *logos* and the before-mentioned *πνεῦμα* were from an early stage close, and the interpretation given to both became also of critical significance, in the discussions regarding the monistic and dualistic interpretations of the relations between God and world, and between the divine spirit and the individual soul. (Upon the *logos*, and the whole related terminology, see, in addition to the systematic histories of Greek philosophy, Heinze's *Lehre vom Logos in d. griechischen Philos.*, Oldenburg, 1872.) In close connection with the theological problem stands that regarding the *freedom of the will*, whose influence upon psychological terminology goes, together with the consequences of that advance, in a knowledge of the *inner life* above mentioned (cf. Siebeck, op. cit., 248 ff.; Heinze, op. cit., 125 ff., 153 ff.). And next (iv) the later terminology is significant in its more purely *ethical aspects*. The Stoical definition of the highest good as *the concordant or consistent life*, or as the life *in accordance with nature* (*ὁμολογουμένως ζῆν*, or *ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει*), is an instance of an expression that has since been in very general use (cf. Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, Th. III, Abth. I, 211). The concept of the *indifferent*, which is neither good nor ill, but is a mere matter of fortune (the *ἀδιάφορον* in general), is expressed by another characteristic Stoic term. The Stoic theory of *virtue*, and of the various special *virtues*, involves a terminology that is, in part, modelled after Aristotle and Plato, in part independently expressed. The doctrine of the *absolute*

*distinction* between the wise and the foolish amongst men, and of *the absence of degrees in the possession of the virtues*, also affects the ethical terminology of the Stoics. These may serve merely as examples of Stoic usage. Less significant are the Epicurean additions to ethical terminology. (v) In the later, and especially, again, in the Stoic *logic*, there appear considerable alterations and elaborations of former terminology, as well as new expressions. (Here one may consult especially Prantl, *Gesch. d. Logik*, i. 412-96. More compendious is Zeller's account, *Philos. d. Griechen*, Th. III, Abth. I, 63-70, 86-114.) In the first place, here, the technical name *logic* is itself of Stoic origin, Aristotle having used the terms *διαλεκτικός* and *ἀναλυτικός*. The term dialectic survives, to be sure, as the usual one for the Stoics also. In the next place, the Stoics offer a revised table of categories, wherein, instead of the Aristotelian table, they offer a list of four categories, *substratum* (*τὸ ὑποκειμενόν*), *quality* (*τὸ ποῦν*), *state or condition* (*τὸ πῶς ἔχον*), and *relation or relative state* (*τὸ πρὸς τί πῶς ἔχον*). They also pay considerable attention to the doctrine of the judgment, and in this region develop a complex and formal terminology, especially in case of the theory of the hypothetical judgment. A similar development of relatively new terminology exists in case of their theory of the hypothetical syllogism (see, in particular, Prantl, op. cit., 470). Finally, (vi) apart from the foregoing characteristics of the later terminology, there is to be noted a general alteration of the context and significance of the various conceptions of philosophy—an alteration which is due to the deepening religious consciousness of the centuries immediately following the Christian era, to the broadening of those interests in common humanity which grew with civilization, to the greater prominence given by later thought to the destiny of the individual soul, and, in general, to the richer, if also more problematic and confused, life of the Roman empire, and of early Christianity. From this point of view it has to be remembered that terms such as those for justice, for freedom, for the divine, for reason, and for humanity, necessarily tend to have a greater, although also vaguer, depth of meaning for later, ancient thinkers than for those whose world was a narrower one. That this greater depth of meaning also often implies a more obscure character, a tendency on the part of the thinkers to lose sight of the sharper definitions of their

terms; and that the same progress in human experience leads, on the other hand, to an increasing temptation to seek escape from all these too-puzzling life-problems by means of formalism and pedantry: these are the inevitable mishaps of a more complex civilization. In general, moreover, it has to be remembered that, if the life of humanity, after the Christian era, faced problems of deeper meaning than those of the Greek cities, there was never again present, in the ancient world, the creative power that Plato and Aristotle had possessed, so that the later ancient philosophy was never adequate to its vastly enlarged task. In the work of the last great thinker of Greek philosophy, Plotinus, the older terminology was not notably reformed or increased; but the deepened insight into religious and ethical problems, and the vaster world in which Plotinus lived, tend to change the force and the implication of his terms in a way which Eucken has in general discussed (op. cit., 39 f.).

(9) The foregoing sketch of the history of Greek terminology is intended only as a rude outline, to suggest the general motives that appear to have determined the development of philosophical speech. Upon the subject, taken in its entirety, no adequate treatise exists. Materials bearing upon the topic have been collected in the most various ways, and lie scattered throughout the literature of ancient philosophy. While therefore no adequate bibliography of our topic can here be given, it is proper to add to the few foregoing literary references a more formal mention of a number of aids to a study of Greek terminology. Of the general histories bearing upon ancient thought, Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen* contains, usually in the form of footnotes, a great many discussions of individual terms. These discussions are introduced at points of the text, determined by the general interests of Zeller's explanation of the various doctrines, so that here, as is usual throughout the whole literature of philosophy, the terminological interest is subordinated to the systematic and to the expository interests. The general index to Zeller's history, published as a supplement to the third edition (the first part only being referred to, in this index, in its fourth edition), is inadequate as a terminological index of the notes in question, so that for Zeller's best remarks the student must in general seek in their own places. Briefer are the discussions of terms to be found from time to time in Ueberweg's and Windelband's

histories. The latter author, in his *General History of Philosophy*, treats of the development of concepts, rather than of the philosophers as individuals, or of their systems as separate wholes; but no very great space is given to the special history of terms, although many terms are incidentally treated. In Windelband's account of Greek philosophy in the *Handbuch der klassischen Alterthumswissenschaft*, there are also a good many brief statements of a terminological character. Prantl's *Geschichte der Logik* is decidedly full in its account of the development of the logical vocabulary; but once more, the material is widely scattered through Prantl's text, and is not easy to find for the purposes of the history of special terms. A valuable collection and comparison of all of the various enumerations which Aristotle gives of his categories (see the summary table in Prantl, i. 207) is a good example of the elaborateness of Prantl's work in this field. Specially upon terminology itself Eucken has written, in his admirable and compact *Geschichte der philosophischen Terminologie*, several times cited in the foregoing. Here pp. 8-47 are devoted to a sketch of the history of Greek terminology. The relations of the technical terminology of Greek philosophy to the language taken as a whole, and to the popular and literary usage, can be extensively studied by a use of J. H. Heinrich Schmidt's *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache* (Leipzig, 1876-86, 4 vols.), where, of necessity, the philosophical vocabulary is always treated, so to speak, as an episode in the general development of the language, but where a great mass of material bearing upon our subject has been collected, compared, and indexed. Examples of Schmidt's method, and of its relation to philosophical interests, are his article 13 (i. 282 ff.) on *γνώσκω*; his series of articles 41-50, at the outset of Book II, on the Greek expressions for space and time relations; his article 81 (ii. 527-49) on *εἶναι*, the existential vocabulary, and the copula; and his article 147 (iii. 621-55) on *οὐς* and its allied terms. Of no little interest for an understanding of the relations between the popular and the technical vocabulary of ethics is Leopold Schmidt's *Ethik der alten Griechen*. The terminology of Greek psychology receives much attention in Siebeck's *Geschichte der Psychologie* (Erster Theil).

(10) Passing from more general to more special works, the vocabulary of the early Greek philosophers has been discussed, with

much independence, although in the usual incidental way, by Burnet, in his *Early Greek Philosophy*; (see, for example, his account of the term φύσις, p. 10; ἀπειρον, p. 59 ff.). Regarding the terminology of Plato, the material is indeed oppressively vast, but for that reason extremely hard to bring into order. Ast's *Lexikon Platonicum* (3 vols., Leipzig, 1853-8) is still the principal attempt at a complete account of the Platonic vocabulary. There exists also Mitchell's *Index Graecitatis Platonicae* (2 vols., Oxford, 1832). In the third volume of Jowett and Campbell's edition of the *Republic*, an essay by Campbell upon 'Plato's Use of Language' contains, as its second part, a study of the *Platonic diction*. Of this part of the essay one sub-section (pp. 291-340) is especially concerned with Plato's *philosophical expressions*. The Platonic vocabulary upon its ontological side has been very elaborately analysed, as a contribution to the 'history of concepts and of terms,' by Peipers, in his *Ontologia Platonica* (Leipzig, 1883). Plato's logical terms, not without much discussion of other sides of his vocabulary, find place in Lutoslawski's recent work upon *The Origin and Growth of Plato's Logic* (London, 1897). In this book, moreover, since the author is much concerned in attempts to fix the chronology of Plato's writings by means of stylometric criteria, an account is given of a long series of works that have been devoted to various aspects of Plato's style and language; and in consequence Lutoslawski's book, in addition to its intrinsic worth, is a valuable bibliographical aid to any one interested in a comparative study of the literature regarding Plato's language and usage of terms. In the case of Aristotle, the centre of all study of his vocabulary remains the great *Index* of Bonitz, which forms the concluding volume of the Berlin Academy edition of Aristotle's works. The recent *Aristoteles-Lexikon* of Kappes (Paderborn, 1894), founded upon the Bonitz *Index*, but put into an extremely compendious form, is a serviceable vocabulary of Aristotle's technical terms, intended for the use of the student who is finding his way into Aristotle. Wallace's *Aristotle* also contains brief definitions of a large number of Aristotelian terms. Aristotle himself, especially in the logical treatises, and in the *Metaphysics*, has done much to render definite the task of studying his terminology, by discussing extensively the various meanings of terms. He was in fact, as we have seen, the first writer upon terminology.

(11) To pass to still more special aids to terminological study, we may mention a few specimens of the literature dealing with particular terms, or groups of terms. Here the most prominent place will be given to examples of the literature of Aristotelian terms. The English editions of the individual dialogues of Plato often contain discussions of the terminology of the dialogue, or comparisons with other dialogues. To limit ourselves here to two very recent cases:—In an edition of the *Philebus*, by Bury (Cambridge University Press, 1897), there is an appendix upon 'τὸ ἀπειρον in Early Greek Thought,' followed at once by another upon 'τὸ ἀπειρον and τὸ πέντας in Plato' (see op. cit., 178-95). In a later appendix (201-11), Bury discusses the Platonic and, incidentally, the general Greek conception of truth (ἀλήθεια). In his edition of the *Timaeus* (London, 1888), Archer Hind, in his lengthy introduction, discusses a part of the Platonic ontological vocabulary, in various dialogues, as well as in particular in the *Timaeus* itself, and in his notes discusses also many points of Platonic terminology. On Aristotelian terminology, one may here first mention Brentano, *Von der mannigfachen Bedeutung des Seienden bei Aristoteles* (1862), an account of the Aristotelian ontological concepts and terms, with especial reference to the concepts of actual and possible being, and of the categories. Of standard importance is Trendelenburg's *Geschichte der Kategorienlehre* in his *Historische Beiträge zur Philosophie*, i. See also Newman's edition of the *Politics*.

Of the same subject Schuppe has treated in his little book *Die Aristotelischen Kategorien* (Berlin, 1871). The ontological vocabulary of Aristotle is dealt with in the two standard editions of the *Metaphysics*, that of Bonitz, and that of Schwegler. See also the dissertation of Bernard Weber, *De oivias apud Aristotelem Notione eiusque Cognoscendae Ratione* (Bonn, 1887)—a very clearly stated account of all the principal fundamental concepts and terms in question. On the Aristotelian concept of ἀνάγκη there is a much older dissertation by Eug. Pappenheim (Berlin, 1856), entitled *De Necessitatis apud Aristotelem Notione*, which contains also a study of the terms τὸ δυνατόν and τὸ ἐδεχόμενον, and of the related terminology. A Berlin dissertation of 1866, by Oscar Weissenfels, discusses *Chance* and *Matter* in their ontological relations, under the title *De Casu et Substantia Aristotelis*, but contains fewer terminological comparisons.

An important matter of Aristotelian usage is included in the topic of a dissertation by Johann Schmitz (Bonn, 1884), *De φύσεως apud Aristotelem Notione, eiusque ad Animam Ratione*. The terminology of Aristotle regarding the Intellect, active and passive, in its relation to all the much-debated problems of Aristotle's doctrine upon that subject, comes under consideration in Brentano's *Psychologie des Aristoteles* (Mainz, 1867); and the later history of the question (down to 1882) is summed up in an essay by Zeller, originally published in the Berlin Acad. *Sitzungsberichte* for 1882, under the title *Ueber die Lehre des Aristoteles von der Ewigkeit der Welt*. See also Eugen Eberhard, *Die Aristotelische Definition der Seele und ihr Werth für die Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1868). An important topic, both of Platonic and Aristotelian psychology, bearing upon the usage of a difficult term, is treated in the dissertation of Peter Meyer, *ὁ θυμός apud Aristotelem Platonemque* (Bonn, 1886). The same term, together with other psychological terms in Aristotelian usage, forms the topic of Dembowski's dissertation (Königsberg, 1881): (1) *De κοινῷ αἰσθητηρίῳ Natura et Notione*; (2) *De Natura et Notione τοῦ θυμοῦ quatenus est Pars ὀρέξεως*. Another important psychological term is the subject of an essay by J. Freudenthal, *Ueber den Begriff des Wortes φαντασία* (Göttingen, 1863), who on p. 52 ff. compares the *φαντασία* with other related mental processes, and so discusses also, in a measure, the terminology of these processes. Both psychological and epistemological terms, especially, of course, the latter, receive treatment in Kampe's *Erkenntnisstheorie des Aristoteles* (Leipzig, 1870). Upon the systematic terminology of Aristotle's zoological writings there is a dissertation by Ludwig Heck (Leipzig, 1885), entitled *Die Hauptgruppen des Thiersystems bei Aristoteles und seinen Nachfolgern*, which also gives space to the classifications and terminology of Pliny and Albertus Magnus. The fundamental concepts of Aristotle regarding the elements, together with this side of his terminology, is treated, in its relation to later thought, by Lorscheid, *Aristoteles' Einfluss auf die Entwicklung der Chemie* (Münster, 1872).

These form a few examples selected from the literature of the more difficult or less accessible portions of the Aristotelian terminology. The philosopher's ethical vocabulary has been very extensively discussed, but is perhaps sufficiently treated in various standard editions of the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

The need of a systematic treatment of the whole range of Greek terminology is made only the more obvious by these fragmentary notes of the literature; and it may be hoped that due attention will ere long be given to this need. (J.R.)

GLOSSARY.

The numerals refer to the paragraphs of the article.

διάφορον, 7.	νοῦς, 9: see also NOUS.
ἀλήθεια, 11.	
Ἄμεσα (immediate): in Aristotle, see HEGEL'S TERMINOLOGY, IV (a).	ὁ θυμός, 11.
ἀνάγκη, 11.	ὀρέξις, 11.
ἀναλυτικός, 7.	οὐσία, (1), see ESSENCE: cf. LATIN TERMINOLOGY, 7.
ἄπειρον, 2, 10, 11.	
γένος, 5, 6.	πνεῦμα, 8.
γιγνώσκειν, 9.	πρότερον (in phrases), 6.
	πῦρ (of Heraclitus), 3.
διάθεσις, 6.	
διαλεκτικός, 8.	τέμνειν, 5.
δυναμῆς, 5.	τὸ δυνατόν, 11.
δύναμις, 6, and see POWER.	τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον, 11.
	τὸ πέρας, 11.
εἶδος, 5, 6.	τὸ ποῖόν, 7.
εἶναι, 9, and see BEING (2).	τὸ πρὸς τί παρ ἔχον, 8.
ἐνέργεια, 6, and see POWER.	τό παρ ἔχον, 7.
ἕξις, 6.	τὸ ὑποκείμενον, 7.
κοινὸν αἰσθητήριον, 11.	φαντασία, 11.
λόγος, 8.	φυσικός, 6.
	φύσις, 4, 10, 11.

**Green, Thomas Hill.** (1836-82.) An English philosopher, born at Birkin, Yorkshire; died at Oxford. His father was rector of Birkin. He was educated at Rugby, and at Balliol College, Oxford. In 1860 he was elected Fellow of Balliol, and in 1862 won the Chancellor's prize for an essay on novels. In 1866 he became a tutor at Balliol. In 1872 he was re-elected Fellow, and in 1878 Whyte Professor of Moral Philosophy. He was the leader of the Neo-Hegelian movement in England.

**Gregarious Instinct** [Lat. *greg*, a flock]: Ger. *Herdeninstinkt*; Fr. *instinct grégaire*; Ital. *istinto d'aggregazione*. The instinct to go in companies. The alternative theories of this instinct are those of INSTINCT (q.v.) generally.

*Literature*: see titles given under COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY, and SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. (J.M.B.)

**Gregariousness**: see GREGARIOUS INSTINCT, and SOCIALITY.

**Gresham's Law**: Ger. *Gresham'sches Gesetz*; Fr. *loi de Gresham*; Ital. *legge di Gresham*.