life and his heritage from all generations? There is no reconciliation between the right and the wrong way of search, between the path of patient experience and the flight of unwarranted assumption. The theory of Evolution has come to do great things in the field of mental philosophy, as well as in that of natural philosophy—a term English workers have been laughed to scorn for retaining, and that is now seen to be more true than ever: but this new learning that has sprung forth under our eyes, and for the most part, as our children will be proud to think, under the hands of living Englishmen, has come not to destroy but to fulfil the work of those English leaders of thought who were foremost in proclaiming that there is but one reason and one rule of truth for matter and spirit, for man and the world, for the greatest things and the least.

FREDERICK POLLOCK.

IV.—THE ORIGINAL INTENTION OF COLLECTIVE AND ABSTRACT TERMS.

Is it not a most striking illustration of the power which language can exercise even on the most vigorous and independent minds, when we see how Mill had persuaded himself that most metaphysical difficulties inherent in the conceptions of Matter and Mind could be removed by declaring* that Matter was nothing but the “permanent possibility of sensation,” Mind nothing but the “permanent possibility of feeling?” There is a certain want of clearness in thus expressing the opposition between the Ego or Mind and the Non-Ego or Matter, and I doubt if many will approve the use which Mill makes of the words sensation and feeling, restricting the former to a passive, the latter to an active sense. However, a philosopher who modifies thought has a right to modify language, and we have only to remember that Mill, in his dialect, uses the expression “possibility of sensation,” as applied to the Non-Ego, in the sense of the possibility of being the object of sensations; while “possibility of feeling,” as applied to the Ego, is intended to convey the possibility of being the subject of feelings.

But what is of much greater consequence is this, that Mill should have imagined he could eliminate, or at least sublimate, the idea of substance, both in the Ego and the Non-Ego, by using an abstract noun, possibility, instead of a concrete noun, the possible, or, as we used to say in our own, half classical, half mediæval dialect, the cause, the substance, the subject.

* *Examination of Hamilton's Philosophy*, pp. 198, 206.

What is the nature of such words as possibility? They clearly express a quality, and therefore a quality of something. When we speak of a thing as feasible, we mean that it can be done; when we say it is destructible, we mean that it can be destroyed. Afterwards, if we want to speak of many things being feasible or destructible, our language enables us to form new substantives from these adjectives, and to speak of the feasibility, the destructibility, the possibility of things. Language will even allow us to go a step further, and to say, for instance, there is a possibility of something being done, but it is here that language begins to react on thought and tempts us to speak of possibilities, as if they were things by themselves, and different from the things which are possible.

One of the best known instances of what I call philosophical mythology is the word *faculty*. From *facere*, to do, was formed *facilis*, easy to do, or easy to be done; e.g. *res factu facilis*, a thing easy to be done; *facilis ascensus*, an easy ascent. *Facilis* means also ready, e.g. *facilis ad dicendum*, ready or quick to speak. From this adjective we have *facilitas*, the quality of being easy, also the quality of being ready. Besides *facilitas*, we also find *facultas*, a word generally represented as a contraction of *facil(i)tas*, but which may be derived directly from the old Latin *facul*. *Facultas* means chiefly the power of doing, e.g. *facultas pariendo*; then the means of doing, supply, resources. In modern languages, however, this word has assumed a much wider development. We speak of the faculty of hearing, the faculty of perceiving, imagining, remembering, reasoning; we speak of the faculties of the mind, and we at last divide these faculties, place them side by side as independent powers, often forgetting that all the time they can claim no subjectivity whatever, that they are no more than qualities of the same subject, and that all we really mean when we say that humanity is endowed with the faculties of seeing, remembering, imagining and reasoning, is that every man can see, remember, imagine, reason, &c.

It is curious that the very school which has always protested most strongly against the abuse of these abstract nouns, which has waged war to the knife against the faculties of the mind, though not always to the advantage of a clear and systematic treatment of psychology, should in metaphysics fall into this very trap. We can imagine philosophers denying altogether the reality of any such thing as substance; we can understand why Mill looks upon that category simply as the result of custom, not as a *sine quâ non* of human thought. But whatever the origin of our category of substance may be, it is through it and with it alone that we can conceive quality.

A quality is inconceivable without reference to a substance, and however much that original coherence may be forgotten, we always find it is there, whenever we go back to the deepest foundation of our intellectual fabric. We may speak of possibilities, we may trust in possibilities, we may be even frightened by possibilities, but if we look more closely, what we trust in and what we are frightened by are always things possible.

If therefore Mill and his followers imagine that by defining Matter as the permanent possibility of sensation, and Mind as the permanent possibility of feeling, they have removed the difficulty of Kant's *Ding an sich*, they are mistaken. Their possibility of sensation, if properly analysed, means things or substances which can become objects of sensation; their possibility of feeling means things or substances which can become subjects of sensation.

However we may fight against the necessities of our reason, reason has its revenge. It is, for instance, only another attempt at avoiding the admission of something substantial in the Ego, which leads Mill and his followers* to define Mind as a series or a succession of feelings. What are series or succession but the germs of collective words, many of which develop into abstract nouns? A series or a succession means things succeeding each other, and if these things are feelings, then feeling again is what might be called an adjectival substantive, expressing a quality, *status*, or act of somebody. Leave out that somebody, that substance, that subject, that *x*, and our mind refuses to act, as Mill has been honest enough to admit himself. For, as he says, (p. 212) :—

“The thread of consciousness which composes the mind's phenomenal life [another *alias* for the Ego as a substance] consists not only of present sensations, but likewise in part, of memories

* M. Taine in his classical work, *De l'Intelligence*, Vol. I, p. 378, expresses the same views in even more determined language: “Le moi n'est lui-même qu'une entité verbale et un fantôme métaphysique. Ce quelque chose d'intime dont les facultés étaient les différents aspects, disparaît avec elles; on voit s'évanouir et rentrer dans la région des mots la substance une, permanente, distincte des événements. Il ne reste de nous que nos événements, sensations, images, souvenirs, idées, résolutions: ce sont eux qui constituent notre être; et l'analyse de nos jugements les plus élémentaires montre, en effet, que notre moi n'a pas d'autres éléments.” What is the meaning of *nos événements*, if not *événements de nous*, and if these *événements* are something real, might we not turn M. Taine's illustration (I. 385), that one cannot hang any but a painted chain on a painted hook, against him by saying that one cannot hang a real series of *événements, sensations, images, souvenirs, idées, résolutions*, on a painted *Moi*?

and expectations. Now what are these? In themselves, they are present feelings, that is of present consciousness, and in that respect not distinguished from sensations. They all, moreover, resemble some given sensations or feelings, of which we have previously had experience. But they are attended with the peculiarity, that each of them involves a belief in more than its own present existence. A sensation involves only this: but a remembrance of sensation, even if not referred to any particular date, involves the suggestion and belief that a sensation, of which it is a copy or representation, actually existed in the past: and an expectation involves the belief, more or less positive, that a sensation or other feeling to which it directly refers, will exist in the future. Nor can the phenomena involved in these two states of consciousness be adequately expressed, without saying that the belief they include is, that I myself formerly had, or that I myself, and no other, shall hereafter have, the sensations remembered or expected. The fact believed is, that the sensations did actually form, or will hereafter form, part of the self-same series of states, or thread of consciousness, of which the remembrance or expectation of these sensations is the part now present. If, therefore, we speak of the Mind as a series of feelings, we are obliged to complete the statement by calling it a series of feelings which is aware of itself as past and future: and we are reduced to the alternative of believing that the Mind, or Ego, is something different from any series of feelings, and possibilities of them, or of accepting the paradox, that something which *ex hypothesi* is but a series of feelings, can be aware of itself as a series."

Nothing can be more frank and honest; only, instead of saying with Mill that we are here "face to face with that final inexplicability, at which we inevitably arrive when we read ultimate facts;" and instead of comforting ourselves with saying, that one mode of stating it only appears more incomprehensible than another, because the whole of human language is accommodated to the one, and is so incongruous with the other that it cannot be expressed in any terms which do not deny its truth,—might it not have been better, if Mill had examined his own language more closely, and asked himself what could be meant by a series, a thread, a succession? A succession of feelings, no doubt, cannot be said or thought to be aware of itself as past or future, but an Ego, a Subject, an *æ*, or whatever you like to call it, of which this succession, *i.e.*, these succeeding feelings are qualities or attributes, may well be thought and said to retain a feeling, not for one moment only, but for a longer or shorter time; and the same subject may also, by means of the same retentive nature of former feelings, and by that very law of association which Mill has so fully illustrated, expect one feeling to arise again, whenever

another feeling, with which it was frequently connected, has arisen.

Language, as I have often said, always revenges herself whenever we do violence to her, or whenever we forget her antecedents. At first sight a series, a succession, a thread may seem a very different linguistic expedient from the termination *tas* which we found in *facultas*, and which is used to form abstract nouns. Yet what was the original purport of such words as *juven-tas*, if not a series, a succession, a class of *juvenes*, and of all things belonging to them? What was *posteritas*, if not a series of *posterī*? What was *civitas*, if not a number of *cives*? The growth of meaning in the derivative *tas*, though long forgotten in Latin, Greek and Sanskrit, can still be watched, if we have but eyes for the secret cunning of languages. Taking *juventas* or *juventus* in its original meaning, succession, thread, class of young men, the Romans could well form such sentences, as *cum omnis juventas, omnes etiam gravioris ætatis eo convenerant*, when the whole youth and also all of maturer age were come together. *Princeps juventutis* would be the chief of their youth, i.e. of all the young men. *Juventas pugnare debet* would mean the young men must fight; *juventas facile decipitur*, young men are easily deceived, or *credula juvenus*, credulous youth. Now in credulous youth, the numerical slowly glides into the more abstract meaning, and so we go on to *tempus juventutis*, the time of youth; *gaudia juventutis*, the pleasures of youth; *robur in juventate*, the strength in young men, or the strength of youth, till at length the abstract conception preponderates; *juventus* becomes all that belongs to youth, and is at last endowed with a new substantival form in the name of the goddess *Juventas*, to whom Lucullus dedicated a temple in the Circus Maximus.

To us the formation of abstract nouns, such as *facul-tus* from *facul*, *juventas* from *juven-is* is so familiar that we hardly think how, at some time or other, the composition of *facul* with what we call the suffix *tas*, or *tāti*, must have been an individual act, performed with a definite purpose. That act took place at a time which escapes chronological measurement; but whenever it took place it must have been a rational act. As long as we know Latin it possesses the suffix *tas*, *tāti-s*; as long as we know Greek it possesses the suffix *της*, *τητ-ος*; as long as we know Sanskrit it possesses the suffix *tāti-s*. Therefore, long before Homer, long before the Veda, long before 1500 B.C., *tāti* had become what we call a suffix, i.e., a purely formal element. In 1500 B.C., Sanskrit must have been separated from Greek and Latin for a very long period

of time, for the Sanskrit of that time is less primitive in several respects than the Latin of Cicero. Therefore, not only would it be impossible to represent Latin as derived from Sanskrit, such as we know it in the Veda, but it will be necessary to admit that on some points Sanskrit in 1500 B.C. had diverged more from the common Aryan type than Latin had in the time of Cicero. True, no method of calculation will enable us to fix the time when Sanskrit and Latin separated, but I believe that, if on other than linguistic evidence that date were fixed at 10,000 B.C., the student of language would have no difficulty in accepting it. At that remote period the word *tâti*, whatever its origin may have been, must have been used so frequently already as to have assumed a merely formative and formal character, for it is in that formal character alone that we find it in Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. Before, however, such a suffix as *tâti* became purely formal it must have had an independent and substantial existence. It must have had a meaning, and that meaning, if we could discover it, would reveal to us the first truly historical germ of what we now call the conception of collective and abstract nouns. I am not myself a great believer in that microscopic analysis of grammatical suffixes and terminations with which Bopp and some of his followers have made us familiar. If I am told as a fact that *thas*, the termination of the second person plural in Sanskrit, the Latin *tis*, was originally a composition of *tva-tvi*, thou and thou, what is stated as a fact seems to me to deserve at the utmost the name of likelihood, and even likelihood in such cases seems often to dwindle down to mere possibility. Still the principle remains that, whatever is now purely formal in language, must at some time or other have been substantial, though we may admit our inability to trace all formal elements, such as we find them, back to the earlier stratum of language whence they arose. We can easily read the origin of such suffixes in English as *ship* (friendship), *dom* (freedom), *less* (useless), *full* (useful); but when we come to *ness* (ful-ness), or *ish* (fool-ish), we cannot dig deep enough to reach the soil from which they drew their life.

With regard to the suffix *tâti*, Latin *tas*, *tatis*, English *ty*, one of the oldest Aryan suffixes for forming collective, and afterwards abstract nouns, I shall not venture to speak positively as to its original purport. It has been explained by a very distinguished scholar as a combination of two suffixes *tâ* and *ti*, which are used by themselves to form abstract nouns, and the origin of which would probably be referred to a demonstrative pronominal base. But it is curious, to say no more, that Indian grammarians should have derived their suffix *tâti*

from a root *tan*, to stretch, to extend, thus giving to this abstract suffix that very meaning, viz., stretching, succession, thread, series, which modern metaphysicians now wish to substitute for the collective and abstract nouns in *ty*. It is true, no doubt, that the correct derivative from *tan*, to stretch, would be in Sanskrit *tatis*, with a short *a*, which means a row, a series, a mass, or *τασις* in Greek, which means tension; but the formation of so ancient a word goes back to a period far beyond the reach of the grammatical laws of Sanskrit or Greek, and no serious objection to the etymology proposed by native scholars could be raised on that ground.

Without, however, ascribing to that etymology more authority than it deserves, I thought it might be useful to mention it as likely to be of interest to metaphysicians. If those who follow Mill and share with him his aversion of abstract nouns believe that by using such words as succession, or thread of sensations, they have escaped from the dangerous spell of words in *ty*, they will see that the step from thread, series, succession of sensations to sensibility, or from a collective to an abstract noun, is not so great as they imagine. These words require a peg, and not a painted peg, to hang them on. The expressions, thread, series, succession of sensations hang as much in the air as sensibility. To say that our Mind is the permanent possibility of feeling, and that the Ego is but a series of feelings, are both but new translations, different ways of saying that our mind possesses feeling, or, as we used to say, has the faculty of feeling. Nay, as long as we bear in mind the original purport of collective and abstract nouns in *ty*, it would seem more straightforward and more English to say that the Mind possesses the faculty of feeling than to say that what we formerly used to call Mind or Ego, is "a series of feelings, aware of itself as a series of feelings."

F. MAX MÜLLER.

V.—PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE.

III.—AS REGARDS ONTOLOGY.

THE question whether philosophy is more than merely analytical brings us for the first time into serious contact with the claims and pretensions of Ontology. The ontological