

N.Y., U.S.A. Such papers are to be marked only with a motto, and are to be accompanied by a sealed envelope, marked with the same motto, and containing the name and address of the writer. The prize will be awarded by a committee consisting of Professors William Brown, E. B. Titchener, and F. M. Urban.

The committee will make known the name of the successful competitor on 1st July, 1915. The unsuccessful papers, with the corresponding envelopes, will be destroyed (unless called for by their authors) six months after the publication of the award.

CORRESPONDENCE.

DEAR SIR,—

It is more important to know what is the nature of scientific reasoning, and of Aristotle's theory of it, than what it is at present thought to be by the bulk of Oxford philosophical teachers; but a statement concerning the latter question by Dr. Schiller on the first page of *MIND* would naturally carry so much weight with those who read it, that I venture to send this note. Dr. Schiller says that "it has become a custom (having the force of law) in Oxford to restrict the study of Aristotelian Logic almost wholly to the *Posterior Analytics*, and to profess boundless admiration for this section of the *Organon*, on the ground that in it is laid down the theory of science on every subject for all time". I think he inadvertently misleads his readers. I remember Mr. C. Cannan a good many years ago, when he was the chief lecturer in Oxford on Aristotelian Logic, explaining to me the importance of the *Topics* in Aristotle's theory of scientific reasoning. I attended a few years since an admirable course of lectures on the subject by Prof. Cook Wilson, in which he criticised very lucidly and severely Aristotle's conception of demonstration, and utilised not only other treatises of the *Organon*, but the *de Anima*, the *Physics* and the *Metaphysics*. Similar criticisms occur in Prof. Cook Wilson's general course of lectures on Logic, which is the most influential teaching on Logic now given in Oxford; and I have discussed these matters with many teachers, and while I do not remember any one to have expressed the opinion which Dr. Schiller says is customary, I have often heard well-grounded criticisms of Aristotle's doctrines in the *Posterior Analytics* and elsewhere. I must not of course be understood to mean that the critics did not also appreciate the merits of that treatise.

Yours faithfully,

H. W. B. JOSEPH.

I am extremely sorry that the introductory sentence of my paper on "Aristotle's Refutation of 'Aristotelian' Logic," in No. 89, should have conveyed to Mr. Joseph any disparagement of the well-known Aristotelian scholarship of Oxford philosophy in general and of his own valuable contributions thereto in particular. But such an intention was so far from my thoughts that I cordially agreed with the important contention of his *Logic* (p. v-vi) that the 'corrupt tradition' of formal logic may be reformed by a return to Aristotle, and indeed had conceived my own article very much in the same spirit. What I was deploring (as an apologia for a somewhat detailed excursus into an obscure point of Aristotelian doctrine) was really that the exigencies of an overcrowded curriculum render it necessary, for teaching purposes, to lay selective emphasis on what are judged to be the most important doctrines