nabor, of which the limits are here defined, arises from the sublime consciousness of striving toward the infinite, and of grasping all that is revealed to us amid the boundless and inexhaustible fullness of creation, development, and being.

This active striving, which has existed in all ages, must frequently, and under various forms, have deluded men into the idea that they had reached the goal, and discovered the principle which could explain all that is variable in the organic world, and all the phenomena revealed to us by sensuous perception. After men had for a long time, in accordance with the earliest ideas of the Hellenic people, venerated the agency of spirits, embodied in human forms,\* in the creative, changing, and destructive processes of nature, the germ of a scientific contemplation developed itself in the physiological fancies of the Ionic school. The first principle of the origin of things, the first principle of all phenomena, was referred to two causest-either to concrete material principles, the so-called elements of Nature, or to processes of rarefaction and condensation, sometimes in accordance with mechanical, sometimes with dynamic views. The hypothesis of four or five materially differing elements, which was probably of Indian origin, has continued, from the era of the didactic poem of Empedocles down to the most recent times, to imbue all opinions on natural philosophy—a primeval evidence and monument of the tendency of the human mind to seek a generalization and simplification of ideas, not only with reference to the forces, but also to the qualitative nature of matter.

In the latter period of the development of the Ionic physiology, Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ advanced from the postulate of simply dynamic forces of matter to the idea of a spirit independent of all matter, uniting and distributing the homogeneous particles of which matter is composed. The world-arranging Intelligence ( $vo\bar{v}\varsigma$ ) controls the continuously progressing formation of the world, and is the primary source

<sup>\*</sup> In the memorable passage (Metaph., xii., 8, p. 1074, Bekker) in which Aristotle speaks of "the relics of an earlier acquired and subsequently lost wisdom," he refers with extraordinary freedom and significance to the veneration of physical forces, and of gods in human forms: "much," says he, "has been mythically added for the persuasion of the multitude, as also on account of the laws and for other useful ends."

<sup>†</sup> The important difference in these philosophical directions τρόποι, is clearly indicated in Arist., Phys. Auscult., 1, 4, p. 187, Bekk. (Compare Brandis, in the Rhein. Museum für Philologie, Jahrg. iii., s. 105.)