

it is quite as necessary, for the understanding of this remarkable movement, to go back to Spinoza,<sup>1</sup> who, if not forgotten, was certainly neglected and egregiously, not to say shamefully, misrepresented<sup>2</sup> by eminent writers in both countries. And, anticipating, we may go a step further in mapping out philosophical currents on the Continent, notably in Germany, by remarking that the current of philosophic thought which set in, in the middle of the nineteenth century, in opposition to the Hegelian attitude, may not

<sup>1</sup> This interest in Spinoza produced four important publications. Leaving out what was done by G. H. Lewes, who was probably led to Spinoza when writing his 'Life of Goethe,' and by F. D. Maurice, who inherited Coleridge's interest in him, also Matthew Arnold's brilliant Essay (1865), we meet with the first fairly impartial and lucid exposition of Spinoza's teaching in J. A. Froude's article in the 'Westminster Review,' 1854. But foremost among all stands the work of Sir Frederick Pollock, from which I have just quoted. It appeared in the year 1880, and gives in addition to an account of his life and philosophy a complete bibliography of English and foreign books on Spinoza in the Introduction, and a history of Spinozism in the twelfth chapter, "Spinoza and Modern Thought." Almost simultaneously James Martineau had occupied himself with Spinoza, and brought out in 1882 'A Study of Spinoza.' In the last chapter of this treatise special attention is drawn to his work as a critic approaching the biblical records from an historical as well as a philosophical point of view. A few years later, 1888, there appeared in Blackwood's Philosophical Class-

ics a volume on Spinoza by John Caird. This treatise, which deals with the "apparent inconsistencies" and "underlying unity" of his system, is written from a point of view influenced by Hegelian thought, which at that time was prominently represented in this country by the author and his brother, Edward Caird. These four works in the English language may be said to have corrected the many misrepresentations and misunderstandings regarding Spinoza's person and teaching which abounded in the earlier literature of this country.

<sup>2</sup> There seems no doubt that Malebranche and Bayle between them must be blamed for having, through their superficial treatment of Spinoza, prevented for a long time an adequate estimation of the importance of his doctrine, not only among their countrymen—such as Voltaire, Montesquieu, and the Encyclopædistes—but also in this country, where, for instance, even so temperate a thinker as David Hume betrays a lamentable ignorance of the subject, calling Spinoza a "famous atheist" and his fundamental principle a "hideous hypothesis" ('Treatise of Human Nature,' part 4, sec. 5).