

and we have in Locke's *Essay* the repeated assertion that natural knowledge gives only probability and not certainty.

We are thus indebted to Locke and his successors not for any attempt towards a complete and systematic theory of knowledge, but rather for leading philosophical thought into separate and definite channels of research; dealing as it were with the different regions of knowledge which were being cultivated or opened out in modern times, thus laying the foundation for separate philosophical inquiries. In each of these separate regions of knowledge, such as Psychology, which deals with the phenomena of the inner life; Logic, which deals with the principles of scientific knowledge; Ethics, which deals with the principles of action; Economics, which deals with the principles of industry and commerce; *Æsthetics*, which deals with the principles of taste,—English Philosophy can boast of having produced treatises of standard merit, distinguished by careful and penetrating analysis. But what was wanting from the point of view occupied by Continental thinkers from Descartes to Hegel was systematic unity based upon completeness and intrepid trust in the conclusiveness of purely logical argument. If we except Bishop Berkeley's Idealism, no attempt had been made in this country before the middle of the nineteenth century to construct a comprehensive and consistent philosophical creed, which should afford definite answers to all the more important problems of theory and practice. It can be easily shown that the prominent feature of British philosophical thought up to quite recent times

16.
Its want of
systematic
unity.