

applied mathematics; and, if not, on what foundation had this belief to rest? Mere experience could not give to knowledge the characteristics of universality and necessity—it could not make it generally valid or convincing. The question then presented itself, how does some of the knowledge we possess, viz., mathematical knowledge, arrive at this generality and convincing evidence? Leibniz had suggested that empirical knowledge did not consist merely of a collection of sensations, but that there was the intellect itself which collected them. And with Kant the problem of knowledge took the form of asking: What does the intellect supply so as to bring into the casual material gained by experience, the logical qualities of universality and certainty? And this question was asked with an eye to the higher interests of the human mind, the truths of morality and religion.

By formulating the problem in this way, Kant issued, as it were, the programme of philosophical thought not only for his age but down to the present day. It is, however, well to recognise that, so far as the theory of knowledge is concerned, he was not in a position, nor in possession of the necessary preliminaries, to carry out his programme successfully. This has been done, to some extent, by thinkers in all the three countries since his time. In Germany, and largely also in France, it has been done mainly under the influence of Kant's own doctrine; in this country—as we have seen above—an independent beginning was made by John Stuart Mill, who, probably only through the study of Hamilton's philosophy, was induced to lay his account with Kantian ideas.