

68.
Bradley and
Bosanquet.

tinct currents of thought, which in Germany were represented by two different schools, has helped to give to recent works on Logic in this country—notably to those of F. H. Bradley and B. Bosanquet—a character of originality and comprehensiveness which places them in the forefront of modern treatises on Logic and the theory of Knowledge. As logic has, mainly through their labours, fully justified its traditional position as an independent science, the special doctrines elaborated therein hardly enter into a general history of thought. The latter, however, has to take note of the change which has come over the general points of view from which, and the interest in which, logical science has been reconstructed. In this respect there are two points which seem to me to have a general bearing on the development of modern philosophical thought.

The first refers to the breaking down of the older

written in the year 1882, and in consequence does not embrace the more recent developments largely to be traced to the influence of Lotze. As being of permanent value up to this point, it is gratifying to know that it has been republished. The second is an article published in the "New Volumes" just twenty years later (1902). This article is written by Prof. Case, and contains a very trenchant criticism of recent logic, which in its distinctive and hopeful reforms is considered by the author to be approaching the position occupied by the genuine Aristotelian logic in antiquity—a view which was held similarly by Trendelenburg in Germany a generation earlier. In addition to the strong recommendation of the Aristotelian 'Organon,' it is

strange to see the 'Novum Organum' of Bacon recommended for the study of inductive logic. Prominent authorities on the Continent—such as Prof. Alois Riehl (see his article in 'Systematische Philosophie,' 1907, p. 84)—maintain that this distinction does not belong to Bacon, "a schemer and dilettante," but to Galileo—a view initiated on the Continent by a celebrated pamphlet of Justus Liebig (1862), and destructive of the *fable convenue* of the Baconian method so prevalent in this country. The third article, in the 11th edition (1911), is by Mr H. W. Blunt. It is thoroughly up to date, and does full justice to the influence of Lotze and the new era in the science represented mainly by Bradley and Bosanquet.