

not lost down to the present moment. There is no doubt that what has been termed the voluntaristic tendency in recent philosophy is largely to be traced back to the impression which Schopenhauer's writings have made on many of the foremost representatives of modern thought, although few of the latter now follow the special lines into which he developed his central and fundamental idea.

For we must not overlook the fact that Schopenhauer was not primarily led to his speculations by a special interest in nature and natural phenomena, such as actuated Schelling. He branched off from the main trunk line of idealistic thought at a point anterior to Schelling's philosophy of nature, which at the time does not seem to have much impressed him. His philosophical tradition was Kantian, his inspiration came from Plato, and, though he barely admitted it, he was influenced by Fichte.¹ And he remained completely entangled in the

other contributions of his had not escaped the notice of eminent scientists, notably medical authorities, such as the physician, J. D. Brandis of Copenhagen, and the ophthalmologist, Anton Rosas of Vienna, but that they in an unpardonable manner did not acknowledge their indebtedness to him, and this leads him into a lengthy diatribe against the dishonesty of German literary practice, taking the opportunity to contrast with it the gentlemanly tone of 'The Edinburgh Review,'—an admission which he, however, retracts in the third edition.

¹ This apparent resemblance to Fichte, from whose writings many sentences may be collected which are almost identical with some of Schopenhauer's, is, however, accom-

panied by a fundamental difference which separates him from Fichte and Fichte's immediate followers, and may probably be one of the reasons why he never acknowledged his indebtedness to Fichte. The difference is well brought out in an excellent sketch of Schopenhauer's doctrine by Dr Lehmann in a recent publication already referred to ('Grosse Denker,' vol. ii. pp. 269-297). "Schopenhauer's Will is a blind and aimless impulse, and here lies the difference which separates decisively his conception of Will from that of Kant and Fichte. Kant's Will is altogether a rational power opposed in its nature to desire, not an impulse or something impulsive but a power through motives of reason to resist impulse: it has in reality