criticise the weighty considerations which have led them to a view so modest and resigned, I propose in the sequel to test within narrower limits, and by what seems to me a novel method, the validity of the conviction that a true understanding of phenomena and events can be attained only by viewing them in their interdependence and collective effect. If anything in the wide expanse of physical and mental life deserves to be considered as one and indivisible, it is surely human thought in its various branches and manifestations. The attempt to trace its origin in the early ages of civilisation, or to foreshadow the end which it is slowly approaching, may indeed be impossible; but of the age to which we belong, and the literature of which we have witnessed the growth, we may claim to possess a deeper knowledge. Astronomers have succeeded in gaining a view of immense and distant orbits by minutely observing and tracing merely an insignificant portion[1] which came within their view. Comparative anatomy teaches how from a few surviving links to construct the whole framework of an organism. I propose to apply a similar method to the small portion

mond's may be termed the philosophy of the Limits of the Knowable. Both views form a contrast to Lotze's philosophy.

[1] The most brilliant example of this is the discovery of the planet Ceres by Piazzi at Palermo in the New Year's night of 1801; the invention of special methods for calculating the orbit of this planet, which had been lost, by Gauss in the course of 1801; and the rediscovery of it by Olbers, aided by Gauss's ephemeris, in the New Year's night of 1802. After the discovery of this first of the small planets, but before it was known in Germany, Hegel published his 'Dissertatio philosophica de orbitis planetarum,' in which he ridiculed the search for new planets, but which Duke Ernest of Gotha sent to the astronomer Zach with the superscription, "Monumentum insaniæ sæculi decimi noni." See R. Wolf, Geschichte der Astronomie, München, 1877, p. 684 *sqq*.