

the aspect of beauty in natural things, or to give a systematic representation of this beauty.¹ Lotze has appropriately remarked that Hegel must have forgotten what Schelling said in the Address mentioned above, in which the idea is, not worked out, yet certainly suggested, that the beautiful in nature might be the key to her deeper significance. My readers will here already expect a reference to the poetry of Wordsworth and the writings of Ruskin, to which my narrative will lead me further on, and they will also understand that Hegel had abandoned, or never realised, the truth of Goethe's magnificent poetic comprehension of nature.

Before leaving that region of ideas in which Schelling's and Hegel's expositions move, the idealist view of Art and Beauty, I may briefly note the writings and posthumously published lectures of Solger,² who was inspired by

37.
Solger.

¹ *Loc. cit.*, p. 5.

² K. W. F. Solger (1780-1819) was a native of Prussia. His home was not only locally distant from that of Schelling and Hegel, but he also differs from Reinhold, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel in not having come to philosophy through theology. He approached it rather from the side of polite literature and classical learning, being inspired by the teaching of F. A. Wolf. Of his philosophical writings the only larger production that appeared during his lifetime was a Dialogue ('Erwin,' 2 vols., 1815), in the platonic style, in which he introduces and combats, under fictitious names, the views of Fichte and Schelling, treating them, especially the latter, with little sympathy, although there is, no doubt, a great resemblance between his own views and those of Schelling. Historians like Schasler, who see in the

Hegelian point of view the consummation of the modern idealistic tendency of thought, consider that Solger as well as Schelling stuck, as it were, half way in the development of a correct idea. This criticism is expressed by saying that neither Schelling nor Solger got beyond the position occupied by Plato, who saw in the ideas of the True, the Beautiful, and the Good, the archetypes which lived in the Divine Mind; they did not advance to the conception that these archetypes do not live only in the Divine Mind, but that they, of necessity, descend into the actual world where they appear as living powers in things that are true, beautiful, and good. In fact, there exists, according to this view, the same difference between Hegel's conception of a necessary scientifically demonstrable development of the content of the Divine Mind, or