

venient to define what I mean by its contrast with a habit of thought which prevailed in the first half of the nineteenth century, mainly, but not solely, under the influence of the scientific spirit. This latter tendency may be defined by calling it the atomising tendency of thought.

Great progress had been made in the course of the eighteenth century by a division of scientific labour, by a process of isolation of special problems, by studying such things and phenomena in the world of nature and of mind as could be neatly separated and defined. Thus, physical astronomy and mechanical physics had made enormous strides through the treatment of the single property of gravitation or of attraction. Following upon astronomy, chemistry had become an exact science through being founded by Lavoisier upon the property of weight, and subsequently upon that of the atomic weights of a limited number of elements and their combination in fixed proportions. Other sciences followed with the study of definite and distinct properties or species of things natural, such as the forms of crystals or the types of animated beings. A similar process of isolation was at work in some of the mental sciences—*e.g.*, in the earlier “faculty-psychology” as well as in the later doctrine of the “association of

need no *synthesis* but only a *synopsis*. We need only to look and see what is contained in the material that comes before us. . . . When we recognise that atomism is untrue from the outset, we recognise that order is involved in our experience all the way through. The term ‘order’ seems to me on the whole the most

satisfactory that we can use to cover all the modes of unity that are contained in our experience. . . . No doubt there is a good deal of difference between different types of order, . . . but they are all alike as being the modes in which the plurality of the content of our experience reveals itself as being at the same time a unity.”