

64.
Contrast
with Comte.

unifying conception of scientific knowledge, resorts to a purely mechanical and geometrical conception. On the other side we have seen that the mathematician Comte, in trying to define the aspect from which biological and social phenomena are to be understood, distinctly discards the purely geometrical view as insufficient, and emphasises the necessity of starting with a consideration of the *ensemble* or "Together" of things. In this respect Comte had really a correcter view of the philosophical difficulty. For it is easy to trace in every and all, even the most complicated, phenomena purely geometrical relations and mechanical processes, whilst it has always been impossible to grasp through them the real essence of these phenomena; the consequence being that latterly even naturalistic thinkers have very generally found it necessary to attribute the unknown but peculiar principle of living and conscious things likewise to those of the lifeless world.

65.
Unlikeness
of Spencer's
Evolution
to that of
Schelling
and Hegel.

It would be a mistake to consider Spencer's evolutionary system in the same light as the apparently similar schemes of Schelling and Hegel. Spencer's philosophy does not deal with the origin, history, and end of things as a whole. It is neither a history of creation nor a history of the human mind. It does not deal with the entirety of things or the Absolute, in fact Spencer distinctly declares that such a general comprehension is impossible. It only deals with definite restricted and related regions of phenomena, and endeavours to show how the same succession and alternation of different and opposite processes exist everywhere, and are, as it were, the underlying mould into which all