

have said, retained an external world as inferred from sensations. Hume, consistently with his doctrine of causation and his empirical system, held that an external world could not be inferred from impressions. As to how impressions arise we know nothing; we have them, and that is all we know. He does not deny the existence of a material world. He admits that we have an idea of body, but we cannot know whether body really exists or not. All we can hope to know is how the idea thereof arises.

Hume, it is thus seen, agrees with Berkeley in holding that we cannot infer body from sensations, but he differs from him in regard to the reference of sensations to a cause. In one sense Berkeley is more sceptical concerning body than Hume, for the latter admits that it may exist, while the former denies *in toto* its existence in the philosophic sense.

It will also follow that, following his doctrine, Hume will hold the same position towards the spiritual and God as toward the material, *i.e.*, we can never know whether there be a spiritual substance and a God or not. It will also follow that he must deny a self-conscious self, in the modern philosophic sense, retaining its permanence throughout a changing experience.

What, then, is the relation of Hume to his predecessors?

1. What was his relation to the remote scholastics? About the only point of agreement is the philosophic spirit; but they differ much in the degree of development of that spirit. In the latter there is merely the faintest glimmer of the most distant star; in the former the meridian sun shines forth in all its splendour. In method and in aim they differ as widely as possible.

2. As to the relation of Locke, Berkeley and Hume, they all belong to the empirical school, their method and professed aim being the same, but they differ in results as widely as realism, idealism, and scepticism differ.

Locke, as has been said, is full of inconsistencies. Berkeley endeavoured to purify him, and he did so on one side, but only by becoming, in some respects, more illogical than Locke himself. It was Hume's work, with the aid and perhaps through the hints received from Berkeley, to purify Locke as much as is possible on empirical grounds, and to carry his principles to their logical conclusions at the expense of knowledge. The relation of Hume to Locke and Berkeley is that of the mature to the less developed