

it is not so effective as the Socratic method in its power of awakening and stimulating thought.

(3) And now I come to my last point. My life-work has been the teaching of philosophy. May I be permitted to say a few words about the character of philosophy—not with the object of enlightening students, even the youngest of whom knows all about everything, and all the more, the younger he is—but for the sake of some of our friends, who are apt to think that philosophy is a very mysterious and a very unpractical subject. I might indeed simply say that the sensible men who have spent their hard-earned money in giving to so distinguished an artist as Mr. Dickson Patterson the commission to paint the admirable portrait which you see before you—I might be contented to say that these gentlemen evidently put a high value on philosophy. Now I am a great believer in the essential rationality of masses of men. I believe that man is a "rational animal," as Aristotle has taught us to say, and hence even *a priori* I should venture to affirm that there must be more in philosophy than some people imagine.

What is this "more"? If you will take a look around the hall and assure me that there are no ferocious friends of the physical sciences present, I will venture to make a confidential statement. The widow of the great composer Wagner, when asked what she thought of certain French and Italian composers, calmly answered: "There is no music but Wagner's." With a similar confidence, I make bold to say, that there is no science but philosophy. I suppose this will be taken as the natural hallucination of one who knows nothing else. But I hope to convince you that the statement is literal truth. Perhaps I may best make my meaning clear by a comparison. With what part of life does morality? With what part of life does religion deal? Matthew Arnold has said that morality is three-fourths of life. I must take exception to that saying: Morality does not deal with three-fourths of life, but with the whole of it. Similarly, religion does not deal with three-fourths of life, but with the whole of it. And the reason is,

that morality and religion take hold of the whole man; so that a man cannot do anything that has not a moral value, good or bad; and he cannot be sometimes religious and sometimes not, but religion takes hold of his whole nature and makes him a new man. Now, the same thing applies to philosophy. Its object is not a separate sphere, but it embraces all other spheres. It takes the results of the other sciences and brings them into connection with one another. Nothing is foreign to it. Mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, literature, history, all must be embraced within its comprehensive grasp. Let me try to illustrate what I mean. There is a branch of knowledge called mathematics, and it has partisans who imagine that in their science is to be found the secret of all existence. Now that is a philosophical theory. But it is bad, or at least defective, philosophy. The ancient Pythagoreans were so impressed with the fact that numbers are at the basis of everything that they supposed numbers to be the explanatory principle of all things. And in modern times Descartes thought that spatial extension was at least one of the principles of all existence, the other being thought. I do not think it is very hard to see the fallacy of this view. You can certainly count things and you can measure them, but you may go on counting and measuring your sensations or your ideas forever without getting to know what their true nature is. And the reason is plain. Anything can be counted and measured, but if you wish to get a complete view of sensation, and much more of thought, you will have to ask what sensation or thought is. You see that philosophy has to do with mathematics—with its principles and their relation to other principles of a less abstract character. Now take another step. The physical sciences work with the principle of the conservation of energy, and hence some men have imagined that the ultimate principle of the universe is energy or power. This, for example, is the conclusion of Mr. Herbert Spencer, and it is the basis of his agnosticism. But it becomes at once obvious that if you have no higher conception than *power*, your universe will be nothing but a