

cal specialization, which will by no means conduce to the main aim of our science. No doubt specious examples may be adduced in support of the opposite view. Lotze and Wundt were physiologists, Helmholtz, Fechner, Mach and Stallo were primarily occupied with physics, Herbert Spencer was an engineer, Hartmann a military officer, and Ostwald was by profession a chemical physicist. But these very thinkers, whose greatness no one will deny, have kept their eyes steadily fixed on the whole, as is only befitting in a philosopher, whilst our philosophic youth have almost entirely surrendered themselves to a one-sided specialization. The metaphysicians stand apart from the epistemologists, the logicians from the psychologists, the moral or political philosophers from the sociologists, and those who are occupied with aesthetics from all philosophy. The religious philosopher and the historians of philosophy form a class by themselves, who are zealous in the cultivation of their own field, but are quite unaffected by the labours of the others. To-day the exponent of aesthetics hardly understands the terminology of physiological psychology, and conversely. What has become of the Universal Science? How can philosophy any longer claim to take the leading place in the hierarchy of the sciences on the ground that she re-unites the *disjecta membra* of the other sciences, when she cannot secure this unity even within her own domain? Fortunately there are still among us, as a survival from the 'good old time,' philosophers of the grand style."

You see what is in Professor Stein's mind. He has been struck,

as we all have, by the enormous specialization of science, which is characteristic of our day. There was a time when a great mind like that of Aristotle could embrace all the knowledge of his day, but the field of research has so expanded, and the critical spirit which is characteristic of modern methods of research demands so much expenditure of mind and energy, that a man, it would seem, can hardly find time for more than a section of a single science, not to speak of the whole circle of the sciences. The division of labour is becoming almost as great as in the various branches of manufacturing, where a man can only do one thing well. And yet Professor Stein, convinced that the older ideal of the Unity of Science remains none the less true, is troubled by the limited vision of the younger devotees of science, whose mental vision has become almost myopic in its range. "Science is one, and yet we act as if it were many." That is the burden of his complaint. Not only, he says, have the natural sciences gone their own way, but even the philosophical sciences have split up into fragments, so that a man engaged in one of them can hardly understand even the language of another. And he might have added, that the result of this state of things is that sometimes a man engaged in one branch of philosophy says hard things about a man engaged in another branch. The bond of common sympathy—which is a great thing in life, for man, as Aristotle says, is essentially a social animal—the bond of a common sympathy is broken, and sometimes life is made harder—as if it were not hard enough already!—by the use-