

osophical views, transcending the mechanical theory of the soul and thought, supercilious twaddle and a barren heath. The blessings of such bald materialism are found in the reaction which they produce in thoughtful minds; they lead men to realize what is at stake. In a literary journal, a reviewer of the last-named book says that the biographer is a devotee of natural science, and seems to belong to those Darwinians whose bigoted zeal and constant occupation with a single specialty have made them blind to everything else—men who came near bringing the tendency they represent into disrepute among broader and more independent thinkers.

There are numerous other evidences that a reaction against materialism has come. Thus, F. Von Hellwald, who takes his stand on natural science, affirms that vigorous opposition has been aroused against materialistic tendencies, and that an effort is made to secure the predominance of idealism again. The opposition to these tendencies from other than religious sources is significant. Thus, a book has been published by Flach, entitled, *Classicism or Materialism*. Indeed, the time has come when not only religion and ethics, but also the classics, the humanities, and all higher human interests, must be defended against a brutalizing and materialistic atheism.

Thus, with all the opposition to religion in the name of science, there are many evidences that a change is taking place. Science itself is becoming more fully conscious of its limitations. If not "exact" even in biology, surely its claims respecting mental, moral and spiritual phenomena must be modest indeed. The fact is, that men are now actively engaged in proving the uncertainty of much which it was thought science had already settled. The question of monism and dualism is still an open one; and monists themselves are not agreed as to what the nature of the only substance or essence is. Respecting the ultimate cause of all things, they are agnostics. In the *Kosmos*, a journal devoted to natural science, a writer opposes spiritualism in the interest of monism. But he also shows that we are totally ignorant of the nature of matter. "About the inner nature of force and substance we know absolutely nothing." We only know that what we call matter is impenetrable; but we can know nothing of the nature of this impenetrability. What motion is in itself is wholly unknown; and it is still a subject of dispute whether there is ether and what atoms are. Helmholtz says: "Matter and force are abstractions from the real." Indeed, we need but ask materialists for an explanation of terms in order to show how unmeaning the assertions that matter, force, atoms and motion explain mental as well as physical phenomena.

Exclusive attention to natural law accounts for the tendency to make it the sole agency in the universe. The absorbing attention devoted to nature has led to a neglect and even depreci-

ation of human interests, and to the effort to explain human peculiarities as developments of animal germs. So completely has man lost his former pre-eminence that it seems ridiculous in the eyes of many to regard him as the chief study of mankind; and the inscription once placed over his lecture-room by a certain philosopher would have to be materially changed to express the ruling sentiment of a large class of scholars now:

"On earth there's nothing great but man;
In man's there's nothing great but mind."

But human nature is beginning to assert itself and demands attention to its highest interests, and it is insisted that man is not the tool for nature, but that nature is to be the minister of man. We do not study bugs for the sake of the bugs, but for the sake of man, said a Berlin professor recently. Others have emphasized the fact that the study of nature is valuable because of its connection with man, and therefore is subservient to his interests. But, if human affairs are supreme objects of study, difficult problems arise. If all processes are reduced to mechanical law, how can science compensate for the necessary destruction of man's ideals and furnish a substitute for religious inspiration and hope? In spite of the praises of the blessings of science, this question is not answered; but the fact that it is seriously asked, and that it furnishes problems which must be solved, is a hopeful sign.

Severe as the conflicts with infidelity will, no doubt, continue to be, the time has come when the claim of atheism as the basis of materialism is recognized as not even thoughtful, much less scientific. Not that this recognition is universal, particularly among the masses, but it is becoming more general, and is now frequently emphasized. The limits of natural science and the value of the claims of specialists outside of their specialties are better understood than formerly. Men are also becoming conscious that certain interests are at stake which concern them far more than those pertaining to the lower animals. A reaction in favor of man, of mind, of ethics and religion, has come; it is still a small beginning, but it marks a change of tendency, and that is its significance.

An article in one of the philosophical journals attributes the pessimism of Hartmann to the prevalence of the mechanical interpretation of the universe, and argues that absolute despair is the necessary result of materialism. Hartmann, like Kant, Lotze and Wundt, passed from natural science to philosophy. Deeply conscious of the claims and aspirations of the mind, he could not but recognize that they are utterly futile if man is in the grip of the fate of mechanical law. Pessimism is the only consistent result. Can blind force and personal annihilation be the seed of faith and hope? During a recent discussion of Pessimism, in the Philosophical Society of Berlin, the president emphasized the fact that pessimism neglects the ethical element,