

Ladies & Gentlemen,

Since we last met Herbert Spencer
has ^{gone} ~~passed away~~, and I ~~suppose~~ you have
his characterism
all read ~~the characterization of him by~~

Prop. James, ^{which neglects no side of} ~~a perfect all round~~
^{the philosopher or} ~~which~~
the man, and ^{which} contains no word that

is not true. I do not know that Spencer's
inconsistency in the matter of religion
is not marked a ^{bit} little ^{top} heavily; he
cause ^{it seems to me that} ~~I do not believe~~ there is ^{none as} ~~anybody~~
from the Pope to Huxley who is not
about as inconsistent on that subject as Spencer;
and from the point of view of real religion
theoretical inconsistencies afford the
only way we have as yet for seeing two

What is said
sides of the truth. What Prof. James says of
the man's personal ~~consistency~~ ^{be able} of character
is a very wonderful thing to say and a very

be capable of being said with so much
true. As to that I have heard many authentic anecdotes and
truth. I was in London in ~~1870~~ ¹⁸⁷¹ ~~and~~ ^{can report many small} ~~and~~ ^{from my own} ~~and~~ ^{experience}

being a young man, if possible ^{if possible} ~~and~~ ^{more}
more obscure than I am now. Spencer

heard of my being there and ~~sent~~ ^{being} on the
board of the Athenaeum Club, set me down
non-members

as one of the twelve ~~its members~~ ^{who}
There was ~~no~~ ^{possible} motive for his doing ~~that~~ ^{except his desire to}
encourage a sincere inquiry

I thus ~~had~~ ^{came to meet him daily} ~~and~~ ^{during that season} ~~and~~ ^{for that} ~~and~~ ^{daily} ~~and~~ ^{was}
this opportunity of ~~seeing~~ ^{meeting} ~~and~~ ^{daily} ~~and~~ ^{was}
of the leading men of ~~the~~ ^{science and}
literature. Unfortunately, I ~~do not~~ ^{do not}
~~do not~~ ^{do not}

~~do not~~ ^{do not} ~~do not~~ ^{do not} ~~do not~~ ^{do not} ~~do not~~ ^{do not} ~~do not~~ ^{do not} ~~do not~~ ^{do not}
play billiards; ~~and~~ ^{and} ~~that~~ ^{that} ~~prevented~~ ^{prevented} my seeing as

much of ^{his} ~~time~~ as I desired. Besides, ~~strongly objected~~
~~to talking upon any subject that might~~
~~excite his brain.~~ It was the only way
 in which, with his constitution, he
 could get his book written. The same
 fact ~~which also~~ explains his small reading in
 philosophy.

Ten years later when he came to
 this country, ~~he~~ ^{and} I ^{was} remained the same
 obscure individual. ~~If he had had~~
~~anything~~ ~~at~~ ~~I~~ ~~do~~ ~~not~~ ~~know~~ ~~what~~ ~~he~~
 could have remembered about me
 unless it was ~~my~~ ^{had I used to tell him he was} telling him in
 the ~~Afternoon~~ that my objection to
 his system was that he was not a thorough

partially

quite

1426

going evolutionist; and ~~and~~ ^{the Spencerian} coterie in New York had ^{several times} shown a ~~given~~ rather curious mark of a disposition ~~decided disinclination~~

to ignore anything that might come from me. ~~Was the~~ ^{But} ~~so~~ Spencer again ^{yet} showed ~~two~~ ^{the breadth of his} sympathies ~~with~~ any-

body who was really trying to get at the truth by writing to me and expressing a ~~desire~~ ^{to get at the truth by writing} to meet me again. ^{to renew the acquaintance}

these two little facts are ^{recorded in my diary} ~~mentioned~~ ^{mentioned} at the mention of ^{owing} the ^{unit} of ^{the work}

When philosophy ^{becomes} ^{of a higher} ^{structure} science, as it will before the twentieth century is half-over, the ^{fair} ~~the~~ question to be asked ^{in relation} concerning weighing the importance of any philosopher, will be what ^{important truth} did he prove, ^{will} in the case, in which truths of philosophy can be

proved. But philosophy is, ~~not~~ ^{as} yet, not a science in that ^{strict} narrow sense. It is merely what this man and that man is inclined to think; and Herbert Spencer himself in declining ^a the nomination as one of the Foreign Associates of the Paris Academy of Science, put his declination on the ground that his work had not been scientific work.

For the present, then, the questions that we ~~But what~~ ask in order to estimate a man's greatness in philosophy are, ^{First} What great conceptions did he introduce into philosophy? ~~And~~ Second, what line of thought did he follow out so far and so consistently as to be very instructive either as showing the great power

of that way of thinking or its fatal insufficiency.
 For the merit of some very great philosophers
 such as the Hedonists and Nominalists has
 been that ~~considered~~ they have carried out their principles
 with such severe logic as ~~so~~ virtually to reduce
 them to absurdity.

Spencer's ^{followers} ~~no doubt~~ and no doubt, Spencer
 himself imagined that he was the father of
 evolutionism. But ^{almost all} all great philosophers
 have had a theory as to how the Cosmos
 came about, a theory lying near the heart
 of their systems. Such a ^{theory} ~~system~~ must either
 suppose the Cosmos eternal and immutable
 or it must be an evolutionary theory.
 For even a system of Emanation is ^{a kind} really

of evolutionism. The majority of great philosophers have been evolutionists and not emanationists. The distinguishing peculiarities of Spencer's Evolutionism were two. In the first place, he supposed an eternal and immutable law of the persistence of force, and the principle of Evolution was for him a mere secondary result of the action of that Immutable Law. In the second place, Evolution ~~was~~ for him, as he states in the distinctest language in a paper ~~given~~ printed in Collier's Synopsis of Synthetic Philosophy, was only one of two ~~more~~ ^{alternating} movements which he regarded as analogous to a vibration and like a vibration to be governed by the

one over-riding principle of the persistence of force. Such a philosophy does not belong to the class of philosophies fundamentally evolutionary.

There were other conceptions, however, were introduced in philosophy by Spencer; such was the doctrine that Innate Ideas are, in some sense (and by some means) hereditary, and were ~~at~~ their first ^{appearance} ~~origin~~ empirical. This idea was put forth in the fifties in Spencer's Principles of Psychology, a book long antedating Fechner's most celebrated work; and I should have supposed that Spencer had some claim to be considered as the Father of Modern Psychology, but since Prof. James who knows a hundred times

more than I do about that, says not such thing,
it is plain that I must have been mistaken
about that.

I do not know what other great ideas
Spencer originated; but he certainly had
extraordinary skill and ingenuity in
forming theories that deserved examination.
He may be studied with profit as master
of abductive reasoning.

The answer to the second question, how
much he taught the world by following
out his own line of thought, is very difficult
to make sure of for the reason that ~~there~~
~~were~~ great historical forces were turning
many powerful intellects to the study of.

social and biological development; so that
 Spencer was only one of many who were
 following out lines of research which have
 resulted in ^{giving to} ~~putting~~ the idea of evolution
 a government over all our opinions
 to an extent that it never had before.

Spencer certainly took up this line of thought
 before anybody else did. It was ^{as} thoroughly
 original with him, as any thought ever
 is with anybody, and ^{his works certainly} ~~what he did~~
 did in the beginning influence a ^{collection} ~~body~~
 of men as remarkable for their intellect
 as for their great numbers, and influenced
 them to such a degree ~~as to~~ that all their
 subsequent ^{opinions} ~~ideas~~ were built upon that basis.