

tional and utilitarian positions Sidgwick seems to have criticised, as well as done justice to, two distinct and important lines of ethical thought in this country, which before him appeared to be irreconcilable,—the intuitional or personal and the utilitarian or social systems.

Both Lotze and Sidgwick, consistently with the limited importance they attach to the historical method for the solution of fundamental philosophical problems, do not show in their writings that extreme appreciation of the theory of Evolution, especially in its Darwinian form, which has become popular in Germany as well as in England; both thinkers may therefore be termed pre-evolutionary. Although Lotze lived and wrote for twenty years after the appearance of the 'Origin of Species,' it cannot be said that he did full justice to the philosophical ideas contained in it, or that he realised the important part which these ideas were going to play in modern thought. Sidgwick's main treatise was published fifteen years after the appearance of Darwin's work, but it was only in preparing the second edition that he became aware of not having taken sufficient note of the importance of the theory of Evolution. We therefore look in vain for a full statement and adequate criticism of the Ethics of Evolution either in Lotze or in Sidgwick. So far as the former is concerned, the very fact that he never dealt adequately either with the ethical problem in detail, or with the most recent version of ethics, explains to a great extent why his writings have fallen temporarily into the background and behind the interests of the age. On the other side, Sidgwick's

61.  
Do not  
sufficiently  
appreciate  
Evolution.