of brilliant and suggestive contributions to the philosophy of science. He has placed many of his old points of view in an entirely new light, and has put into connected and systematic form much material which until now has lain scattered and inaccessible in his more fugitive writings. The essays are marked by the same calmness, simplicity, and moderateness of expression, which have become an unfailing and distinguishing characteristic of all of Professor Mach's writings.


Professor Boltzmann, the leading physicist of Germany, and successor to Professor Ernst Mach at the University of Vienna, offers in this volume a collection of lectures and essays which have appeared during the last decade. The constituents are very irregular, partly scientific and partly mere *causeries*. He discusses Maxwell's theory of electricity, the mechanical theory of heat, the significance of theory in general; and other problems within the domain of mathematics, mechanics and physics. He criticises his rival Ostwald and devotes several lectures to such great men as Kirchhoff, Joseph Loschmidt, etc. He devotes a scathing criticism to Schopenhauer, scorns philosophy in contrast to exact science, defends the mechanism of atomistic principles, not as absolute but as indispensable, and finally winds up with a report of his journey to America. He had been invited to lecture at the University of California, and he does not hesitate to give us the impression which he had during his hasty trip to the Pacific Ocean. His account is sometimes very humorous, although the humor may not always be intentional, for he tells us of his sufferings from heat and thirst and dust, and conditions to which he is not accustomed.

Dr. Hans Kleinpeter, an admirer and one of the most prominent disciples of Professor Ernst Mach, offers an exposition of Mach's conception of science and the world in his article "On the Monism of Professor Mach," which appears in the present number of *The Monist*. We count ourselves among the admirers and personal friends of Professor Mach, but we would say that in some salient points we do not endorse Dr. Kleinpeter's view. Though Professor Mach has worked out his views independently of other thinkers and though his method of dealing with facts may be rightly regarded as original, we do not accede to Dr. Kleinpeter's opinion that Mach's philosophy is as unique as he represents it. As to our own opinion we have to say that there are differences, and whether or not they are to be considered important depends very much upon the view which Professor Mach would take of them himself. We feel inclined to enter into details and make a résumé of the points of agreement and apparent discrepancies, but we abstain from it in the present number, reserving the subject for a future issue in case it would be deemed welcome to our readers.

**ERRATUM.**

Our attention has been called to an important typographical error in the department of "Criticisms and Discussions" in the January *Monist*. In Mr. Peirce's contribution to "Mr. Peterson's Proposed Discussion," on page 149, line 25, the last word should read "definitive" instead of "definite."