

**DEFINITIONS AND
AXIOMS OF A FUTURE
SCIENCE OF EXISTENCE
OR ONTOLOGY: A STUDY**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649494590

Definitions and Axioms of a Future Science of Existence or Ontology: A Study by Karl Friedrich Fröbel

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

KARL FRIEDRICH FRÖBEL

**DEFINITIONS AND
AXIOMS OF A FUTURE
SCIENCE OF EXISTENCE
OR ONTOLOGY: A STUDY**

DEFINITIONS AND AXIOMS
OF A FUTURE
SCIENCE OF EXISTENCE
OR ONTOLOGY

A Study

BY

KARL FRIEDRICH FRÖBEL



"Seek, and ye shall find."

In discovering the immutable laws of nature, revealed in Mind as *eternal* truths,
we acquire a true knowledge of the Eternal—

"And this is life eternal."

WILLIAMS & NORGATE
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON
AND
20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH

1881



32,906

'BERKELEY failed, as the greatest thinkers of all times have failed, not because he was weak, but because Ontology is impossible.

'What then are the questions on which I must be content to remain in darkness? Locke, no less than Hume, has told us: All which relate to Ontology,—which pretend to discuss the nature and essences of things.'—*G. H. Lewes.*

'The man of science . . . ascertains . . . that objective and subjective things are alike inscrutable in their substance and genesis. In all directions his investigations eventually bring him face to face with an insoluble enigma. . . . He, more than any other, truly *knows* that in its ultimate essence nothing can be known.'—*Herbert Spencer.*

'The distinction between knowledge of things in their relations, and knowledge of things "in themselves" is a distinction without a meaning.

'When we desire to know the nature of things "in themselves," we desire to know the highest of their relations which are conceivable to us.'—*The Duke of Argyll.*

There is one, and only one, fact which cannot be explained, the Existence of this real World—meaning by 'world' the totality of all real things in this infinite Universe (Mr Herbert Spencer and myself as yet included). But the reality of this world being given as the plainest fact or the 'deepest mystery,' as you will

take it, there is no reasonable question to which there is not a reasonable answer.

What is Space in relation to other contents in the self-consciousness of Man, is a reasonable question. Essence the same.

'The best thoughts are generally those which come without being forced, one does not know how.'—*Ruskin*.

'The real Being (existence) of whatever was, and whatever is, and whatever will be, is even now and for ever.'—*Carlyle*.

'In the very idea of God is included all that of which a world of finite intelligence is the manifestation—the true idea of the Infinite is that which contains in it organic relation to the Finite.'—*John Caird*.

DEFINITIONS AND AXIOMS
OF A
FUTURE SCIENCE OF EXISTENCE
OR ONTOLOGY.

A Study.

WHAT a man writes for his own study on a subject still in the state of a 'Question,'—as, for instance, on the 'Reasonable Ownership of Land'—the fateful 'Land Question'; or on the not less portentous Relation between Matter and Mind, between this real World and an 'ideal' or spiritual World,—he ought to keep to himself, till he is sure to have come to an acceptable answer. Some 'Studies,' however, both in Science and Art, may be solutions of vexing problems, or partial embodiments of ideals, and as such, may deserve to be offered to the public, although they treat their subjects not in an exhaustive manner. Many studies of artists present the greatest beauty; and articles in periodical publications often promise great works.

A series of articles on 'The Unity of Nature,'—one of the philosophical questions of the day,—now appearing in the *Contemporary Review*, promises a new important work by the profound author of 'The Reign of Law.' As a grateful reader, I have been encouraged by these articles to

support the disinterested purpose of spreading salutary truth in opposition to the threatening errors of positivism and scepticism. To call positivism, realism, and materialism kinds of philosophy, would be the same as calling perjury a kind of oath, or want a kind of riches, or darkness a kind of light. Black is no colour; and to consider this whole World to be nothing but a 'phenomenal Mechanism,' or a mystery, an inscrutable enigma, is no truth. Enlightened and believing *Christians* will express their notion of this *created* world and their own *existence* in it as '*the Revelation of the Almighty Creator in His creatures.*' To discover and understand the Laws of Nature, or 'The Reign of Law,' is considered by modern philosophers a *revelation* of God Almighty in their minds.

The error of positivism is a want of abstract thinking, of a right distinction of our concepts, notions and thoughts. And as an error leads to fault, and fault to mischief, it is the moral fault of positivistic thinkers to assume, that what they do not understand of metaphysics is above *all* human understanding. So the ostrich thinks that no creature can see, if he pokes his head into matter in the shape of pulverised mud. This want of abstract, logical thinking—and all logical thinking is abstract—allows positivists to confound, with perfect peace of mind, reality with existence, existence with being, being with beings, and so on. Matter, force, substance, motion, function, mind, spirit, sensation, consciousness,—is all confusion with most of them. Some 'thinkers' even use 'invisible'

for 'ideal.' As if an 'invisible world' could not be filled with invisible gases.

The most striking error of the greatest consequence for the destiny of mankind is the confounding of 'reality' and 'existence' and 'being' or 'to be.' What has passed or has been, is no longer real, and what may exist but is not existing yet, is not real. Or, what *was* real, need not be now real; and what is not real now, is not real at all, though it may be real yet, in a future 'time.' Reality, therefore, is limited to the present time, to the enduring Now. Let us reflect on the existence of any real thing or person, and ask: As what do we think this person, this animal, this tree, this substance (water), this Earth *to exist?* Let us take away all the past of its existence, which is no longer real, and also all possible future existence which is not real yet, and what remains? No existence at all, although we have the *real* thing or person *now* before our senses; what remains is a mere 'phenomenon,' a mere mechanism. Even a mechanism, a machine cannot be conceived without possible future and past motions, which are purely imaginary. Motions, however, we can accompany in our imagination from their first *assumed mechanical conditions* kept in our *memory*, to their progressing changes in our *expectation*. Infinitely different are the conditions of the existence of the smallest worm, of the first living cell, which date as far back as the Creation of our solar system, and imply some future existence reaching as far as that of the first perfect human individual, and—perhaps a little farther. Exist-