

# THE NEW PRINCETON REVIEW.

---

---

61st Year.

JANUARY, 1886.

No. 1.

---

---

## SOCIETY IN THE NEW SOUTH.

THE American Revolution made less social change in the South than in the North. Under conservative influences the South developed her social life with little alteration in form and spirit—allowing for the decay that always attends conservatism—down to the Civil War. The social revolution which was in fact accomplished contemporaneously with the political severance from Great Britain, in the North, was not effected in the South until Lee offered his sword to Grant, and Grant told him to keep it and beat it into a ploughshare. The change had indeed been inevitable, and ripening for four years, but it was at that moment universally recognized. Impossible, of course, except by the removal of slavery, it is not wholly accounted for by the removal of slavery; it results also from an economical and political revolution, and from a total alteration of the relations of the South to the rest of the world. The story of this social change will be one of the most marvellous the historian has to deal with.

Provincial is a comparative term. All England is provincial to the Londoner, all America to the Englishman. Perhaps New York looks upon Philadelphia as provincial; and if Chicago is forced to admit that Boston resembles ancient Athens, then Athens, by the Chicago standard, must have been a very provincial city. The root of provincialism is localism, or a condition of being on one side and apart from the general movement of contemporary life. In this sense, and compared with the North in its absolute openness to every wind from all parts of the globe, the South was provincial. Provincialism may have its decided advantages, and it may nurture many superior virtues and produce a social state that is as charming

## WHAT AN AMERICAN PHILOSOPHY SHOULD BE.

AMERICA has arrived at a stage at which there is a body of men and women who have leisure and taste to cultivate the liberal arts and advance the higher forms of civilization. She does not claim to have accomplished in a century or two what Europe has done in twice that time. It would not be just to require her, as one country, to be doing as much as all the countries of the old world are doing. Still, she now ranks with any other one nation in literature, science, and art. She has a literature which promises to rival that of England. Her historians, in respect both of research and style, are equal to those of Europe. She has not yet produced a poem of the highest class, such as the *Iliad*, *Æneid*, the *Inferno*, or *Paradise Lost*, or *Faust*, but some of her poets in this past age may be placed on the same level as any of their contemporaries. She can show statues and paintings (in landscape, for example) full of vigor and freshness. She has humorists, not perhaps of the highest order—they are too much given to startle by exaggeration—but with a manner of their own. Franklin, Thompson (Count Rumford), and Joseph Henry have led the way in original scientific research, and there are professors in our colleges pursuing the most advanced science. In “practical inventions,” called forth by the necessities of the wide country, she is in advance of all other people.

But all enlightened nations have also had a philosophy bent on inquiring into the reasons of things and settling the foundations of knowledge. India and Persia had it in very ancient times in the form of a theosophy. Greece, followed at a distance by Rome, sought to establish the reality and penetrate into the nature of things. France has had a philosophy ever since the days of Descartes, in the seventeenth century, and so has Germany since the time of Leibnitz in the following age. The English have had a most influential mental science since the time of Locke, and Scotland has since the days of Reid. Italy, at this present time, has a promising school.\* How does America stand?

---

\* See an account of this school, by Luigi Ferri, in *PRINCETON REVIEW*, 55th year. Mamiani, who had so fine a Platonic spirit, is now dead, but it is hoped that *La Filosofia delle Scuole Italiane*, of which M. Ferri is now sole editor, will take a lead in this school. I may mention that his book, written in French, *La Psychologie de l'Association*, shows historically and critically that Association of Ideas cannot account for our high intellectual and moral ideas. It is the ablest work on this subject.

She has had a considerable number of able philosophic thinkers. It may be doubted whether any country has had a more acute metaphysician than Jonathan Edwards, whose views were restricted, and who was kept from doing more, simply by his want of books, and of collision with other thinkers. The theologians of America have made constant use of philosophic principles in defending their doctrinal positions, but the thinking people have not formed a separate school, as the French, the English, the Scotch, and the Germans have. In the last century and the earlier part of this they followed Locke or Reid, one or both always making an independent use of what they adopted—as a rule they took from Locke only what was good, and carefully separated themselves from his sensational tendencies. In this past age our thinking youth have been strongly attracted by Kant and his school, some of them being caught in the toils of Hegel. In the present age a number are following John S. Mill, Bain, and Herbert Spencer. All this, while we never have had a distinctive American philosophy.

The time has come, I believe, for America to declare her independence in philosophy. She will not be disposed to set up a new monarchy, but she may establish a republic confederated like the United States. Certainly she should not shut herself out from intercourse with other countries; on the contrary, she should be open to accessions from all quarters. But she should do with them as with the emigrants who land on her shores, in regard to whom she insists that they speak her language and conform to her laws; so she should require that her philosophy have a character of its own. She had better not engage in constructing new theories of the universe spun out of the brain. The world has got sick of such. Even in Germany, where they summarize, expound, and critically examine all forms of speculative thought, they will not listen to any new philosophical systems, and the consequence is that none is now offered—the latest being pessimism, which startled young thinkers by its extravagance, and by its containing an element of truth in bringing into prominence the existence and prevalence of evil which the philosophy of last century had very much overlooked.

But what is to be the nature of the new philosophic republic formed of united states? All national philosophies have to partake of the character of their nation. The philosophy of the East was sultry and dreamy—like the Indian summer. The Greeks used a dialectic, sharp as a knife, and separated things by analysis and joined

them by intellectual synthesis. The French thinking excels all others in its mathematical clearness imposed upon it by Descartes. The English philosophy, like Locke, is characterized by profound sense. The Scotch is searching, anxiously careful and resolute in adhering to observation. The German has a most engaging *Schwärmererei*, and is ever mounting into the empyrean, its native sphere, in which it is seeking by criticism to construct boundaries. If a genuine American philosophy arises, it must reflect the genius of the people. Now, Yankees are distinguished from most others by their practical observation and invention. They have a pretty clear notion of what a thing is, and, if it is of value, they take steps to secure it.

It follows that, if there is to be an American philosophy, it must be Realistic. I suspect they will never produce an Idealistic philosophy like that of Plato in ancient times, or speculative systems like those of Spinoza, Leibnitz, and Hegel in modern times. The circumstance that Emerson is an American may seem to contradict this, but then Emerson, while he opens interesting glimpses of truth, is not a philosopher; his thoughts are like strung pearls without system and without connection. On the other hand, the Americans believe that there are things to be known, to be prized and secured, and will never therefore look approvingly on an agnosticism which declares that knowledge is unattainable. The American philosophy will therefore be a REALISM, opposed to IDEALISM on the one hand and to AGNOSTICISM on the other.

#### REALISM.

It holds that there are real things, and that man can so far know them. But if there are things and we know them, we must have a capacity to know them directly, of course having also the power of adding indirectly to our direct knowledge. We cannot by legitimate reasoning infer the existence of mind or matter from a datum or premise which does not contain the existence of mind or matter—the addition or multiplication of 0 can never give us anything but 0. We shall see that Hume made us start with mere impressions or ideas, and thereby, of purpose, landed us in scepticism or what would now be called agnosticism; and that Kant started with phenomena, in the sense of appearances, and tried from these to reach things, but utterly failed to extract reality from what had no reality. If we are ever to get hold of reality, we must seize it at once.

Realism holds that the mind perceives matter. In sense-percep-



tion we know things; we know them as external to the perceiving self—as extended and exercising resisting power. We have no need to resort to such theories as those of intermediate ideas or occasional causes coming between the perceiving mind and the perceived object. All of these were brought in to remove supposed difficulties which do not exist, and have only introduced real difficulties.

While we adhere resolutely to the doctrine of natural realism, namely, that the mind knows matter directly, there is room and reason for doubt as to what is the thing perceived directly by the senses generally and by each of the senses. The mature man is apt to think that he knows by directly looking at it the distance of that mountain, and yet it has been shown that all that he knows immediately by the eye is a colored surface, and that he knows the distance of objects by a process of reasoning proceeding on a gathered observation. There is still need to inquire what is the matter we originally perceive, whether it is our bodily frames or objects beyond them. It seems to me that our early perceptions are mainly of our organism; say by taste of our palate, by smell of our nostrils, and by touch proper of our extended frame. I think it probable, however, that by the muscular sense and by the sight of eye, as higher senses, we know objects as external to our body but affecting our body. But there is need of farther experimenting to determine what matter each sense perceives, how far out of or how far in the organism. On this subject, which is a very important one, the experiments and observations of certain German physiologists, such as Lotze, Helmholtz, Wundt, Fechner, Professor Stanley Hall and Doctor Starr, will throw light. Meanwhile, we must resolutely hold that in the farthest resort the mind perceives matter, whether in the body or out of the body, as external to the mind, extended and resisting energy.

We should hold still more resolutely that we have an immediate knowledge of self in a particular state. By this I do not mean that we know Self apart from a mode of self: the self is under a certain sensation, or is remembering, or thinking, or deciding—is in joy or in sorrow. Certainly we do not know the self aloof from the sensation or some other affection, but just as little do we know the sensation except as a sensation of self; nor a sensation without a sensitive object, nor a sensation in general, nor a sensation of another, but a sensation of our own.

Realism farther maintains that in Memory we know things as

having been before us in time past, and do thus know Time as mixed up with the event in time from which it can be separated by an easy process of abstraction. In this we know Time to be as real as the event in time.

In contemplating Space and Time we are led to look on them as without bounds, and thus rise to such an idea as the mind can form of Infinity.

In knowing objects we perceive that in the very nature of the things there are relations involved such as that of Personal Identity, of Substance and Quality.

We have still higher knowledge. We know certain voluntary acts as being Morally Good or Evil, say as being just or unjust, benevolent or cruel, candid or deceitful. Not that this moral good discerned by us is the same kind of thing as body or mind, or has the same kind of reality. Still it is perceived as a reality in voluntary acts known in consciousness. I am inclined to argue that by the conscience the mind perceives voluntary acts to be free.

Philosophy should not attempt to prove this by a process of mediate reasoning. Mind perceives matter at once; but it also perceives benevolence, and perceives it to be good, as clearly as the eye perceives objects to be extended. It is the business of philosophy not to set aside these realities, but to assume them and justify the assumption; and to endeavor—what is often a difficult work—to determine and express their exact nature.

In doing this, philosophy proceeds by observation and according to the method of induction, the observation being made by the consciousness or internal sense. It should decline to proceed in the old Greek method of analysis and synthesis, or of deduction and reasoning. It should refuse with equal decision to proceed in the method of Kant by a criticism, liable itself to be criticised by a farther criticism carried on without end, without a foundation of facts to settle the questions stirred. It is the office of metaphysics to find out what the facts immediately perceived are and enunciate them as first and fundamental truths. Not that it is our observation or induction of them that makes them realities or truths; the correct statement is that philosophy observes them because they are realities.

Obvious objections present themselves to this mode and style of thinking. These can be answered, and they should be answered. First, it should be noticed that our observation does not make the propositions true; we perceive them because they are true. Se-

condly, we have to call attention to the important distinction between our original and acquired perceptions, and be ready to defend the original ones if assailed ; but we are not bound to stand up for all the additions by human thinking. Our intuitive convictions carry with them their own evidence and authority, the others may be examined and criticised, may be proved or disproved. Thirdly, a distinction should be drawn between our sensations proper and our perceptions proper, the former being mere feelings of the organism which may be misunderstood and misrepresented, the latter only being the cognitions of realities. Fourthly, there is the distinction, often very loosely drawn, between the primary and secondary qualities of matter. The former are energy and extension perceived directly and in all matter, the latter a mere organic feeling or sensation, such as heat as felt, implying an external cause, which is shown to be a molecular motion. Fifthly, there is a distinction between different kinds of realities. There is a certain kind of reality involved in our perception of body as extended and impenetrable. There is also a reality, but of a different kind, in the perceiving of self in a certain mode, say as thinking or willing. The one reality is as certain and definite as the other, but it is of a different kind and is perceived by a different organ, by self-consciousness and not the external senses. There is a third kind of reality in the object perceived by our conscience or moral perception. It is quite as certain that hypocrisy is evil and that truthfulness is a virtue as that body exists or mind exists ; but the one is a separate thing known, whereas the other is a quality, a quality of mind, quite as certainly existing as mind itself.

These distinctions are not difficult to comprehend. They are very generally known and acknowledged. But they need to be carefully applied to our cognitions in order to defend first truths and a thorough-going realism.

It will be found that in proceeding on this method we meet with far fewer difficulties than on any other. There is a mode of discovering and testing truth often resorted to, and this successfully in the present day, which I am willing to use in the case before us. Let us begin, it is said, with adopting the doctrine we are seeking to establish as a working hypothesis, and inquire whether it explains all the facts ; and if it does, we may regard it as an established law. Let us then adopt realism as a working hypothesis, and inquire how it works, and we shall find that it unravels many perplexities and is

encompassed with fewer difficulties than any other doctrine ; that by it the real difficulties which present themselves may all, or nearly all, be met and removed, and that realism is consistent with all other truths and throws light upon them. Adopt any other theory, say idealism, and make the mind add to things as it perceives them, or phenomenalism, which makes us know mere appearances, or agnosticism, which makes things unknown, and we shall find ourselves ever knocking against obstacles which cannot be removed, against intuitive convictions which insist on our listening and submitting to them, or against obstinate facts facing us as rocks. Adopt realism, and we shall discover that we have a clear way to walk in. But in order to this our doctrine must be thorough-going. If we resort to compromises, or make weak admissions, we are entangled in difficulties from which we cannot extricate ourselves. If, for instance, we take the position that some of our intuitions or natural perceptions look to realities while others are deceptive or contain only partial truth, our inconsistencies will greatly trouble and weaken us. The sceptic will ask, if one of our primitive perceptions may deceive us, why not all, and we can answer this only on principles which will undermine them all and leave us in bottomless agnosticism.

It can be shown that the inquiries of the Greek philosopher were after realities ; not for the absolute, which is the search of the modern German philosophies of the higher type, but for *τὸ ὄν* or *τὸ εἶναι*, phrases which should not, as they often are, be translated absolute. The Greeks saw that there were appearances without realities and that appearances were often deceptive. Some of them, such as the Eleatics, came to adopt the maxim that the senses deceive, and appealed from them to the reason, forgetting that the reason has to proceed on the matter given it, and if this is erroneous the reason which rests on it may give erroneous decisions. Aristotle was the first to establish the grand truth that the senses do not deceive, and that the errors arise from the wrong interpretation of the information given by the senses. By the help of the distinctions drawn by him, and since his time by the Scottish school and others, we can stand up for the trustworthiness of the senses, and do not require to call in to our help "ideas" with Locke, or "impressions" with Hume, or "phenomena" with Kant ; and we may follow our natural convictions implicitly, and regard the mind as perceiving things immediately, and run no risk of deceptions or contradictions.



## IDEALISM.

Idealism in thought and in literature is altogether of an ennobling character. But we are to speak of it here as appearing in speculative inquiry. As a philosophic system it holds that the mind out of its own stores always adds to our apprehension of things.

It may be a thorough-going idealism, such as that of Berkeley, who maintained that by the senses we perceive not material things extended and made up of particles but ideas created by the Divine Mind, and that things exist only as they are perceived. Fichte went to a greater extreme, and held that things are the projections of mind, of the individual mind, or rather of that incomprehensible fiction of the philosopher's brain, the universal ego or consciousness. But by far the greater number of the systems of idealism have been partial and one-sided. Locke was practically a decided realist, believing both in mind and matter; but he holds that mind perceives bodies, not directly, but merely by ideas supposed to be representatives of bodies. Kant speaks of the mind beginning with phenomena, in the sense of appearances, and then tries illogically, I think, to argue the existence of things, which, however, he (followed by Herbert Spencer) represents as unknown. Berkeley, coming after Locke, urged that if we can perceive only ideas, we cannot from these argue the existence of material things, the ideas being themselves the things and sufficient. Fichte, coming after Kant, defied any one to prove from mere appearances the existence of a reality beyond, as this would be putting in the conclusion more than is in the premises. Ever since, the German metaphysicians of the higher sort have been pursuing realities, and in thinking that they have caught them have only embraced a cloud. If we do not start with realities, both in the object perceived and the perceiving mind, we can never reach them by any legitimate logical process.

The half-and-half systems, the ideal-real as they are called, held by so many in the present day in Germany, are in the position of a professedly neutral person between two hostile armies, exposed to the fire of both. On the one hand it is argued that if one part of our native and original perceptions be ideal, why may not the other parts, why may not the whole be so? If the balloon without any weights attached be let loose, it will move as the winds carry it, and cannot be brought down to the solid earth except by a collapse. On the other hand it is argued by the agnostic that if all or so much be created by the imagination we have no warrant for asserting that

there is any reality, and we must sink into the slough of nescience and nihilism, which are the same nonentities viewed under different aspects; the one asserting that man has no capacity to know, and the other that there is nothing to know, and both culminating in the absolute blank of agnosticism, which is darkness which cannot be seen, for there is no eye to see it—the darkness of the sepulchre in which death ends all. But are we in the narrowness of our realism to exclude the ideal? This would be like depriving the flower of its perfume. The imagination is one of the loftiest powers with which our Maker has endowed us. The child with the aid of its doll and other toys weaves its tales of weal or woe and takes a part in them. The mature man has his day-dreams as well as his night-dreams, and in the midst of the hard struggle of life pictures better days to come. The Christian dies gazing into the invisible world as if it were visible. Take away the ideal and literature would be stripped of half its charms. Even science cannot do without it. "The truth is," says D'Alembert, "to the geometer who invents, imagination is not less essential than to the poet who creates." In the mind of Newton gravitation was a hypothesis before it became an established law. Philosophy without the ideal would be shorn of the halo which it has in Plato and Leibnitz, and could not mount to heaven, which is its sphere. All our higher thought goes out into infinity. The real without the ideal would be like the earth without its air and sky.

Idealism has a wide sphere lawfully allowed it, but it must not be permitted to break out of its orbit. We give it a place, a high place, but we keep it in its place, and we should not allow it to evaporate into nonentity. By all means let us have fancies in our spontaneous thinking. But we are here speaking of philosophy, which is reflective thinking. It is one of the most important offices of philosophy to announce to us the grounds on which we believe in *what is* in opposition to *what is not*, and in doing this it has to define what field the ideal has as distinguished from the real; it has to show us how fancies differ from facts. It will not discourage the soaring into the imaginary, but it requires that all the while we know and acknowledge it to be imaginary. The man who believes in the existence of unreal objects is a madman; the speculation, wild as a romance, but not so attractive, which makes the ideal real is equally lunatic.

It has been shown that all our imaginations are simply reproduc-

tions, in new forms, of our experiences. A giant is a man enlarged. A dwarf is a man diminished. The consequence is that the larger our knowledge the wider the circumambient region of fancy in which we may fly. In modern times, with our larger knowledge, historical and scientific, we have a more varied field for the fancy, if we would use it, than the ancients. The atmosphere is an essential part of our earthly abode, and what diversified action does it show as it raves in the storm and soothes us in the gentle breeze, as it displays such clearness in the morning and such a glow in the evening! But, after all, it is held in its place by gravity, as the solid earth is; so our very highest flights of the mind are ruled by law. The flower needs its stalk, and the leaf its branch. The bird with its wings can fly, as I have seen, a thousand miles across the ocean; but it starts from solid ground, and lands at last on a ship or island. The mists are beautiful when and only when they form a veil to the mountains whose grandeur they at once reveal and conceal, showing us so much, and tempting the curiosity to look into what is hid beyond.

#### AGNOSTICISM.

Extremes meet, as the east and west do in lines on our globe. Idealism leads logically and historically to Agnosticism, for, if portions of our original knowledge be ideal, that is imaginary, why may not all be? And if all be so, we are down to Nihilism. Locke's philosophy, partly idealistic, became wholly so in Berkeley, and sunk into nescience in Hume, and continued so in John S. Mill and his school. Kant's phenomenal theory of knowledge, and his forms imposed by the mind on things, are the places of refuge to which Agnosticism retreats when it is pressed.

It should be noticed of Agnosticism that it is seldom or never consistently carried out. Its supporters maintain that we cannot have a knowledge of reality. But they act and speak and write as if there are things. They believe in the existence of some things—they commonly believe in the existence of meat and money. They are convinced of the reality of things that are seen; they begin to doubt and deny only when we press spiritual truth upon them, when we show them that there is an immutable morality, that there is a God, and that this God will call them to account.

The common way of meeting Agnosticism is by showing that it contradicts itself. It is obviously a contradiction to assert that we know that we can know nothing. But when we have proved this,

we have only strengthened the opinion we are opposing. One of Hume's strongest sceptical arguments is that our vaunted knowledge is inconsistent, that reason lands us in contradictions. The most effective way leading us to abandon our assurance is to demonstrate that in pursuing different lines of thought we reach opposite and inconsistent conclusions. The only satisfactory and conclusive way of meeting Agnosticism is to follow the realistic method we are recommending in this paper, and to show that we have a primitive knowledge which we spontaneously proceed upon, and which we ought to assume in philosophy.

In the present day the Americans are still depending on the Europeans, and borrowing from them. The more earnest students go to Deutschland, and are ploughing, as Ulrici used to say, with the German heifer. Others, who are more addicted to the observations of sense and the methods of physical science, are taking what philosophy they have from Professor Bain and Mr. Spencer, and may be called the Modern English School.

#### THE GERMAN SCHOOL.

The American youth of the present day who wishes to carry on research goes for a year or more to a German university. In particular, those of a metaphysical taste do not feel that they have enough to satisfy them at home, and they betake themselves to Berlin or Leipsic to get a full supply of the food for which they crave. On entering the lecture-rooms there they find certain formidable distinctions proceeded on without being explained—such as those between object and subject ; à priori and à posteriori ; rational and empirical ; real and ideal ; phenomenon and noumenon—all of which may involve a concealed error with the truth which they convey, namely, making objective truth subjective, or the creation of the mind. As they go on they find themselves in a labyrinth, with no clew to bring them out into the open air and light.

All these distinctions have had the mark of Kant branded upon them. That powerful thinker has taken possession of the philosophic thought of Germany more effectively than Plato did that of Greece, or Aristotle that of the Middle Ages, or Locke did that of England, or Reid and Hamilton did that of Scotland—he rules over the minds of the Germans as determinedly as Bismarck does over their political action. Some, such as Fichte, Schelling, and



Hegel, have been carrying out certain of his principles to greater heights of idealism. Younger men, feeling dizzy on the elevations to which they have been carried, insist on being carried lower down, and have raised the cry, "Back to Kant," thinking that they may stop in the descent where he stopped, but find that by the weight upon them they can get no resting-place short of the bogs of agnosticism. All are alike entangled, even Helmholtz and the physicists, in the nets of the critical philosophy from which they cannot extricate themselves.

We have come to a crisis when of all things it is necessary to criticise the critical philosophy. I have been taking exception to certain of the positions of the great German metaphysician. I have all along maintained what Dr. Sterling seems now to be establishing, that Kant did not satisfactorily meet Hume, the sceptic. On the contrary, he yielded to him certain grounds on which he erected a scepticism as deadly as that of the cold Scotchman, but much more alluring. First, he proceeded in a wrong method—in the Critical—which has started a series of criticisms with no ultimate ground of fact to rest on, instead of the inductive, which, it should be understood, does not give cogency to first truths, but simply discovers them. Secondly, he started not with facts but with phenomena, in the sense of appearances, and from these could never logically rise to realities. Hume began with impressions and ideas from which no one could ever draw things; and for these Kant substituted unknown presentations, from which we cannot extract realities any more than we can extract light from cucumbers. He has built a formidable castle in the air, to which agnosticism retreats when it is attacked. Thirdly, he maintains that the mind perceives objects under forms which are not in the things, and has thus created an ideal world, to which poets such as Goethe and Schiller delighted to mount, but which affords no secure abode to those who insist on having on earth a solid domicile in which to dwell.

In the last century Locke was the most influential of all philosophers. It has taken a long time to separate the error from the truth in his system. In order to this it needed the profound examination of Leibnitz in last century, and the brilliant criticism of Cousin in this; it has required, further, the practical sense of Reid and the Scottish school to expose his ideal theory, and the glow of Coleridge to attract the eyes of men to something higher than sensations. Locke's error in supposing that the mind perceives ideas and not

things, and in deriving all truth from a limited experience, are clearly seen, and we need now only to accept the great body of truth which he has established forever.

Kant holds in the nineteenth century the place which Locke did in the eighteenth. We need now to have him examined as searchingly as Locke has been. The wave which carried Kant's philosophy to its greatest height crested at his centennial in 1881, and will now fall down to its proper level. His system will be stripped of its fictitious features, that we may receive and welcome the great body of truths which he presents.

For myself, I can scarcely regret the exclusive authority which Aristotle exercised for a thousand years, for he has thereby, through the mediæval logic, modelled modern notions into their present shape—even as the ocean by its agitations has moulded the pebbles and sands which bound it. But it was necessary for the advancement of thought that the Stagirite should be dethroned from his too extensive power by such original thinkers as Bacon and Descartes. In like manner the influence of Locke has been for good, but we rejoice that Reid exposed his theory of ideas, and showed that he had overlooked truths of primary reason. So, while we do not grudge to Kant his reign for a hundred years, we may earnestly wish that his whole philosophy be now subjected to a kindly but rigid criticism, in which the true and the good are retained, namely, first truths prior to experience, while the false and evil are cast off, namely, all that is inconsistent with a thorough-going realism.

#### THE MODERN ENGLISH SCHOOL.

It consists of writers who have drawn their philosophy from Locke through Hume. The most eminent representatives of the School are, first, Mr. J. S. Mill, then Mr. Lewes, who brought in an element from Comte, the positivist, and Mr. Herbert Spencer, who has called in the development power, and Professor Bain, who has sought to combine physiology with psychology. The American philosophy must be ready to accept from all these men valuable observations made by them both as to psychical and nerve action—we may borrow from these Egyptians the materials wherewith to build our tabernacle; but we must superadd higher and spiritual truth to give it a form and meaning. The whole school is guilty of great oversights which require to be supplied. They commonly

state correctly the physiological facts as made known by the senses and the microscope, but they overlook a great many of the psychological facts quite as clearly revealed by the internal sense or consciousness. They give us the husks, but do not open to us the kernel. We may specify some of their defects, leaving others to carry on the work.

1. There are oversights in their view of the exercises of the Senses; not of the bodily organs, but of the mind or intelligence as operating in perception by the senses. They have not seen or acknowledged that in sense-perception there is knowledge, in fact, our primary knowledge; our knowledge of things as extended, and as having resisting power—the beginning of the idea of power. They have commonly been satisfied with representing the mind as starting with impressions (that vaguest of terms) or sensations from which they can never get the knowledge of things.

2. They have not seen that in Consciousness, meaning Self-consciousness, they have a knowledge of *self* in some particular act, say perceiving, remembering, judging, or resolving, all of which we know as acts of *ourselves* and not of another. The school speak of the mind as itself unknown, the qualities only being known, whereas the qualities are abstractions from a thing known, known as exercising the qualities. The knowledge of self as conscious, along with the knowledge of a not self as external and extended, is the beginning of all our knowledge. All our other cognition presupposes this and proceeds upon it. This knowledge is of real things, and all knowledge legitimately built upon it is also of realities.

3. The whole school give a defective account of what is involved in the memory. They make it a mere reproduction of the past. There is, first, they say, a perception of an object, say a mountain, and then a reproduction of this perception. But this is not all that is involved in memory. In remembrance there is not only the image of the object, but a recognition of it as having been before the mind in time past. This implies a Faith element and the idea or knowledge of Time which metaphysicians have had such trouble in dealing with.

4. They do not acknowledge or see what lofty exercises are involved in the Imagination, which creates the ideal out of the real, and ever tends towards what it may never be able to reach, the Infinite. In these operations the mind rises above the senses into a higher sphere, where the philosophers of the senses do not choose to follow it.

5. They commit a great and fatal error in making the mind perceive only the relations of Resemblance and Difference, whereas it has the capacity, as Locke and Hume and Brown maintain, of discovering a variety of other relations which penetrate deeply into the nature of things, such as those of Space and Time, of Quantity and Active Property, all of which the mind can perceive.

6. In particular, they do not take sufficiently deep views of such relations as those of Personal Identity and Causation. In not noticing the knowledge of self in the original perceptions of consciousness, they do not expose to view what is involved in the identity of self in its successive states, which as perceiving we are prepared to believe in its immortality. Again, they represent causation merely as invariable antecedence which may not hold in all times and in all space, whereas it consists in a power in the agents acting as the cause and producing the invariableness, and constraining us to rise from real effects to a real cause supreme in God.

7. Their grand error consists in overlooking what is involved in morality, in our Moral Perceptions, which discern the good as distinctly as extension is seen by the eye. In not noticing these facts they are missing the very highest qualities in our moral and spiritual nature.

8. Their account of the Feelings or Emotions is meagre. They are apt to identify them with mere sensations, which again they identify with nervous affections. Herbert Spencer does this. They do not fully apprehend that in all emotion there is an appetite or spring of action, say the love of pleasure, or the love of power, or the love of good, and an idea of the object which calls forth the emotion, as fitted to gratify or disappoint the appetite.

9. They deny that man has Free Will; they make him the mere evolution and creature of circumstances. The realistic philosophy will require carefully to unfold the nature of free choice as an inalienable prerogative of man.

In all these and other ways the modern English School is degrading our nature, and with it all high philosophy—leaving us little but shallows in a waste of weary sand. We are obliged to them for showing wherein man agrees with the brutes, but we must have others to show us wherein man is above the brutes. It must be one of the highest offices of the realistic philosophy to expose the errors and supply the deficiencies of this school.

But it will be urged, that if philosophy is kept within such rigid



fences it will lose much of its attractiveness, and metaphysical and dialectic youths will complain—as bitterly as the Indians do when they say they have no room for hunting in these enclosed fields where they must be contented to plough and sow. As the result, there will be no room for speculation such as was indulged in by Plato, by Leibnitz and the higher German philosophers.

To this I reply that there will still be a rich possession left to philosophy to cultivate, and one as much more fertile and profitable above mere guesses as agriculture instead of hunting will turn out to be to the Indian. By imposing judicious restrictions we do not deny to philosophy any of its prerogatives; we merely prevent it from becoming an arena in which one system lives to fight against another. It will still be allowed to inquire into the opinions of the thinkers of all ages and countries, as Cudworth did in England and Hamilton did in Scotland, and as German scholars are still doing. Not only so, these opinions may be analyzed and criticised, always on the condition that the ultimate test of truth be the facts in our nature. Historical criticism will have a boundless field in determining what were the precise opinions of the eminent thinkers of antiquity, and in settling what truth there is in Plato's ideal theory and Aristotle's analytic of thought, and in the Stoic and Epicurean discussions as to the relative places of virtue and pleasure. The gold will have to be gathered from the sand in the wastes of the Middle Ages. Coming down to modern times it will have to settle what are the limits to the method of induction as expounded by Bacon, and to what fields the combined dogmatic and deductive methods of Descartes and Spinoza are to be confined. It will have to weed out all the idealism and sensationalism in Locke's *Essay*, and so explain the great truths regarding experience which he has expounded so as to keep them from issuing logically in Humism. It will have to take special pains to keep thinking youth from embracing the errors along with the truths of Kant. While standing up resolutely for a priori truths such as causation, it will show that these are not forms in the mind imposed on things but realities in the nature of things. It will have to acknowledge that there is such a process as evolution, but it will also prove that this cannot account for the origin or beneficent order of things. I am inclined to go a step farther, and allow full freedom to guesses, queries, speculations, theories, care being taken to represent them as mere hypotheses till they are established as facts by facts.

Is not the world open to our view as it was to that of our forefathers? I am sure that it is as full of wonders as it ever was. The physical investigator does not complain that those who lived in the past have drawn all its wealth from the universe. It is the very fact that so many real discoveries have been made that makes him expect more without limit and without end. The ground that has been so enriched with the deposited vegetation of the past will yield larger and richer vegetation and fruit in the future. I believe that there are as many unexplored regions in the mental as in the physical world. I am sure that all the laws and properties of mind have not yet been discovered. It has secrets alluring us to seek to discover them, and sure to reward us for the labor we devote to the search after them. If the modern cannot go so far and mount as high as the ancient it must be because his mental capacities are not so great, and this he will scarcely be prepared to admit. The world as we look upon it is as boundless as it ever was, and human nature is as full and fresh and inexhaustible as it was seen to be in ages past.

A new region has been opened to the modern. A keen interest within the last age has gathered round the relation of brain and nerves to the operations of the mind, or what is called Physiological Psychology. It is a difficult subject, but this only makes it more attractive to the adventurous explorer. It is full of the promise of discovery, and youth will rush into it as to a newly discovered mine. We know much now of the laws of the mind, we know something of the physiology of the brain—careful experiments are being performed by competent men in various countries. We seem to have come to a position at which we may unite the two lines of inquiry, and they will be found to throw light on each other. The physiologist in his department will insist on proceeding only in the method of observation; let the psychologist do the same. Let each require of the other that he restrain premature hypotheses. As the result, we shall have an immense accumulation of empirical facts, rising, according to Bacon's recommendation, to "minor, middle, and major axioms," promising in the end to reach some grand laws which, while insisting that mind and matter are different substances, will realize the sublime conception of Leibnitz by uniting them in a pre-established harmony.

They who start this Realism are proclaiming a rebellion against all modern schools, *à posteriori* and *à priori*, and if they persevere

and succeed are effecting a revolution. In doing so they are not overturning but settling fundamental truth on a surer foundation—as the Reformers in the sixteenth century did not destroy religion but presented it in a purer form. Fertility will be produced by this new upturning of the soil.

This attempt, if it is noticed at all, will be assailed by the modern systems of Europe. The monarchies of the old world will look with doubt, perhaps with scorn, upon these republics of the new world which acknowledge no king. The Hegelians will not deign to look at us, because we do not proceed by dialectics and put the world into trinities. The materialists will represent us as following illusions, because we claim to be able by internal observation to discover high moral and spiritual truth. But in spite of all efforts to keep it down, realism, which is the obvious and the naturalistic philosophy, will ever, will again and again, come up and assert its claims. Meanwhile we keep our place, we mean to carry on and consolidate our work, and we may in the end secure attention and recognition. Acting on the Monroe principle, permitting no foreign interference, and allowing the old systems to fight their battles with each other, we hold our position and may come to command respect, as the United States have done, after being long contemned by European countries; and they may be induced to seek our established truths—as they do the corn and cattle reared in our virgin territory.

JAMES McCOSH.