# A Hundred Years of British Philosophy

Rudolf Metz

*Muirhead Library of Philosophy*

# A HUNDRED YEARS OF BRITISH PHILOSOPHY


MUIRHEAD

## 20TH CENTURY PHILOSOPHY
In 22 Volumes

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I | Contemporary American Philosophy (Vol I) | *Adams & Montague* |
| II | Contemporary American Philosophy (Vol II) | *Adams & Montague* |
| III | G E Moore | *Ambrose & Lazerowitz* |
| IV | Ludwig Wittgenstein | *Ambrose & Lazerowitz* |
| V | Philosophy in America | *Black* |
| VI | Contemporary Philosophy in Australia | *Brown & Rollins* |
| VII | A History of Philosophy (Vol I) | *Erdmann* |
| VIII | A History of Philosophy (Vol II) | *Erdmann* |
| IX | A History of Philosophy (Vol III) | *Erdmann* |
| X | Ideas | *Husserl* |
| XI | The Development of Bertrand Russell's Philosophy | *Jager* |
| XII | Contemporary British Philosophy (Vol III) | *Lewis* |
| XIII | Contemporary British Philosophy (Vol IV) | *Lewis* |
| XIV | A Hundred Years of British Philosophy | *Metz* |
| XV | Lectures on Philosophy | *Moore* |
| XVI | Commonplace Book | *Moore* |
| XVII | Philosophical Papers | *Moore* |
| XVIII | Some Main Problems of Philosophy | *Moore* |
| XIX | Bernard Bosanquet and His Friends | *Muirhead* |
| XX | Contemporary British Philosophy (Vol I) | *Muirhead* |
| XXI | Contemporary British Philosophy (Vol II) | *Muirhead* |
| XXII | Bertrand Russell Memorial Volume | *Roberts* |

# A HUNDRED YEARS OF BRITISH PHILOSOPHY

RUDOLF METZ

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1938 by
George Allen & Unwin Ltd

Published 2013 by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*



*British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data*
A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

A Hundred Years of British Philosophy
ISBN 978-0-415-29548-2
20th Century Philosophy: 22 Volumes
ISBN 0-415-29526-2
Muirhead Library of Philosophy: 95 Volumes
ISBN 0-415-27897-X

As may be seen from the original programme printed in Erdmann's *History of Philosophy* under the date 1890, the Library of Philosophy was designed as a contribution to the History of Modern Philosophy under the heads: first of different Schools of Thought—Sensationalist, Realist, Idealist, Intuitivist; secondly of different Subjects—Psychology, Ethics, Aesthetics, Political Philosophy, Theology. While much had been done in England in tracing the course of evolution in nature, history, economics, morals and religion, little had been done in tracing the development of thought on these subjects. Yet "the evolution of opinion is part of the whole evolution".

By the co-operation of different writers in carrying out this plan it was hoped that a thoroughness and completeness of treatment, otherwise unattainable, might be secured. It was believed also that from writers mainly British and American fuller consideration of English Philosophy than it had hitherto received might be looked for. In the earlier series of books containing, among others, Bosanquet's *History of Æsthetic*, Pfleiderer's *Rational Theology since Kant*, Albee's *History of English Utilitarianism*, Bonar's *Philosophy and Political Economy*, Brett's *History of Psychology*, Ritchie's *Natural Rights*, these objects were to a large extent effected.

In the meantime original work of a high order was being produced both in England and America by such writers as Bradley, Stout, Bertrand Russell, Baldwin, Urban, Montague and others, and a new interest in foreign works, German, French and Italian, which had either become classical or were

attracting public attention, had developed. The scope of the Library thus became extended into something more international, and it is entering on the fifth decade of its existence in the hope that it may contribute in this highest field of thought to that Intellectual Co-operation which is one of the most significant objects of the League of Nations and kindred organizations.

GENERAL EDITOR

*1930*

# A HUNDRED YEARS OF BRITISH PHILOSOPHY

*by*

DR. RUDOLF METZ

*Translated by*

PROFESSOR J. W. HARVEY, M.A.
PROFESSOR T. E. JESSOP, M.A.
HENRY STURT, M.A.

*Edited by*

J. H. MUIRHEAD, LL.D., F.B.A.

LONDON: GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1938
SECOND IMPRESSION 1950



PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY NOVELLO & CO. LTD.
LONDON, W.I.

*To*

MY PARENTS

*in*

*Sincere Gratitude*

*and Reverence*

This page intentionally left blank

# CONTENTS

# EDITOR'S FOREWORD

DR. RUDOLF METZ'S book entitled *Die philosophischen Strömungen der Gegenwart in Grossbritannien*,[1] of which this volume is a translation, was the first attempt to give a detailed account to his own countrymen of the development of British philosophy during the last, and the first part of this, century. The great movement of British thought in the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, represented by Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, and Hume and continued in the XIXth by Mill and Spencer, had received ample recognition in continental histories of European philosophy. Dr. Metz has himself written books on Berkeley (1925), and Hume (1929), in the series Klassiker der Philosophie. But the hardly less important revival of interest in speculative problems that was initiated by Coleridge and, after an interval, manifested itself with better resources at its command and more concentrated power in the 'sixties and 'seventies of last century with the equally powerful reactions it called forth had received scant notice. As Dr. Metz himself puts it in his Preface: "The few works which have dealt with it are either mere collections of material or treat of particular aspects only and are rough summaries and sketches." This is true even of Heinze's invaluable additions to Ueberweg's *Outline of Philosophy since the beginning of the XIXth Century*.

There can have been few men living, even in Germany, who possessed in like degree the necessary equipment for the task of supplying this gap in German philosophical literature. With complete knowledge of the movement in the philosophy of his own country which exercised so profound an influence on British thought in the latter half of the XIXth Century he combines a thorough mastery of the course of that thought itself in all its manifold windings and a personal acquaintance, cultivated in repeated visits to England, with many of the men who have themselves contributed to swell its stream.

[1] Felix Meiner, Verlag, Leipzig, 1935, 2 vols.

It was the brilliant use which he had made of these advantages in presenting a picture, at once comprehensive and detailed, sympathetic and critical, weighted with learning yet full of human interest and lively portraiture, that at once attracted the notice of readers of German in this country and suggested to several, including Mr. Stanley Unwin, the publisher of the Library of Philosophy, and myself, that it was no less fitted to fill a gap in the philosophical literature of our own country than in that of Germany. As in Germany so in England, although we have many characterizations of particular movements of thought and one or two attempts to characterize it as a whole, the former have offered only the materials for a comprehensive view, while the latter have been little more than sketches and are already out of date as records of contemporary thought.

There were difficulties financial and other to be faced in so large an undertaking. But these were overcome partly by the generosity of the German publisher and of Dr. Metz himself in showing themselves prepared to regard it as no mere matter of business but as a contribution to international understanding at a time when nothing is so greatly needed, partly by a like generosity on the side of the translators who were willing to enter on it as a pure labour of love.

We have been further aided by the author's willingness to revise the whole of the German text with the view not only of bringing the bibliographies up to date but of making valuable additions of new material. The result of this has been that the English translation amounts in reality to a corrected and enlarged edition of the German work. It would be impossible here to give a complete list of these additions. But attention may be drawn to three of the longest and most important in the section on Theodor Merz (pp. 443–46), the enlargement of the section on the Oxford Moralists (pp. 527–29), and of that on the new school of Logical Positivists (pp. 723–26).

It only requires to be further explained that the Translators with the permission of the Author have permitted themselves a certain amount of abbreviation in a few passages in which

the subject dealt with is more familiar to the English than to the foreign reader. For this permission and for his invaluable co-operation with us in the production of this volume I cannot conclude this Foreword without offering Dr. Metz in the name of the Publisher, the Translators, and myself as Editor our warmest thanks.

The portions for which the translators are respectively responsible are:

| | |
|---|---|
| HENRY STURT | German, Vol. I, pp. 1–56 (par. 1). (English, pp. 29–83) (par. 2).<br>German, Vol. II, pp. 1–246. (English, pp. 447–704.) |
| T. E. JESSOP | German, Vol. I, pp. 217–442 and pp. 56 (par. 2)–110. (English, pp. 83 (par. 3)–121 (par. 2), pp. 237–446. |
| J. W. HARVEY | German, Vol. I, pp. 110–213. (English, pp. 128–234.)<br>German, Vol. II, pp. 247–349. (English, pp. 121–234, 705–820.) |

But they have all read the whole in proof and reduced my function as Editor to little more than a nominal one.

J. H. MUIRHEAD

This page intentionally left blank

# AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE GERMAN EDITION

THE following book aims at giving an account of the development of British philosophy from about the middle of last century to the present day. But in order to give a foundation to my account of the British philosophy which is contemporary in the narrower sense, it seemed indispensable to include the older ideas and to show in all directions the lines of connection which bind the present to the past in a relatively complete and manageable whole. The First Part of the book owes its origin to this consideration and it is thus that the account of modern British philosophy has been rounded off into an historical unity.

But the main interest of my book begins with the Second Part, and it is for the sake of it that this laborious work has been undertaken. While those older schools of thought have been studied adequately and are well known in their main features, the later period has never been treated comprehensively. The few works which have dealt with it are either mere collections of material or treat of partial aspects only and are rough summaries and sketches. In this field almost everything had to be done which was needed for a thorough mastery of the matter. Here it was my work to discover new country in the history of philosophy and not only to mark out the complex web of contemporary British philosophy in its outer extent, but to illuminate it from within and to present it intensively as well as extensively. I had therefore to go straight to the original sources; from them only could I get presentations of the individual thinkers, of their place in schools of thought, and of the schools of thought themselves.

When in this book I speak of 'schools of thought' I am relying, of course, upon insight into the relations of ideas. But the many-coloured fullness of life, in which the philosophic thinking of an age and a nation moves, does not always fit easily into the schema of a history of philosophy, and often conflicts with the neat labelling of all those 'isms' which once

were viewed with so much favour and are so unpopular to-day. A work such as the present, if it is not to lose itself in the moving manifold of phenomena, cannot in the interests of order and consistency dispense with such labels altogether. But these should not be more than signposts in a country which at first sight seems to be trackless; they can never be a substitute for facts. They are lines of direction and points of orientation for the traveller and as such are intelligible and necessary. Therefore I regard them not as the main interest of my work, but merely as an indispensable help to inquiry. It may be that one thinker or another has been classified under a wrong category, and is partly or wholly out of place where he has been put. Such objections must not be given too much weight, if I have been successful in giving a true account of the thinker and his doctrine, and in understanding him adequately. For this reason I have taken more interest in individual thinkers than in schools of thought, and more interest in the problems of thought than in the labels by which they are identified. I have made it, indeed, my chief purpose to give an account of the various philosophers in their individual character and to present as vividly as possible their personality as thinkers. In view of this each thinker will be dealt with at *one* place only, although a treatment arranged according to tendencies of thought would have required a discussion in more than one place. This may lead to many anomalies, which are inevitable if system is not to be preferred to personality, tendency of thought to the thinker, and category to living presentation.

It may seem hazardous to trace the line of British thought right down to the present day, seeing that such an undertaking has not that distant perspective which is necessary in order to survey a movement which is not yet finished or thinkers who are still in the middle of their work, and to distinguish the essential from the unessential, the permanent from the transitory. I am fully conscious of this, and where I had to treat of contemporary matters I make no claim to that accuracy of judgment which may well be required from a historian in regard to matters where the record is closed. Here much remains in the stage

of a temporary arrangement and mere approximation to that which future inquiry will settle more definitely. For this reason I could not take account of all the germinal movements which can be discerned in British thought, or of anything which so far has failed to take definite form. Moreover, it was not my purpose to strive for an absolutely complete and a perfectly inclusive record. Apart from its practical impossibility such a purpose would have been theoretically mistaken. For in the realm of ideas there is the same natural selection which the genius of Darwin has shown to be so dominant in the world of nature. What is dead and forgotten, because it has failed to maintain itself in the struggle of ideas, should not be revived by the historian, merely because it once existed. But of all that has borne the test of survival, there is scarcely anything that we can afford to overlook. The principle of selection has been applied in this respect also: that a much fuller treatment has been accorded to the great figures and prophets of philosophy than to the *di minorum gentium*. To this extent the amplitude of the treatment is in a sense an indication of inner value, although it cannot be interpreted directly as fixing the place of a thinker in the scale of values.

The question may be raised: What is the meaning and value of an undertaking such as this at a time when nations are continually closing themselves more and more against one another, and mutual understanding is continually becoming more difficult? What is British philosophy to us Germans of to-day, what can we learn from it and for what useful purpose should we concern ourselves with it? This very practical question, which the generation of our fathers would have regarded as incompatible with the meaning and purpose of genuine research, must be faced to-day. The question is one of politics or of politics and culture, and so in the present case we cannot afford to dismiss it as a matter of merely taking pleasure in the picture of British thought which is here presented or of increasing or completing our knowledge of what people are thinking across the Channel. Apart from the fact that the present condition of things can

hardly be maintained permanently, it appears in view of the present political situation necessary that those bridges should be built for us from the spiritual side which are so hard to build from the political side. Less than ever can we to-day neglect anything which brings the nations together and helps them to understand each other; above all, nations so close in race as the English and the German. To cultivate and promote understanding should be our aim wherever it seems to be possible; and this enterprise has been undertaken with the express purpose of bringing the minds of the two nations nearer to each other and of encouraging mutual understanding. I turn therefore to the professional philosophers not only of Germany but of Great Britain and America and ask them to co-operate in the cultural and political purposes for which this book has been undertaken. And although I am conscious that, in view of the narrowness of my circle of readers, which is due to the nature of the subject, I can make only a modest contribution to achieving that purpose, I see nevertheless in this possibility the authorization and justification of my enterprise.

Finally, it should be mentioned that I have had the good fortune to come into personal relations with a great number of British philosophers, especially with many of those who are discussed in this book. An excellent opportunity for this was furnished by the Seventh International Congress of Philosophy which met in Oxford in September 1930, and by a long stay in England on the occasion of it. What was gained by personal intercourse and the direct exchange of ideas could not in many cases have been supplied by prolonged study of books. To all those who have helped me thus, I wish now to make suitable acknowledgment. Especially are my thanks due to my friend, R. I. Aaron, Professor of Philosophy at the University College of Wales in Aberystwyth, to Professor T. E. Jessop, of the University College of Hull, and to the late Dr. F. C. S. Schiller, of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Their ever-ready help and their valuable advice and encouragement have contributed greatly to my book. And last, though not least, I

have to thank my wife for her affectionate sympathy, constant encouragement, and active co-operation during the long years which have been spent in preparing the book. Finally, it must be mentioned that the Notgemeinschaft der deutschen Wissenschaft has furnished the material basis for the appearance of the book by a generous contribution to the expense of printing. For this the author and the publisher here express fitting thanks.

RUDOLF METZ

HEIDELBERG
*November 1934*

This page intentionally left blank

# PART I

# OLDER SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT XIXTH CENTURY

This page intentionally left blank

# I

## THE SCOTTISH SCHOOL

THE school of thought founded by THOMAS REID (1710–96) in the second half of the XVIIIth Century was called the Scottish in accordance with its geographical place of origin and the domicile of its leading representatives. In reference to the content of its doctrine it is usually termed 'the philosophy of common sense'. It forms a branch of the stem of British empiricism although it arose from conscious opposition to the school of empirical thought represented by Berkeley and Hume. It drew nourishment from the motives and problems of that school which it set out to combat and refute. But it was able neither to explode these motives and problems from within, nor to bring to them new nourishment from without. It contented itself with surveying and distorting the traditional problems and their solutions, but it nowhere advanced beyond the results which British philosophy reached in its classical period. It did not abandon the previous line of thought, but diverged from it and pushed into a side-track. In its systematic import it is far inferior to the great classic works of British philosophy, with which it is directly connected and apart from which it is unintelligible; in its regress to healthy human understanding it implies a relaxation of the philosophic impulse and a decline of that speculative force from which Hume's mighty shock to thought issued. It was not adequate to the greatness of the historical situation in which it found itself and it was incapable of managing the inheritance which came to it from Hume. Thus Reid's brave struggle against Hume resulted in no proper victory over his opponent, and the answer which he gave to Hume's sceptical challenge was no help to philosophic thought, but brought it into a blind alley. Like Kant, Reid was awakened from his dogmatic slumber by Hume, but the powerful impulse which both experienced was made fruitful and directed into a new great

movement of thought by the German thinker only. From Reid and his followers there came no creative renewal of thought. They remained the undistinguished successors of great men and made no considerable contributions to thought.

Nevertheless, the historical influence and diffusion of the Scottish school is of no small importance. Reid's doctrine established itself at the Scottish universities, was organized there into a kind of scholastic system, and drew continually fresh followers into its sphere of influence. It crossed over into France, where it inspired many of the thinkers who succeeded Maine de Biran (Royer-Collard, Cousin, Jouffroy, Garnier, Damiron, de Rémusat, and others).[1] In America its tradition was carried on by J. M'Cosh (vide infra, p. 41), Noah Porter, and others. Apart from the so-called Cambridge school, in which the Platonic renaissance of the XVIIth Century was crystallized, we here for the first time in the history of British thought encounter a real school of philosophic training. For the first time we see a unified thought-system which was incorporated into the academic curriculum and was for many decades represented, taught, and elaborated by the co-operation of a considerable body of adherents. The school which was founded by Reid in Scotland had its counterpart in England, where there arose an important school with Bentham as its centre. For a long time the two proceeded in rivalry with each other and concentrated in themselves most of the philosophic energies which were available at that time.

The early history of the Scottish school falls outside the limits of this book; its chief phases can be only lightly sketched here. Even before Reid's death the leadership of the school passed to DUGALD STEWART (1753–1828), the ablest among his early students. Stewart was an eminent academic teacher, whose rhetorically powerful lectures exercised a great educational influence upon the rising generation of Scotsmen. From 1785 to 1810 he occupied the Chair of Moral Philosophy at

[1] Vide E. Boutroux, "De l'influence de la philosophie écossaise sur la philosophie française," in his *Études d'histoire de la philosophie*, 1897.

Edinburgh, which was the spiritual centre of Scottish philosophy for many generations. At his feet sat many young men who later were destined to attain distinction in the most various spheres of political and intellectual life, e.g. no less a man than Sir Walter Scott and the future Prime Ministers Palmerston and Russell. In the main points of his doctrine he followed the footsteps of Reid, with whom he disagreed only in some special questions, and his only service in point of theory consisted in the fact that he tried to systematize his master's doctrine more thoroughly and to apply it more extensively. He was a man of high intellectual culture, who understood how to put the dry and soberly expressed ideas of Reid into a pleasing and cultured literary dress. But it is remarkable that Stewart, who at that time was the most powerful exponent of philosophic culture in Great Britain, took practically no notice of the great advance of German philosophy which took place in his lifetime. After Reid, Stewart is the chief academic representative of the Scottish system. He carried its tradition on into the XIXth Century and was so powerful and influential a representative of it that it maintained itself till Bentham took over the leadership in philosophy.

Stewart's pupil and later his successor in Edinburgh, THOMAS BROWN (1778–1820), is closely connected with the Scottish school though he did not accept fully all its ideas. His philosophic position represents a sort of compromise between the associationist tendencies of the older empiricism and the intuitionist views of Reid. He thus forms a bridge from the philosophy of common sense to the later empiricism and therefore to the psychological doctrines of the two Mills, Bain, and Spencer. His most important philosophic contributions are those which he made to the problems of perception and causality, which in part brought him into violent opposition to Reid. Although he adhered to the assumption of certain intuitive principles of belief, in regard to perception he drew nearer to sensationalist views and in regard to causality to the views of Hume, while rejecting Hume's sceptical conclusions. The latter problem was treated by him in a comprehensive work in which he entered

into a critical discussion with Hume (first edition in 1805; third greatly enlarged edition in 1817 under the title *An Inquiry into the Relation of Cause and Effect*). He was a much stronger thinker than Stewart, and had good critical powers. Even then he took an interest in Kant, on whose philosophy he wrote the earliest essays in English (published in the first volume of the *Edinburgh Review* in 1802), and was, like Stewart, an honoured and successful philosophic teacher. To this circumstance is due in the main the extraordinary literary success which was gained by his Edinburgh lectures. Shortly after his premature death they were published under the title *Lectures on the Philosophy of the Human Mind* (1820) and within thirty years reached no less than nineteen editions.

Less intimate were the relations of Sir JAMES MACKINTOSH (1765–1832) to the ideas of the Scottish school; he is better known as a politician and historian than as a philosopher. The only writing for the sake of which he should be mentioned here is his *Dissertation on the Progress of Ethical Philosophy, chiefly during the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries* which was first published in 1830 as an introduction to the seventh edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* and at once achieved great popularity (ten editions to 1870). At its appearance it attracted great attention and provoked a severe reply from James Mill (*A Fragment on Mackintosh*, 1835).

In this essay, in which Mackintosh gave a sweeping view of the English moral systems of the past two centuries, he attempted a kind of reconciliation of utilitarian and intuitionist ethics. He did not reject the principle of utility, but deposed it from its dominant position and found the bases of moral conduct more in conscience and sympathy than in usefulness.

All these thinkers and a series of others, who have long since sunk into well-merited oblivion,[1] were overshadowed by a much

[1] The following may very briefly be mentioned. John Abercrombie (1784–1844), a physician who achieved a great literary success with his book *Inquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers* (1830, twenty-one editions to 1882); James Mylne, Reid's successor in the professorship of moral philosophy in Glasgow, a distinguished and influential philosophic

more important and powerful thinker, Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON (1788–1856). Hamilton gave Scottish philosophy a new impetus, and it is mainly due to him that for the second time it came dominantly into the foreground and gained a sort of pre-eminence over all other philosophic schools. This supremacy lasted from about the thirtieth to the sixtieth year of the century. From 1836 to his death Hamilton held the professorship of logic and metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Even before his appointment he had established his name and fame in philosophy by numerous contributions to the *Edinburgh Review*; he was known far beyond the boundaries of Scotland and even on the Continent. Among his contributions there were three of special importance, since they contained the main substance of his thought and attracted the greatest attention from his contemporaries: *Cousin's Writings and Philosophy of the Unconditioned* (1829), *Brown's Writings and Philosophy of Perception* (1830), and *Logic* (1833). In the first are developed the main principles of metaphysics, in the second those of theory of knowledge, and in the third those of logic. Later they were reprinted in his *Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform* (1852). A boundary-mark in the history of the Scottish school is furnished by the edition of Reid's works (1846, completed in 1863), with careful comments and numerous excurses and notes into which Hamilton poured the immense wealth of his knowledge. Later there came also the edition of Dugald Stewart's works (in eleven volumes, 1854–58). For the most part this finished Hamilton's literary activity, apart from his *Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic*, which were not prepared

teacher, who, however, wrote nothing; David Ritchie, Hamilton's predecessor in Edinburgh, more a divine than a philosopher; John Wilson (1785–1854), better known under his pen-name of Christopher North, who also filled a philosophical professorship in the University of Edinburgh; Thomas Chalmers (1780–1847) the great Scottish theologian, for a time professor of moral philosophy in St. Andrews, and author of *Sketches of Moral and Mental Philosophy* (1836), who shortly before his death made a vigorous attack upon German philosophy and upon Hegel's 'nihilism'.

by himself for publication and were edited after his death by his pupils Mansel and Veitch (in four volumes, 1858–60).

With Hamilton, Scottish philosophy enters upon the final stage of its course; with him begins the process of inward disintegration and transition to other lines of thought. But its finest flowering takes place just before the end, when it reaches not only its widest popularity and its most concise academic expression but also its highest achievement in criticism and speculation. But this is attained not by its own resources but by the extension of its range of problems and by the introduction of new ideas. This addition was due to the omnivorous erudition of Hamilton, whose reading in philosophical and other literature far surpassed that of all previous British thinkers and came from various sources, but mainly from the recently discovered German philosophy. How Hamilton was influenced positively by the Kantian philosophy and negatively by post-Kantian philosophy will be shown later. For the present it may be said that the opening of wider prospects, mainly through the adoption of Kantian ideas, implied the shattering of the original structure of the Scottish school. The extension and deepening of the Scottish doctrine by Hamilton was achieved at the cost of its purity.

This can be shown briefly by an example. Reid's philosophy had grown out of opposition to the phenomenalist theory of knowledge of the older empiricism and especially to Hume's sceptical conclusions from it. When we know the external world, analysis shows us the mental act on one side and the real object on the other. The object is *qua* external immediately present in perception and needs no intervening pictures or presentations to mediate for us the reality of external things. Reid therefore rejects the so-called representative theory of perception or knowledge and will have nothing to do with the whole apparatus of presentations (ideas and impressions). For that we apprehend external things immediately and directly in perception is one of those fundamental principles of healthy human understanding of which we are intuitively certain and the truth of which we have no occasion to doubt. Hamilton

also begins by accepting the 'natural realism' of Reid's theory of knowledge. But his doctrine implies from the first an important advance beyond Reid, inasmuch as he tries to reach this result not through a mere appeal to the healthy human understanding of the plain man, but through a critical analysis of the process of knowledge. By rejecting expressly that appeal, he returns once more to the ground of true philosophic inquiry. In the place of Reid's dogmatism he puts Kant's criticism. But this involves a displacement of the problem. The problem of knowledge is not solved by the mere assertion that we are *immediately* conscious of material reality as something different from ourselves or our mental states. When the statement that the object as such is present in consciousness is taken to mean that its existence must be identical with the experienced quality, it is evident that in many cases this condition is not fulfilled. We need, therefore, a careful critical examination of the concept of immediacy. Such an examination tells us, e.g. that all knowledge through recollection cannot be immediate in the same way as knowledge through perception, since the object which is past is no longer present. What is immediately present is rather a memory-image from which we make inferences to the object which was formerly present. The possibility of immediate knowledge therefore exists only for sense-perception. But even here Hamilton's critical analysis shows that the naïve idea of immediacy often cannot be maintained. He therefore feels himself constrained to diverge from the original common-sense theory almost as far as the phenomenalist theories against which the common-sense theory was directed. The final result is that everything which we can know about the outer world is nothing else than contents of consciousness and that therefore consciousness is the sole trustworthy voucher for the existence of external things. Of Reid's natural realism there remains nothing but the bare knowledge that in consciousness not merely the ego and its psychic acts are disclosed, but also the non-ego and its relations to the ego. But this means that the theory of common sense which was set up by Reid as a barrier against subjectivism and

scepticism was so transformed by Hamilton that it returned to the opinion that we can know nothing truly beyond the transitory phenomena of consciousness. Natural realism was bent back into that very phenomenalism to refute which it was originally invented.

It is evident that these arguments are derived not so much from Berkeley and Hume as from Kant. To this extent they are not a mere return to the theories combated by Reid, but an advance beyond them to the critical theory of knowledge of the German thinker. This is shown by the fact that with Hamilton the principle of relativity is conjoined with the theory of perception, and that it is just this principle which is the centre of gravity of his whole philosophy. In general the theory of perception had maintained that we are immediately conscious at least of the primary qualities of things and that we have the right to maintain that they exist as we perceive them. To this extent our knowledge of external things is not mediated or representative, but immediate or presentative. But the fundamental principle of the relativity of knowledge maintains that we know nothing as it is in itself and therefore that we are limited to the knowledge of phenomena and that things in themselves are hidden from us. Between the two there is evidently an irreconcilable contradiction. On closer inspection, however, it is seen that the theory of perception must be interpreted in the light of the principle of relativity, and not conversely. For the primary qualities which we know immediately and which testify to the existence of a world independent of consciousness turn out in the end to be nothing but phenomena; which means that they are relative to our capacities for knowledge and are extensively modified by them, and therefore are incapable of manifesting reality in itself. Hamilton's doctrine thus ends finally in the position that the external world, *qua* known world, has no existence independently of the knowing subject.

This theory in its consequences leads to an agnosticism which is in many respects close to Kantianism or rather with that prevalent interpretation of Kantian doctrine which lays

undue stress upon the phenomenalist elements of his criticism of knowledge and neglects the metaphysical implications which are contained in it. It leads, moreover, to the rejection of all metaphysics and to renunciation of any kind of speculative knowledge of the Absolute or, as Hamilton in his famous essay of 1829 expressed it, to rejection of every "philosophy of the unconditioned". But with Hamilton this is not connected with indifference or hostility to religious beliefs as with Spencer, Huxley, and others; on the contrary it involves a more vigorous affirmation of them. The *docta ignorantia* which for Hamilton is the end of all philosophy, is also the beginning of theology. When he bids the understanding keep to its boundaries, he tries to establish faith in its just rights; a faith, the proper object of which he regards as being that which in its own nature is incomprehensible. Thus for him philosophy, so far as it keeps within its own limits and rejects the presumptuous claims of reason to absolute knowledge, is the true justification of religion.

Hamilton's doctrine, which we can follow no further here, suffers from the inconsistency which arises from trying to reduce two theories so different as those of Reid and Kant to a common denominator. The result of this is that on the one side he greatly falsifies the original intentions of Reid, and that on the other side he interprets Kant's meaning very one-sidedly. The whole is a compromise which does justice to neither side and thereby discloses its inner weakness. The historical importance and influence of Hamilton's philosophy is, however, not affected thereby. He still performed the service of being the first academic philosopher of rank to open his mind to the influence of German ideas and thereby to take a decisive step in ending the insularity of British thought. This step was the more momentous because it was made by a man who during his two decades of teaching at Edinburgh had more philosophic authority than any of his contemporaries. As head of the Scottish school, Hamilton was a sort of philosophic dictator whose authority was unbounded within his circle, whom his pupils followed blindly, and who enjoyed high con-

sideration far outside the limits of the school. His reputation remained almost unimpaired throughout his life; no one raised any noteworthy protest against his predominance. Not till nine years after his death was an attack delivered from two directions against his doctrine. The much better known and stronger of these attacks was made by John Stuart Mill in the name of empiricism. By Mill's criticism of Hamilton, contained in the book *An Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1865), which was comprehensive though in many respects unjust and based on misunderstandings, the Scottish philosophy suffered such a blow to its authority and such a setback to its influence that from thenceforward it lived with reduced vitality and was threatened with extinction. The second attack, which contributed to this result, came in the same year from quite another direction. John Hutchison Stirling, who may be said to have brought Hegelianism into Great Britain, attacked Hamilton, protesting against his negative attitude to the great post-Kantian systems, both in his epoch-making work *The Secret of Hegel* and in a separate book *Sir William Hamilton, being the Philosophy of Perception* (both in 1865). Thus the idealist movement which at once became powerful set itself from the first in opposition to Hamilton and led subsequently to an almost complete neglect of his philosophy. Hamilton's interpretation of the Kantian doctrine could no longer be accepted, since it could not be brought into harmony with the predominantly Hegelian interests of these thinkers, who never even acknowledged adequately his historical service in introducing the ideas of Kant and other Germans. Thus the year 1865 marks, not indeed the end, but the almost complete exhaustion of the line of thought initiated by Hamilton and the Scottish school.

By far the best known of Hamilton's pupils is the theologian HENRY L. MANSEL (1820–71). Ordained a priest, then Lecturer in Theology at Magdalen College, later Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Oxford, and finally Dean of St. Paul's, Mansel introduced Hamilton's philosophy into England, teaching and diffusing it with vigour and success in the Uni-

versity of Oxford. Besides two early books on logic, he wrote on metaphysics, endeavouring to reduce the main ideas of Hamilton's doctrine to a stricter and more systematic form than the master had given to them (*Metaphysics or the Philosophy of Consciousness*, first in 1857 in the eighth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, later in book form in 1860; and afterwards a *Philosophy of the Conditioned*, 1866, in which he tried to defend Hamilton and himself against Mill's attack). But the most influential of his writings were his Bampton Lectures on *The Limits of Religious Thought* (1858), which attracted great attention, aroused a vigorous controversy, and made his name widely known. These lectures were mainly of interest because they made perfectly plain the attitude of the school to the religious questions which Hamilton, in spite of many indications, had left obscure. For the first time and very definitely they drew the theological conclusions which lay concealed in Hamilton's agnostic phenomenalism. Starting from the principle of the relativity of knowledge, Mansel tried to show that all our efforts to discover by means of thought anything about the absolute divine nature are doomed to failure. The absolute and infinite are completely inaccessible to man's finite understanding. Every attempt to think the absolute or to apprehend it by any rational means leads to a tangle of contradictions and inconsistencies which the intellect cannot solve. In matters of faith, thought is completely impotent and must in the end confess its bankruptcy. Mansel therefore declares that all theoretic arguments against the dogmas of religion are invalid, and thus rids himself in the quickest and simplest manner of all the enemies and contemners of faith. It is not the business of reason to interfere with holy things; and there is no occasion to be sorry for this. On the contrary, this renunciation of reason should be most warmly welcomed in the interest of religion. Thus Mansel bases all our knowledge of the super-sensuous upon divine revelation and the sole task which falls upon the critical reason in deciding whether to accept or reject religious dogmas is not concerned with the content of the dogmas but merely with the

evidences which can be adduced for their divine origin. In this connection he assigns a certain subordinate importance to the moral argument. Although this is not competent to give judgment upon a revealed truth, yet from our ethical standards of value we obtain helpful indications for judging religious ideas.

Mansel thus gave the Kantian theory of knowledge a more definite turn towards sceptical agnosticism than did Hamilton and made it subserve the purposes of revealed religion. More definitely than ever since the time of Bacon the separation was made between faith and knowledge, religion and philosophy; and the old saying "Credo quia absurdum" was restored once more to its rights. From this doctrine Spencer's agnosticism gained decisive support and presents itself as nothing else than its complete secularization. It was only a short step from Mansel's revelation-theology to Spencer's indifference to religion. The procedure by which the strictest orthodoxy supplied weapons for itself from one of the most advanced schools of thought, and at the same time threw extreme discredit upon thought as such, was so extraordinary that it was attacked with vigorous criticism from the most diverse quarters. The controversy which rose out of Mansel's Bampton Lectures and was conducted with equal vigour by philosophers and theologians,[1] raised a great dust, and, although the results which came from it had but small importance, the interest of the public in the questions discussed was greatly increased, and a favourable atmosphere thus prepared for the keener pursuit of philosophy which ensued soon afterwards.

After Hamilton and Mansel, the path of Scottish philosophy runs steeply downward. Of those who issued from the school or adhered to it there are only a few names of importance who represent the doctrine in its purity. Even in JOHN D. MORELL (1816–91) those centrifugal tendencies appear which were to gain the upper hand more and more in the future. It is true that Morell was rooted in the Scottish tradition, within which

[1] Among Mansel's critics were men so distinguished as J. S. Mill, T. H. Huxley, and F. D. Maurice.

he received his early philosophic training, but he was subject to many influences from other schools of thought and was especially receptive to the German systems with which he first came into touch during a student-journey in Germany. We owe to Morell, who was, like Hamilton, a man of wide reading and catholic receptivity of mind, some works on the history of philosophy. Among them is the book *Historical and Critical View of the Speculative Philosophy of Europe in the XIXth Century* (1846), which justly attracted lively attention and contributed to widen the philosophic outlook of Englishmen, and a book on Fichte's ethics (1848). But his chief contribution was a *Philosophy of Religion* (1849) in which we can trace the influence of Schleiermacher and R. Rothe. His *Introduction to Mental Philosophy on the Inductive Method* was published in 1862.

Another thinker of Hamilton's school was JAMES M'COSH (1811–94), a voluminous philosophic writer who went to America in 1868 and took with him the philosophy of common sense and achieved for it a certain recognition. Besides many systematic works, M'Cosh wrote a full history of the Scottish philosophy (*Scottish Philosophy from Hutcheson to Hamilton*, 1875).[1]

HENRY CALDERWOOD (1830–97), at first a Scottish minister, then from 1868 Professor of Moral Philosophy in Edinburgh, began as a pupil of Hamilton. But even in his first book (*Philosophy of the Infinite*, 1854, second edition, 1861), which he published while still a student, there appeared a surprising independence towards his master who was still alive. In this book he subjected Hamilton's doctrine to a searching criticism and ruthlessly exposed its weaknesses. His purpose was to re-establish the original meaning of the doctrine of common sense by separating from it the agnostic elements introduced by Hamilton and Mansel. His chief desire was to refute Hamilton's argument that the human mind, as being finite, cannot

[1] In this connection I may refer to a bibliography of the Scottish philosophy which will appear shortly from the pen of Professor T. E. Jessop.

know the infinite. He saw in a religion which builds altars to the unknown and unknowable God, and excludes rational thinking from its sphere, nothing but mere superstition, and no true reverence for the divine nature. To the agnostic relativism, which was inherent in Hamilton but was first made into a basic philosophic principle by Mansel and Spencer, Calderwood opposed the genuine intuitionism of the earlier Scottish doctrine. We are immediately conscious of God as an all-wise, all-powerful, and all-righteous being. Such knowledge is independent of all rational considerations, transparent and certain, and therefore intuitive. Calderwood represented a similar intuitionism in the ethics which he presented in a successful handbook (*Handbook of Moral Philosophy*, 1872, fourteenth edition, 1888). While attacking naturalism and hedonism, he insisted upon the necessity of an absolute law and aim of conduct. This aim he took to be neither happiness nor pleasure, but the full and harmonious use of all our powers and talents to the fulfilment of their natural purposes.

Finally we must notice the following fact. The Scottish doctrine, which in the middle of the century had been the focus of philosophic life in England, found itself in the succeeding decades driven more and more from its commanding position and under the pressure of two powerful opponents, Darwinism and idealism, against both of which it had to defend itself. While Veitch (vide infra) undertook the defence against idealism, Calderwood concerned himself with Darwinism. In his last systematic book (*Evolution and Man's Place in Nature*, 1893, completely recast in 1896) he entered the controversy which raged over the Darwinian evolutionary systems. While recognizing the great value of the results of recent biological inquiry, he saw the weakness of their application to the general problems of philosophy. He comes to the conclusion that the animal descent of man can give no basis for explaining the rational and ethical elements of his nature and he held to the assumption of a transcendent intelligence as the common cause both of moral and of cosmic development. In this way he tried to vindicate the Scottish philosophy which

had always been founded upon religion against the attack of those tendencies in Darwinism which were hostile to religion.

As the *ultimus Scotorum* in the sense of faithful adherence to the school must finally be mentioned JOHN VEITCH (1829–94), Professor of Logic and Rhetoric in the University of Glasgow. Veitch was very closely related to Hamilton. He sat at his feet as a student, later became his assistant, after his death was joint-editor of his lectures and wrote no less than three books to commemorate his personality and to explain and diffuse his teaching (*Memoir of Hamilton*, 1869; *Hamilton* in Blackwood's Philosophical Classics, 1879; *Hamilton: the man and his Philosophy*, 1884). Of his independent works we need merely mention his essay *Knowledge and Being* (1889) (a complete index of his writings is given in the book posthumously edited by R. M. Wenley, *Dualism and Monism*, 1895, vide pp. ix seq.). In this Veitch develops his own doctrine with a constant polemic against the idealist theories of the school of Kant and Hegel; he tries to defend the last positions of the Scottish tradition against the attack of the new movement of thought. But Veitch is fighting in lost positions for a lost cause and nothing reveals more plainly the complete collapse of a once powerful front than this rear-guard resistance of the last successor of a great line. Here the simplicity and superficiality of common sense are pitted against the profound thought of Kant and Hegel, and Veitch tries with his coarsely realistic theory of knowledge to discredit the works of the critique of reason and of idealist speculation. His naïve realism implies a regress to Reid or even further back; and although he came from Hamilton's school he is almost completely wanting in Hamilton's critical caution. He is wanting also in the sympathetic understanding of the real meaning of the new problems and what is required for their solution which in spite of many misunderstandings we find in Hamilton. Veitch's polemic is directed mainly against Green's theory of relations and his doctrine of the eternal self-consciousness. Against the former he sets his own simple, coarse-fibred realism (the reality which we perceive or know exists outside of our con-

sciousness and is independent of it whether we know the reality or not, and this fact must be accepted simply as given). Against the latter doctrine he puts the fact of the real individual ego and the psychological analysis of its contents. All through he is fighting with insufficient means and measuring with an inadequate scale; and thus makes all the more evident the complete exhaustion of the Scottish philosophy.

Although the last representatives of the school (Morell, M'Cosh, Thomas Spencer Baynes, Veitch, and Calderwood) were still living and working in the 'eighties and 'nineties of the last century, the Scottish tradition cannot be said to be regularly maintained after the early 'seventies. Scottish thought disintegrates or passes over into other more powerful and new-fashioned schools. It still exerts an influence here and there, but it can no longer maintain itself independently. Such centrifugal tendencies appeared even among thinkers who are to be reckoned as members of the school. Others parted early from it and either went their own ways or joined other camps. Thus, e.g., Ferrier confessed that he had learnt more from Hamilton than from all the other philosophers together. But his own later thinking moved far away from him and involved itself in profound speculations, including a sharp polemic against Kant and Hegel (vide infra, pp. 246 ff.). A similar path was followed much later by Laurie, who also moved far beyond his Scottish origin and developed a metaphysics which has scarcely anything in common with his philosophic starting-point (vide infra, pp. 429 ff.). With Fraser, Hamilton's pupil and successor in Edinburgh, the original, still active Scottish impulse was later deflected into the paths of Berkeleyan philosophy (vide infra, pp. 228 ff.). But some principles of the Scottish doctrine passed into thought-systems which were originally unconnected with it. For example, there is intuitionism both in the ethics and the philosophy of religion of Martineau and in the philosophers of the Oxford Movement (J. H. Newman and W. G. Ward), while agnosticism, as is well known, appeared anew in Spencer's evolutionism, though with a difference. And there are connections also between

Mansel's doctrine and Balfour's theism. In these and many other ways Scottish ideas percolated into the British philosophy of the XIXth Century. The least to be influenced was the more thorough-going empiricism, owing to the wide difference of the underlying ideas. But even here occasional lines of connection may be traced. It may be noticed that James Mill in his youth was greatly impressed by Dugald Stewart, to whose lectures he owed his earliest philosophic and psychological education.

The national Scottish philosophy, so far as one can use that name, in the expansion which was given to it mainly by Hamilton had opened for itself the path by which it was destined to cross the boundary of its native country and join the great stream of European thought. At the moment when the Scottish school was moving to its end, this stream was represented in Great Britain by the idealist movement. Although no actual historical transition from the former to the latter occurred, one may say that Scottish thought, after it had fulfilled its mission, was taken up and dissolved by idealism. It is no accident that the renaissance of Kant and Hegel of the 'sixties and 'seventies was encouraged in Scotland at its first onset and later in the Scottish universities more than anywhere except in Oxford. We need only mention the Hegelian work of the Scotsman Stirling and the teaching of Caird, also a Scotsman, at the University of Glasgow. And if it was an accident that Stirling's epoch-making book (1865) and Caird's thorough and widely influential teaching in Glasgow (beginning in 1866), both in the service of Hegel and the new movement, occurred just when Hamilton's star began to set (Mill's decisive attack was in 1865), this accident has a deep significance in the history of thought. Thus in the middle of the 'sixties Hegelianism established itself firmly in Scotland and from Glasgow, where it had gained a strong position, pressed continually harder upon the native philosophic tradition. Only in the citadel of Hamiltonianism, the University of Edinburgh, was the old school able to maintain itself much longer. There the dissolution was delayed till the 'nineties. Both

professorships, as there were no successors of the Scottish school available, fell into the hands of neo-Kantians. That of Hamilton, which till then was occupied by Fraser, was in 1891 given to Andrew Seth (Pringle-Pattison); that of D. Stewart, the last occupant of which was Calderwood, was given to Andrew Seth's brother, James Seth. Thereby the Scottish philosophy vacated its last academic strongholds in favour of the new school and was completely extinguished. The few ideas which it contributed to the new century are not continuously connected with it, but are occasional recurrences to one or other of its principles, and that more to those of Reid than of Hamilton. Wherever the healthy human understanding with its intuitive certainties and convictions is appealed to and is recognized as the decisive criterion of truth, wherever knowledge strives to free itself from the subtleties of an over-critical and sceptical intellect and resorts to the direct methods of natural realism, there we see plainly reminiscences of the system of the Scottish school and its founder. As such views are represented by thinkers of the new-realist school more often than by any other (plainest by J. C. Wilson, G. F. Stout, G. E. Moore, J. Laird, and C. E. M. Joad), it follows that the little which is still alive of the Scottish school must be looked for mainly in new-realism.

## II

## THE UTILITARIAN-EMPIRICAL SCHOOL

THE main line of British philosophy runs in a relatively continuous and self-contained course from the Renaissance to the present day. This line of thought is usually called empiricism or the philosophy of experience. More than any other it can look back upon a long tradition and in no other country has it been embodied so typically and strikingly as in the British Isles. We may therefore call it the indigenous or national or traditional school, and although it would be a crude misinterpretation of the facts to identify it simply with British thinking, yet there is a certain justification for holding that this is the most typically British school. In any case we have here not a school which has been invented by historians of philosophy, but the real existence of a single basic idea and attitude of thought, which in spite of great diversity, in spite of side-issues and by-paths, offers to our view what is essentially a unitary whole. The philosophic line which stretches from Bacon and Hobbes to Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, and thence to Bentham, Mill, and Spencer, implies a complex of coherent and harmonious principles which take on a different appearance according to the standpoint from which they are viewed, but always stand in relation to the same totality. If we wish to find suitable terms for this totality in its main aspects, we must choose empiricism or positivism to show its general philosophic position, sensationalism or phenomenalism in relation to its theory of knowledge, associationism in relation to its psychology, hedonism, eudaemonism, or utilitarianism in relation to its ethics, scepticism or agnosticism in relation to its metaphysics, deism or indifferentism (occasionally also atheism) in relation to religion, liberalism in relation to politics.

The classical empiricism of the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries, which we distinguish from its natural successor, the modern empiricism of the XIXth Century, culminates in the

philosophy of Hume and finds a temporary ending there. The ending was temporary because Hume did not leave behind him any neat and tidy stock of doctrines which pupils and successors could have taken over to elaborate, but a complete confounding and undermining of philosophic principles which abolished all possibility of orthodox teaching and prevented all direct continuation of his doctrine or of any philosophic training akin to it. Herein lies the real meaning of what is usually in a condescending spirit called the Humian Scepticism. The line of British empiricism upon the whole runs straight forward and continuously till it reaches its highest point in Hume; is then interrupted and deflected, and does not move forward again till it receives a new influx of ideas. The break of continuity occurs just where the classical empiricism is divided from its modern counterpart and is renewed in a changed form. The interruption is marked historically by the counter-attack which was made by Reid and the Scottish school against Hume; the new incoming ideas are represented by Bentham's philosophy.

It is important that these historical connections should be clearly indicated. The later school is not immediately connected with the earlier; there is a break between them. The break is filled by the Scottish philosophy. By Reid's attack and by the Scottish movement resulting from it the traditional empiricism was so severely crippled and repressed that it took a long time to recover from the blow. The first decades of the XIXth Century are filled with the conflicts of these rivals which lasted till the famous attack by J. S. Mill upon Hamilton in 1865 brought them to an end. In this decisive encounter empiricism was victorious. The controversy between Mill and Hamilton is exactly parallel historically to that between Reid and Hume. But the fortune of arms inclined in this case to empiricism, which had gained new strength and now drove its Scottish opponent finally from the field. By re-establishing its tradition and contributing new ideas and principles of thought it showed itself to be the stronger philosophic force and the better able to survive. The rivalry between the two

schools and their contest for supremacy forms the interesting and progressive factor in British thought from the middle of the XVIIIth to the middle of the XIXth Centuries, and it is remarkable that the span of time thus occupied is exactly a century, i.e. from Reid's first attack upon Hume in 1764 to Mill's final attack upon Hamilton in 1865. These two years are both dramatic climaxes in the conflict, while the intervening period is marked by less decisive encounters and skirmishes, occasionally also by truces and armistices, though also with a certain open or latent tension.

In accordance with its historical importance, modern empiricism as exemplified in its chief works from Bentham to the younger Mill shows itself to be an intellectual movement of high rank and very powerful influence. It not only formed the back-bone and driving force of the specific advance in philosophy, but like no other movement of the day it diffused its influence into the spheres of literature, culture, politics, law, social reform, and education, dominated and informed them with its spirit, and stamped its character upon them. It grew up not so much from the closets of students or from lecture-rooms as from the hard necessities of life and the fluctuating daily struggle for existence. It was not merely the concern of scientists or specialists and so, unlike the Scottish philosophy and other schools of the century, limited mainly to academic and learned circles. This was shown externally by the fact that its chief representatives were not holders of professorships or other academic posts but were mostly engaged in practical professions. From the beginning it develops itself amid the varied occupations and practical conditions of life, and this eminently practical character which is peculiar to it secures to it a much wider and deeper range of influence than is usually accorded to philosophic ideas and movements. Thus it takes over the inheritance of its classical predecessor, while increasing and enhancing it and penetrating more deeply into various provinces of life. It is not only the mirror which picks up and reflects national thought and feeling; it is also together with literature and

poetry the chief moulder of its spirit. What is almost unique in this connection, it opens for philosophy a path of influence upon politics, law, Parliament, legislation, and education. It makes a positive contribution to the solution of urgent social, economic, penological, and other practical questions. In all this it is a true successor of the age of enlightenment wholly averse to the scientific ideal of pure contemplation, and entirely in the service of practice even when it works theoretically. It is pragmatic through and through, even though it has not discovered the philosophic formula for its essential character.

We get another view of empiricism if we raise the question of its intrinsic philosophical value and so test it by the criterion of its classical predecessor. Here as might be expected the comparison is to its disadvantage, although an unprejudiced study will lead to a more favourable judgment than is usually formed of it. For there can be no doubt that the empirical philosophy reached its highest speculative development in the triad Locke, Berkeley, and Hume, so that the development which followed takes in this respect a downward path. In its classical period the system of empiricism had not only established its ground-plan, but had exhausted its speculative possibilities on all points of principle. The XIXth Century was unable to make any important advances within the framework of the traditional doctrine. To this extent the later empiricism is indeed the work of thinkers who are far below their predecessors and is wanting in all true originality and power of creative thought. But the men of this philosophic generation, though inferior to its predecessors, are no mere copyists or commentators, they are not men who live upon inherited wealth and consume it; they employ themselves rather in a careful and fruitful management of their wealth; they put out their inherited capital to interest. Thus, although no real speculative results were achieved, important new positive values were created. These consist mainly in progress in differentiating and distinguishing problems, in refining methods of investigation, and finally in a vast expansion and enrichment of the empirical material and in the opening up of new fields of inquiry. This

later phase of the empirical movement becomes for the first time hungry for experience in the true sense of the word. It collects eagerly masses of new material, arranges and classifies, methodizes and systematizes; in short, tries to apprehend and deal with them philosophically. But when philosophy surrenders itself in this measure to experience, it runs the risk of being mastered by it, instead of mastering it. Thus it becomes ever more forced away from the central problems, and its main interests are deflected to outlying matters. This is shown in a slackening of the properly speculative impulse, in renunciation of constructive system, in a negative attitude to the problems of metaphysics, in the transformation of theory of knowledge into psychology, and of logic into methodology and in the primacy of action. Thus modern empiricism is a movement which is extensive rather than intensive; broad rather than deep. Although this is a disadvantage upon the whole, in one sense it is an advantage. For it has done excellent service in conquering new material and provinces of inquiry. It is to the XIXth Century also that we owe a well-worked-out system of empirical logic, whereas the classical period had produced nothing more than a few suggestions, combined with a general theory of science and a methodology of knowledge which till then had been almost completely neglected. In ethics also there is now achieved for the first time a strict systematization of what in the earlier ethical doctrine had been apprehended indeed, but never reduced to a firm and permanent shape. This holds good less strikingly for psychology; while the work done in theory of knowledge in general shows a definite regress as compared with the earlier. On the other hand, new ground was broken in the spheres of law, politics, social life, education, and others belonging to practice.

Apart from the evolutionist school which will be dealt with in the next section, the main figures of modern empiricism are Bentham, James Mill, and John Stuart Mill. Upon these three thinkers rests the chief burden of the movement and in them is embodied the inheritance of the British tradition in its best and most penetrating form. Although JEREMY BENTHAM (1748–

1832) goes back a long way into the XVIIIth Century both in regard to his intellectual education and to his literary activity, he belongs in regard to his philosophic influence to the XIXth Century. In him we see the earliest representative of what we term modern empiricism. His work lies exclusively in the field of practical philosophy; in the first place in ethics and then in all the departments of study which are based on ethics, such as politics, social reform, legislation, jurisprudence (especially penology), international law, and education. In all these spheres he was a radical innovator and revolutionary, and by him the English thought of the XIXth Century was fertilized more deeply and shaped more intensively than by any other man. Herein he continues and revives those liberal-democratic and utilitarian views established by Locke, by which the century was dominated. No other philosopher's doctrine has had a wider field of influence; none has had more important practical results. He was withal the freest spirit of his age and country. He bowed before no authority and no tradition. He emancipated himself from all bonds of State, Church, constitution, and traditional law; from inveterate prejudices and rigid customs. He was the greatest questioner of the established order of things, both of doctrines and of institutions, the most ruthless transvaluer of traditional values, the severest critic of dead conventions; in short the 'radical philosopher' or 'philosophic radical', as his contemporaries called him. He is the founder of a new political and social ideology which in many respects is akin to that invented later by Karl Marx and may be said to have anticipated it, although it grew out of very different logical assumptions, and is, much more than Marx's ideology, based upon a popular appeal. His ideas, although they were organized into a strict doctrinal system, never aimed at mere instruction, but at the practical purpose of changing and improving existent things. Falling far and wide upon fruitful soil, they were seized upon gladly and enthusiastically by his contemporaries. Everything, in fact, which was current in England at that time among progressive liberal thinkers was attracted by Bentham's doctrine as by a powerful magnet. Thus

for the first time upon British soil, rather by the diligence of pupils than by any particular concern of the master, there was established an ambitious school of philosophic training. The only parallels to it were the much feebler efforts in a similar direction by the thinkers of the XVIIth Century who formed the 'School of Cambridge' and later by the thinkers grouped around Reid. The ideas of the master were taken up by a number of diligent and devoted pupils, commented on, diffused, and applied in many and various directions. Finally they were erected into a political programme, and a political party (known under the name of 'philosophic radicals') was established to carry them out, with a literary organ to diffuse them. Therewith the doctrine transformed itself into propaganda and even entered Parliament, the proper place for transforming ideas into realities. Bentham himself did not come before the public; he lived in quiet retirement engaged in elaborating his system and left everything else to his followers. How much of his ideas was realized in this way by the great legislative reforms of the 'thirties it is not easy to say exactly. But that the spirit of his ideas infused itself into them and contributed considerably to their accomplishment is generally recognized to-day.

In the history of philosophy Bentham figures as the creator and founder of the ethical system of utilitarianism. But he is certainly not the inventor of utility as an ethical principle. This penetrates the moral doctrine of the English and French Enlightenment and is occasionally formulated and applied there. Bentham suddenly received the new insight which lighted up his thinking like a lightning flash on reading the third volume of Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature*. In his own words scales fell from his eyes, when the high importance of the idea of utility for human conduct first flashed upon him. In this creative moment the bridge was established from the classical tradition to its modern revival. Bentham's great historical service consists in this, that he took a firm hold upon this idea, made it the basic principle of his thinking and the main pillar of his system, that he built up this system with vast

energy and perseverance and supplied it with an inexhaustible wealth of empirical material. There is hardly any other system of thought in which a single principle is thus thoroughly systematized and established by a wealth of experience as it is by Bentham. For not only the masses of empirical material, which he brought under his main theoretic principle, but the principle itself was also a result gained from experience. Herein we can see the sharp contrast in which this doctrine stands to the views of the Scottish school to which it was historically opposed. On one side there are *a priori* principles, innate in human nature and established as immediately evident by intuitive knowledge, on which our judgments of value rest. On the other side there is the simple thought, which is confirmed by innumerable experiences and may be verified at any moment, that all human conduct is determined by and filled with striving to obtain pleasure and to avoid pain. How Bentham from this elementary principle arrived at the universal application of the principle of utility and from thence at his famous ethical formula of the "greatest happiness of the greatest number", how he advanced to the qualification of the whole moral life and thence to the establishment of a balance of pleasure and pain in human conduct or to the so-called hedonistic calculus, how he applied these ideas to the most diverse spheres of practical life, especially to politics and social reform—none of this can be followed out further here. It must suffice to mention that he tried to bring the whole sphere of human action (both individual and social) under a single dominant principle which is all-embracing, applied with ruthless consistency and brutal disregard of counter-arguments. In this way he tried to get a rational view of the confusing multiplicity of moral phenomena and to subordinate them to a strictly reasoned system. Thus ethics (together with the other practical departments of study) was to be raised for the first time to the rank of a strict science and, like the natural sciences, added to the domain of exact inquiry. The greatness of this conception and of its execution depends upon the radical isolation of one definite and separate aspect with a magnificent neglect of all the others. Out of a

complex and many-dimensional field Bentham cuts a single surface and presents it to us with all the apparatus of exact scientific investigation. This was achieved by making the principle of utility the all-important factor and by subjecting the whole moral life to a complete quantification. Thus ethics was divested not only of all qualitative elements, but of all metaphysical, religious, and other conditions, and Bentham even sought to dispense with the psychological foundation which British moralists both before and since have always considered indispensable.

The development of British thought which follows, partly in Bentham's lifetime and partly after it, is influenced entirely by the powerful, well-established, and logical system of utilitarianism. But it was inevitable that this system, which claimed to be final, should decline into dogmatism, and instead of setting minds free, should put a crippling constraint upon all who fell within its influence. For a long time, apart from the followers of the Scottish school and a few minor thinkers and eccentrics, utilitarianism claimed the adhesion of almost the whole body of English philosophers and workers in philosophy. The great problems of life and thought seemed here to be finally solved, and no room was left for the free development of philosophic powers, except for the ever more minute and detailed extension of the basic principle, and for its application to wide provinces. In moral philosophy Bentham seemed to have spoken the last word, and, as metaphysical and religious problems were completely set aside by him, the wings of speculation were clipped. The stiff orthodoxy of the school of Bentham thus came to form the strongest hindrance to further philosophic progress.

Of those contemporaries of Bentham who made independent contributions and, without being directly pledged to follow him, moved along the paths of utilitarian thought, we must mention at least Godwin, Malthus, and Ricardo. All three belong less to the philosophic movement in the proper sense than to that spiritual *milieu* which draws its nourishment from philosophy and in turn enriches philosophy. WILLIAM GODWIN

(1756–1836), whose famous and striking book *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793) is the chief of his writings to be mentioned here, is a more radical and uncompromising assailant of the existing social order even than Bentham himself. He was under the direct influence of the wave of the French Revolution and is the first systematic revolutionary among British thinkers. He also regards pleasure and happiness as the motives of human action and like Bentham he demands their maximization in order to obtain the ideal Utopian condition of society to which he aspires. Reason, which he invests with sovereign rights, is for him the sole guide and liberator of man from political oppression and religious servitude. His fanatical faith in progress, his anarchism, his zeal against priestcraft and those who delude the people, his humanitarian and cosmopolitan dream of human happiness, his deification of reason, his attack upon social institutions and current ethical ideas, were all drawn from the spiritual armoury of the Enlightenment and the Revolution. By Godwin they were brought together into a closely reasoned system of thought, and as they were presented with passionate feeling, they shook men's minds with immense power, above all those of the romantic poets. Coleridge and Wordsworth, Southey and Shelley, and many others succumbed to the charm of Godwin's doctrine and saw themselves compelled to come to terms with it, in part to free themselves from it, in part to be engulfed by it.

Godwin's soaring Utopian views were attacked by THOMAS R. MALTHUS (1766–1834) in his noteworthy and notorious *Essay on the Principle of Population* (first published in 1798) which brought the matter back on to the ground of sober fact. His theory of population, which immediately on its first appearance unloosed a storm of indignation and a flood of replies, was aimed in the first place against the delusion of progress and of the ever-increasing perfectibility of man and society which was characteristic of the Enlightenment. It aimed at showing that the realization of such dreams of happiness was shattered against the iron law which the problem of population

reveals to us: to the effect that population increases much faster than the means of support. Accordingly we can expect no progressive increase of happiness, but on the contrary an increase of individual and social misery due to these conditions. Malthus's doctrine, which in its consequences concurred with Bentham's line of thought, became at once a component of the utilitarian doctrine, and gave a powerful though depressing impulse to English economic thinking which left its traces in practical legislation. As a living force it maintained itself at least till after the middle of the century. Historically it was more influenced by A. Tucker and W. Paley than by Bentham; not to speak of Hume, to whose ideas on population it owed much, as Malthus himself gratefully acknowledged. Later Darwin borrowed from it the pregnant idea of the struggle for existence (the term itself occurs in Malthus) and thus obtained the point of view which dominated his biological researches.

DAVID RICARDO (1772–1823) with strict adherence to principle and with much wider application than Malthus developed the economic doctrine of utilitarianism in his *Principles of Political Economy and Taxation* (1817). Any estimate of the surpassing importance of this book, which is a landmark in the history of British political economy, or any examination of the doctrine contained in it lies outside our present scope. It was surpassed only by the classical work of Adam Smith, with which it is closely connected, carrying on its line of thought into the XIXth Century in an independent form. Ricardo stood, mainly through the mediation of James Mill, in closer connection with Bentham's ideas than did Malthus, with whose social and political views he essentially agreed. The economic thinking of the XIXth Century, especially that of Marx, owes its basic ideas to him, and his views later became increasingly the commonplaces of the theoretic study of economic laws and facts.

After Bentham, the main stream of utilitarian thought is continued directly in JAMES MILL (1773–1836). He is the young protégé, friend and ally of Bentham, whose doctrine he takes over and carries on like a confession of faith. He forms a

bridge from the refounder of empiricism to its completer: from Bentham to his own son John Stuart Mill. Thus his position is mainly a mediating one. It is his task to guard the inheritance in order to hand it on pure and unadulterated into the hands of his greater son and successor. He was the most vocal herald and most zealous propagandist of Benthamite ideas. Round him mainly there grouped themselves those 'philosophic Radicals' who worked for the renovation of English political life in the spirit of Bentham. His literary activity directed itself mainly upon moral philosophy and the practical studies cognate with it; upon history, jurisprudence, theory of the State, politics, and political economy, in which latter study he professed himself to be the immediate follower of Ricardo. In all these provinces he drew upon the ideas of the school, which had passed into his bones and which he felt no need to question. To the utilitarian formula of the greatest happiness of the greatest number he adhered with the enthusiasm and zeal of an initiated disciple.

In one respect, however, he performed an important and necessary service for the cause of the school. Bentham had taken next to no trouble about the theoretic foundation of his doctrine, and thus there was a gap in his system which needed to be filled, especially as the opposing Scottish school had produced works of high merit which could be neutralized only by works of equal merit from the other side. Mill undertook this task in his most important book *Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind* (1829, new edition by J. S. Mill, 1869). In it he laid the psychological foundation of the utilitarian doctrine. Apart from its function as a foundation, Mill's psychology has a special historical importance. For such a foundation it was necessary to have recourse to the older empirical ideas, and accordingly Mill had to pick up or effect a junction with the thread of development at the point where it had been broken by the Scottish thinkers half a century before, that is, with the association-psychology of the older classical school. Thus Mill's psychology shaped itself by recurring to the doctrines of Hume and Hartley and therefore

in express opposition to the intuitionism of the Scottish school. He gave currency again to the mechanism of the mind, introduced once more the anatomizing method and with it psychic chemistry, held firmly to the analysis of mental phenomena into their simplest parts (psychic atoms), revived the law of association as the basic law of psychic life and the phenomenalist view in the theory of knowledge, and thus called afresh into existence the whole stock of ideas belonging to the classical philosophic theory. He drew nearer to Hartley than to Locke and Hume, but refrained from all physiological explanations and confined himself to the simple exploration of consciousness. He had a keen eye for analysis, kept a firm grasp upon his main principle of association, refined his method, strengthened his system, and brought in new empirical material, but never abandoned in any essential point the foundations consecrated by tradition. Here again, Mill played his characteristic part of mediator by doing the same service for theoretical studies that Bentham had done for practice, i.e. renovating thought with the spirit of classical British philosophy. His historical importance lies in the fact that he gave to psychology and theory of knowledge a stimulus which involved a long series of further results and remained vigorous at least till near the end of the century.

The work of John Stuart Mill, the greatest empiricist thinker of the XIXth Century, grew organically out of the philosophic situation created by Bentham and J. Mill. Before we pass on to him it is necessary to mention the names of some men who were born between the elder and the younger Mill and are also closely connected with them. Among the closer friends of the Mills, at first intimate with the father and later standing in paternal friendship with the son, were the jurist JOHN AUSTIN (1790–1859), and the historian GEORGE GROTE, brother of the philosopher, John Grote, who will be mentioned later. Austin, for some years Professor of Law in the University of London, undertook a stricter systematization of the province of law from the utilitarian standpoint, and in his influential book *The Province of Jurisprudence determined* (1832) laid the

foundations of a philosophy of law.[1] But his affiliation to the utilitarian circle was complicated by influences coming to him from the historical school of law and the German romantics; since in his later twenties he made a long stay as a student in Heidelberg and Bonn, where he formed acquaintance with men like Savigny, A. W. Schlegel, Brandis, and others. In this way his thought gained a wider outlook beyond the orthodox limits of Benthamism; and this showed itself in many ways, not the least being that he based the ethics of utility not upon utility itself, but tried to support it by religious sanctions. Grote, famous as the historian of Greece, had from the first more sympathy with the views of the elder Mill than Austin, and joined Mill energetically in the reforming efforts of philosophic radicalism, which he also represented in Parliament. But his system of thought was fed from other sources, above all from Greek philosophy, with which he was thoroughly acquainted (as witness his works on Plato and Aristotle). In his posthumous *Fragments on Ethical Subjects* (1876), his only systematic work, he tried to establish the social character of morality more effectively than the utilitarians had done with their predominantly individualistic views, emphasizing the primacy of society over the individual and the individual's duty to subordinate himself to the collective will of the community.

Beside Austin and Grote we may mention here SIR JOHN HERSCHEL (1792–1871) and WILLIAM WHEWELL (1794–1866). Though far away from Bentham's circle, they did important work in preparation for the logical inquiries of the younger Mill. In the *Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy* (1830) by Herschel, the great astronomer, Mill found not only abundant documentary material taken from the natural sciences for describing the processes of induction, but he saw here his own empirical method implicitly at work, though not yet explicitly explained. Still more valuable for him were the comprehensive researches of Whewell, based upon thorough knowledge of the theory and history of the inductive sciences

[1] From his papers were published after his death *Lectures on Jurisprudence, or the Philosophy of Positive Law* (1863).

as set forth in his two monumental works *History of the Inductive Sciences* (1837, German translation 1839–42) and *Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences* (1840). Whewell possessed a quite stupendous knowledge of the past, and in the range and thoroughness of his encyclopaedic learning surpassed even Hamilton himself, who had the reputation of being the most learned man of his time. In preparing the third book of his *Logic* ("On Induction"), Mill made full use of the material accumulated by Whewell and gratefully acknowledged that without this preliminary work he could not have been equal to his task. But at the same time he felt with sure instinct the definite methodological contrast which separated him from Whewell. In him he saw a representative of what he called the German or *a priori* view of human knowledge and its capacities. Whewell was, in fact, strongly influenced by Kant and rejected the empirical logic and theory of knowledge. Like Mill he recognized the fundamental importance which belongs to induction as the process of deducing general truths and principles from particular facts in all scientific investigation and discovery. And therefore he called 'inductive' those sciences which are usually called 'natural sciences.' In them he did not put the sole emphasis upon the observation of facts, but regarded as an equally important factor the ideas in forming which understanding plays the main part. It is quite in accordance with the Kantian doctrine that perceptions are blind without ideas, while ideas without perceptions are empty, when Whewell in the introduction to the first-mentioned work says that the essential condition of all scientific progress is the union of clear ideas with definite facts. It is called by Whewell the fundamental antithesis of philosophy that the idea must never be independent of observed fact, but that fact must ever be drawn towards the idea. This he expressed aphoristically in the following passage: "The antithesis of *sense* and *ideas* is the foundation of the philosophy of science. No knowledge can exist without the union, no philosophy without the separation, of these two elements" (*Philos. of the Inductive Sciences*, new edition, 1847, vol. ii, p. 443). Whewell's purpose in his two

great works was to restore Bacon's *Novum Organum* and to bring Bacon's work up to the advanced level of modern science. Thus the study of the methodological bases of science began with Whewell and was continued directly by Mill's *Logic*, and the controversy which subsequently arose between them proved very fruitful and awakened interest in these questions both in philosophical and in scientific circles.

We come now to JOHN STUART MILL (1806–73), in whom modern empiricism reaches its conclusion, as the classical empiricism reached its conclusion in Hume a century earlier. Many persons think Mill to be the greatest British thinker of the XIXth Century. However this may be, it is certain that he was the greatest philosophic writer of his age. Like Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Shaftesbury, Berkeley,[1] Hume, Bentham, James Mill, and later Spencer, he never held an academic post, and practised philosophy, not as a merely scientific or learned pursuit, or for the benefit of a small circle of students and experts, but as a spiritual mission to be fulfilled in obedience to an inward call and, as it were, before the eyes of the whole nation. He was the foremost philosophic voice of his time and became one of the series of great literary and creative forces that, like him, have stamped themselves upon the spiritual aspect of England in the XIXth Century. With Mill, more than with his immediate predecessors, philosophy came forth from its previous narrow circle, extended itself till it became an affair of general literature, and thus became the property of the whole intellectual élite of the nation. It was carried on in the forum of a wide and broad publicity, into which it radiates its powers, while in its turn it was strengthened by the influences of the cultural life by which it was surrounded.

In the development of British philosophy, Mill's work stands for the last great synthesis of empiricism. In it all the leading themes of empiricism unite once more into a great harmony. This occurs, not in the form of a well-fitted and strictly regulated system, as with Spencer later; but in that freer style which occupies as many provinces of experience as

[1] [Berkeley was Fellow and Tutor in Trinity College, Dublin.—ED.]

possible, in order to penetrate them with philosophic thought, but not to include them in a comprehensive unity or to subject them to the constraint of an architecturally composed system. The former and not the latter is indeed the true style of empirical philosophizing, which, because it is devoted to experience in all its manifold possibilities, cannot surrender itself directly to a simple basic idea or find satisfaction in the regimentation of a system. Systematized thought, such as later occupies a predominant position with Spencer, is an alien element which it is hard to reconcile with the principles of empiricism. As these principles are held unimpaired by Mill, we may regard him and not Spencer as the last genuine representative of the great British tradition.

This tradition had passed into his bones in early youth. His education was made according to the ideas and under the sole control of his father, far from school and university, strictly in the spirit and according to the principles of the Benthamite philosophy. He himself has described this extraordinary experiment vividly in his *Autobiography* (1873), and it is almost a miracle that he was not ruined by it. The doctrine with which he was thus inoculated under outer compulsion he accepted willingly and in full faith and thus at the age of fifteen he was a finished and perfect utilitarian, who was at home in all the doctrines of the school and had acquired all imaginable sorts of knowledge. He was so completely caught by the system that at the age of sixteen, together with some kindred spirits, he founded a philosophical society, which he called the 'Utilitarian'. It was from this use, apart from isolated earlier applications, that the term gradually gained currency. The word 'utilitarian' which Mill boyishly inscribed upon his banner became for him the symbol of all that he had acquired in philosophy through his father, i.e. the ideas of Bentham and his school.

At the age of twenty Mill was overtaken by a severe spiritual crisis, which must be noticed here, because it determined all his future life and for the first time emancipated what had been so far repressed by his artificial education, his own native character. This crisis, especially in the fruitful effects which it

produced later, implied nothing else than a reaction against the doctrinaire narrowness and stuffiness of the views in which his education had imprisoned him. Already he showed a certain reaction against the eudaemonist theory of happiness, the determinist ethics, and the tyranny of the understanding. For the first time he became aware of the high importance of art and poetry as cultural influences, for the first time he recognized the need for the education of the emotions and the imagination as well as of the merely theoretic faculty of understanding; and the value of the inner culture of the individual soul besides the mere arrangement of external conditions. The new world, which now poured in upon him and which enabled him to overcome his deep spiritual shock, was first disclosed to him by his absorption in the poetry of Wordsworth. Later many helps came from other sides; at first from his occupation with the genius of Goethe, then from his acquaintance with the great romantic poet and thinker Coleridge, with whom he came into touch both through his own reading and by friendly intercourse with enthusiastic young friends of Coleridge such as Frederick D. Maurice and John Sterling, the friend of Carlyle who died young; and finally from Carlyle himself, who had then begun to reveal the spiritual world of Germany to his countrymen. By him Mill felt himself partly attracted, partly repelled. Although resisting, he could not wholly withdraw himself from his influence, which was responsible not only for the direction in which his thought was now moving, but also for the limitations within which it remained enclosed. One thing was certain to him, that he had now parted irrevocably with his father's mode of thinking.

All this was made clear in two important papers which Mill published in 1838 and 1840 in the *Westminster Review*; the first devoted to Bentham, the second to Coleridge (both included later in the first volume of *Dissertations and Discussions*, 1859). These essays deserve special attention, because in them Mill was one of the first to set forth the decisive contrast by which the spiritual life of his time was divided into two sharply opposed camps. This contrast on one side was embodied

and symbolized in Bentham, who continued the traditions of the XVIIIth Century, and on the other side in Coleridge, in whom the new spiritual forces which had appeared in the XIXth Century concentrated themselves and pressed for utterance. Mill, who by origin, environment, and education was pledged to the world of Bentham and later was moved profoundly by that of Coleridge, felt the polar tensions which discharged themselves in the bearers of these two names and the dialectical forces which came to expression in them. He recognized with keen sagacity the absolute opposition between their ideas and views of life ("every Englishman to-day is by implication either a Benthamite or Coleridgian"), and he described them, on the whole correctly, by saying that Coleridge's doctrine is ontological, conservative, religious, concrete, historical, and poetic, while Bentham's is experimental, innovative, infidel, abstract, matter-of-fact, and essentially prosaic. In a wider sense he viewed the contrast as that between the XVIIIth and XIXth Centuries, or as that between the Enlightenment and the romantic period, or again as that between the British and German spirit. At the same time he felt the necessity of reconciling these contrasts with one another and balancing their tensions, and an inner call to try to effect a synthesis of them, in the conviction that "whoever could master the premises and combine the methods of both would possess the entire English philosophy of the age".

The shock which he received from Coleridge, whom Mill rightly regarded as the English interpreter of German idealism, had temporarily at least the result of carrying him far from the dogmas of Bentham's school. In the essay on Bentham he discussed the master's system and pointed out the mistakes and inadequacies of his doctrine. He dissociated himself, as he said later, "emphatically from the narrow-hearted Benthamism of his early writings". He saw plainly that Bentham's philosophy had touched only the surface of things and that the deeper and finer aspects of life remained hidden from it. These Coleridge had brought to light and from him, therefore, Mill

sought enlightenment on those decisive questions in which, as he believed, he had renounced the traditional way of thinking. If now we survey Mill's later work in his chief books, all of which belong to a time *subsequent* to these two essays, the question arises to what extent the impulse from Coleridge proved fruitful and how far his standpoint was changed by it. The right answer to this question will at the same time put Mill's historical position in its true light.

First it must be said that the impulse from Coleridge, as we might briefly term the opening of Mill's mind to the currents of thought springing from Idealism and Romanticism, reached its highest point with the composition of these essays, and that in Mill's later thought there was no enhancement of its power, but rather a weakening of it. Mill himself was under this impression when towards the end of his life he looked back over this phase of his development (in his *Autobiography*) and observed that at that period he had mistakenly emphasized too much the favourable side of one line of thought (Coleridge) and the unfavourable side of the other (Bentham). Often, later, he affirmed his solidarity with the ideas of the XVIIIth Century against which he had at that time experienced a certain reaction, but had never completely given up. It is a remarkable fact that though he was introduced by Coleridge, Carlyle, and others to the world of German thought, Mill never exerted himself to master the German philosophic systems. In this respect he was far inferior to his older contemporary Hamilton. It is true that he was superficially acquainted with the poetry of Goethe and the educational theories of Pestalozzi, and later came into contact with Wilhelm von Humboldt. But what he knew of the German philosophic movement from Kant to Hegel was derived almost exclusively from hearsay, and did not get beyond some confused and vague ideas. Here Mill, whose freer spirit was in other respects widely accessible to outside influences, persisted in that insularity which is characteristic of so many British thinkers. Wherever he suspected German influences, he set himself against them and depreciated them in favour of his national tradition. German

philosophy was to him a book with seven seals whose secrets he felt not the smallest desire to discover.

Nevertheless, Coleridge's impulse did not pass from him without trace. He never definitely broke away from his old associations, or arrived at a real reconciliation of the old with the new ideas. Through him the utilitarian movement became fluid once more, pressed over its narrow boundaries, and burst its dogmatic shell. Although it did not conquer much new country, it became conscious of its own limits, and there arose in it an anticipation of new ideas and fresh philosophic life. One cannot say that there was a radical renovation, but there was an important change in the traditional doctrine; a change which did not surrender the old doctrine in any important point but at many points shook it, and occasionally altered it to such an extent that it would no longer fit into the former framework. With Mill, as Paul Hensel justly says (vide *Kleine Schriften und Vorträge*, 1930, pp. 139 seq.), many ideas sprang into activity from within the fixed forms of traditional doctrine which went far beyond what these forms could include. "His whole life was a manly struggle to force his rich and individual character into the Procrustean bed of a narrow system" (ibid.).

Mill manifested his superiority to most of his contemporaries in the fact that he was willing to learn from everyone (with the exception of German philosophers) who had anything to say to him. His thinking shows almost always that conciliatory spirit which is ready to mediate between opposing schools of thought and to allow contradictory arguments to act upon each other.

As we have seen, Mill's philosophy sprang from the soil of British tradition. As an assumed possession he first takes over in ethics the utilitarianism of Bentham, in psychology and theory of knowledge the doctrines of his father, in political economy the theories of Malthus and Ricardo, in metaphysics and religion the agnosticism which was common to them all. Next from outside comes that new system of ideas which is embodied in Coleridge and Carlyle. This his philosophy,

though it was shaken by it, was never able to assimilate. Another school with which rather later (*circa* 1840) Mill's philosophy comes into contact is the French positivism of St. Simon and his great pupil Comte. It was better suited than the other to Mill's way of thinking and was therefore quickly apprehended and easily assimilated. His relations with Comte, which took a personal form by exchange of letters, led to a thorough union of the two systems. Thence sprang a philosophic combination which rested on the similarity of aim and inner kinship of their views. In Mill English Empiricism and French Positivism flowed together in one wide channel. Nevertheless, from the last phase of Comte's thought Mill turned away disappointed. In its pseudo-religious rigidity he thought that the freedom of philosophic inquiry was endangered, and felt compelled to reject it. But it is the German and the Scottish schools that throughout are the main opponents.

Mill takes little notice of the deep differences between the two schools. He sees only their common opposition to his own methods. Thus the whole philosophy of his age presents itself to him under the single aspect of a tension between the German-Scottish and the British group, or between the transcendental philosophy of Kant, the common-sense theory of Reid, and Hamilton's doctrine which sprang from their union on the one side and empiricism on the other side. He finds himself continually in conflict with everything which does not spring from experience or cannot be verified through experience; against innate ideas, *a priori* truths, and intuitive certainties, whether in knowledge or ethics or anywhere else. Under this he includes everything which is supposed to be part of the secure property of healthy human understanding and therefore all those basic elements and principles of human nature which Reid's analysis had brought to light. Apriorism in all its varieties is for him nothing but a great *asylum ignorantiae*, which he makes responsible for the corruption of all true science and of all honest philosophic inquiry. In his own time the doctrine of Hamilton stood as the strongest bulwark of this intuitionist philosophy, and against it and its powerful

influence he prepared himself for a final struggle. Mill's polemical book against Hamilton (1865) is the last phase of this long conflict between the opposing schools in Great Britain, and with it the strife is buried. It ends with the complete overthrow of the adversary and the triumphant affirmation of Empiricism.

Mill's work in the several departments of philosophy can be noticed here only very summarily. In the first place—not only on respect of time, but in respect of their importance—stand his services to logic. To him and no one else does Empiricism owe the establishment and development of its logical theory. Compared with him the work of his predecessors is hardly appreciable.[1] It is true that Hobbes, Locke, and Hume built the foundations, but Mill was the first to raise the edifice. He subjected the whole area of this province to a thorough systematization and, Bacon apart, he was in the main the first to make the logical foundations of the exact sciences a matter of inquiry. He makes an epoch in the history of logic, not only as regards the new methodical foundation of this study, but also as regards the vast extension of its field of work. All subsequent logic, so far as it did not move along the familiar lines of the Aristotelian tradition or follow idealist-metaphysical or mathematical paths, is more or less indebted to him. But even the traditional and idealist systems were spurred by him to new reflection upon the basis of their method. Through Mill the psychological tendency in logic gained the upper hand for many decades and its predominance was not broken till Husserl's epoch-making inquiries about the end of the century. All inquiries into the theory and method of science take their

[1] The only man who before Mill and Whewell gave a decided impulse to the study of logic, which was so much neglected all through the XVIIIth Century, was Richard Whately, Archbishop of Dublin (1787–1863). In 1826 he published his *Elements of Logic*, which went through many editions. It is a textbook of formal logic on the lines of the traditional doctrine, treating the forms and rules of inference, with special attention to fallacies. But it was merely the revival of interest in logical problems for which Mill's work was indebted to him, not for any definite suggestions from his teaching. On other logical works of the first half of the century see p. 705.

start mainly from Mill, and however far they may have departed from him subsequently, are indebted to him for their beginnings. Mill has added a whole new area to the frame of logical science in his doctrine of the method of forming scientific concepts and of exact inquiry generally. His logic of the natural sciences, which is developed in the fundamental sections on induction, is, as compared with all previous attempts of this kind, the most systematic treatment of this field, to which he added the first attempt to form a logic of the mental sciences. It is true that he was not yet able to recognize the essential differences between the methods of the two; and that he overemphasized the claim of natural science to supremacy. But he saw that there was an important logical problem here, and he was one of the first to include in the domain of logic a group of sciences which had been almost completely neglected by logicians. These facts should not be forgotten by later logicians and writers on the methods of mental science, many of whom to-day show scant respect for Mill's work. He tries to solve this problem by regarding the procedure of mental science as being strictly parallel to that of natural science; through such a parallelism alone does he think that mental studies can be made strictly scientific. In general, Mill's *Logic* (which first appeared in two volumes in 1843 under the title *A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive*) is the strictest and most comprehensive application of the principles of Empiricism which has been carried out in Great Britain. Mill has driven apriorism from its last and strongest positions and has not shrunk from drawing the most radical conclusions. Thus he goes far beyond all his predecessors, even beyond Hume. They had not ventured to attack the autonomy of logic in this place or that; they had shrunk from interfering with certain provinces consecrated by centuries of tradition. But Mill made a clean sweep. He explained the logical axioms themselves and mathematical propositions as being nothing but inductions from experience. "We see no reason to believe that there can be any object of our knowledge, whether our experience or what may be inferred from our experience by analogy, or that there is

any idea, feeling, or power in the human mind which needs for its justification and its origin to be referred to any other source than to experience." This leading theme rings like a great basic harmony through the whole of Mill's *Logic*.

In the *theory of knowledge* also Mill tries to establish the empirical-psychological standpoint in its full logical purity, mainly and with comprehensive argument in his second philosophic work, his *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1865). It is the basic work of modern Empiricism on the theory of knowledge as James Mill's *Analysis* is on psychology. Mill's capacity for clear, fluent presentation and for practical, critical controversy here reaches its highest development. His doctrine of knowledge, however, is much below his logic in philosophic importance. Here there was no new province to conquer; but only a field to be cultivated anew which had already been occupied intensively by the classical representatives of Empiricism, whose work he was able to utilize. In the main he recurs to the old ideas of Berkeley and Hume, and reaches some new formulations, but no real additions to knowledge. His standpoint is that of a strictly articulated phenomenalism, the most important doctrines of which are those concerning the nature of matter and mind. The solution of the problem of the external world (or of matter) is found by him in the effort to avoid crude sensationalism, in the well-known formula of 'permanent possibilities of sensation.' Not the sensations which are immediately present to consciousness and are continually in flux and wanting in all duration and permanence, but the fact that under given conditions we expect certain sensations as possible and that these possible sensations possess stability and permanence, this seems to him to be the key to the problem. But he is not aware that the concepts 'possibility' and 'permanence' presuppose an objective arrangement of things and that therefore strict sensationalism, which dissolves all real being into feelings and their associations, is surrendered in principle. Moreover, the doctrine of the mind or ego is developed upon the same lines. In complete agreement with Hume's bundle-theory, Mill

defines mind as the series of our feelings, as they actually appear in consciousness, and he extends this theory only in so far as he adds to the feelings which present themselves immediately those infinite possibilities of feeling and emotion which need merely certain conditions for their actual presentation; these conditions being always present as possibilities whether they actually occur or not. Yet he notices the remarkable fact that this bundle of feelings is aware of itself as past or future, so that we must either regard the ego as a something different in principle from a series of feelings or possibilities of feeling or must accept the paradox that something which *ex hypothesi* is merely a series of feelings can be aware of itself as a series. Mill can neither solve this paradox nor make up his mind to revise the bundle-theory in favour of a doctrine of the ego as a spiritual principle of unity. He contents himself with observing this mysterious fact, and renounces any attempt to explain it. In any case his dead stop in face of this and of other problems shows that he often had to suppress violently the illumination of his own better insight, in order to remain faithful to the traditional doctrine of his school. Though he viewed this with increasing mistrust, he never came either here or elsewhere really to break through the crust of tradition.

He failed to do so in his *Ethics*, developed mainly in his *Utilitarianism*, 1863, which must now be briefly described. Here also Mill starts from the radically utilitarian doctrine of Bentham and his own father, but, without completely giving up the principle of utility, arrives in the course of his development at a much more refined and less repellent moral theory. One may say that Mill transposed the hard and shrill tones of the Benthamite doctrine into a subtler and nobler key. His high ethical sensibility, combined with a finely appreciative feeling for value, failed to find satisfaction in a doctrine which had reduced all human action to a striving for pleasure and happiness and had expressed all feelings of pleasure and happiness in purely quantitative terms. Mill weighs feelings of pleasure and unpleasure against each other, in this respect a true utilitarian. But in his reckoning he includes also qualitative

differences, estimating feelings of pleasure not only according to their quantity but according to their higher or lower value. Thus a higher kind of value can outweigh a great quantity of a lower kind, and a man may be regarded as a higher moral character if the higher kinds are more fully developed in him than the lower. When Mill prefers to speak of the welfare of mankind instead of the greatest happiness of the greatest number, when in his ethics he says more about duty and character than about happiness and utility, when he rates the ethical worth of man more highly than mere effort to obtain pleasure, and when finally he plants the ethical ideal in the all-round and harmonious development of personality, he is following out the consequences of that important correction which he made in the basic formula of utilitarianism. Similarly, he softened the extreme individualism of the school by bringing it into harmony with a moderate socialism. It is easy to see that here new wine has been poured into old bottles. The methodological bases are the same as in Mill's predecessors, but the content has been considerably changed. Mill is standing upon the threshold of a new view of life which, bound in the fetters of tradition, he is not able to seize resolutely, but of which he has a lively foreboding.

A glance at Mill's attitude to *metaphysical* and *religious* questions will round off the picture which I have been trying to sketch. His autobiography contains the following impressive passage; "I am one of the very few examples in this country of one who has not thrown off religious belief, but never had it. I grew up in a negative state with regard to it." Much later Mill wrote *Three Essays on Religion* which aroused general surprise when they were published after his death. For in them he no longer maintains his cool sceptical attitude to final questions. He discusses them in a thoroughly speculative manner, although feeling his way cautiously to positive views upon the cosmic order, upon the meaning of suffering in the world, upon the nature of God, and other metaphysical questions. In his careful examination of the path which should lead him from the empirical bases of his thought to the

attempt to answer transcendental problems, he shows much sympathy with the idea of a divine world-principle. This he thinks of as a being of the highest moral perfection, but not of infinite power. Thus he finds the idea of a finite God, who in constant struggle against the negative world-principles leads the cosmic process upwards to ever higher development and thus needs the active co-operation of man, to harmonize best both with moral and with religious experience—an idea which has often shown itself fruitful in later times. Although this last phase of Mill's thought cannot be harmonized with the views on these matters which he inherited, it stands in no contradiction to his own philosophic development. It shows the more definite appearance of ideas which were latent in the general course of his thought and were not completely unfolded only because they were repressed by the system which he had inherited.

The most gifted pupil of Mill, who was one of his inner circle of friends and owed his advancement to him, was ALEXANDER BAIN (1818–1903). He was, like the Mills, of Scottish origin and held from 1860–80 the professorship of logic in the University of Aberdeen. Through him and his success as a teacher the newer empirical school received for the first time an academic representation corresponding to its importance and extended itself through the north of the kingdom where so far the Scottish school had held the field, and where recently idealism also had established itself. In Bain, Fraser, whom we may call a rear-guard leader of the Scottish school, and E. Caird the three chief schools of British philosophy in the XIXth Century were for many years represented contemporaneously at the Scottish universities; the Scottish school was in decline, the empirical at its highest point, and the idealist on the upward path.

Bain, who beside his work as a teacher, was active and versatile as a writer on psychology, logic, ethics, education, grammar, and rhetoric, is known mainly for his work on psychology. In his two great and influential works *The Senses and the Intellect* (1855) and *The Emotions and the Will* (1859), in which

he treated the whole field of mental life more thoroughly and comprehensively than had ever before been done, he carried forward the direct line of British psychology by attaching his views more to the elder than to the younger Mill, who, while not neglecting this department of study, did not cultivate it systematically. John Stuart Mill himself, whom Bain had helped in the preparation of his *Logic* and with whom Bain later worked in fruitful co-operation, received important assistance from this pupil and regarded him as the proper continuer of his own work.

Although Bain's psychology grew from the tradition of the British school and adheres to it completely both in its methods of inquiry and its philosophical presuppositions, it shows in many respects an advance beyond the former position and points forward to the future period of evolutionism and voluntarism. His close connection with tradition is shown not only by his strong feeling for facts, his regard for the exact sciences, his accumulation and exploitation of great masses of materials of inquiry, but also by his analytic-descriptive method, his maintenance of the principle of association, and finally his rejection of the speculative metaphysics of the soul. In contrast to the two Mills, who limited themselves to the psychology of consciousness, he enlarged the outlook of psychology in the direction of physiology, as Hartley before him had done, though not in Hartley's obscure, half metaphysical, half exact style, but in making full use of the physiological results which were available at that time, especially of those which were furnished by Johannes Müller, putting the whole apparatus of physiology into the service of psychology. The relations of psychic phenomena to their correlates in the brain and nervous system are investigated; the higher psychic processes are referred to their instinctive foundations and organic conditions; and all this is carried through free from any speculative motive and kept within the limits of exact science. But although Bain draws no materialist conclusions and indeed expressly rejects them, he hands over the whole mental life and the whole sphere of consciousness so completely to material processes that

he is always in danger of falling into the abyss of materialism, and is only secured from it because he turns psychology into an exact natural science and avoids every philosophic decision. And as Hartley's first attempt to base mental life upon physiological processes had escaped descent into materialism only because of a strong religious faith, so this second attempt of Bain escaped a like fate only because of his preoccupation with strict scientific method.

In important points Bain considerably extended and improved the association-psychology and introduced many new ideas into its rigid scheme. He advanced beyond its preoccupation with intellect by giving full recognition to the emotional factors, the impulses, instincts, affections, etc., and also recognized the decisive importance of the whole sphere of the will for the formation and course of psychic processes. Thus he was the first of his school to make the attempt to break away from the passive mechanics of association and to recognize the activity and spontaneity of mental life. He also tries to escape from the atomizing of the soul by regarding it less as a sum of associated elements than as a fluid process or continuum. In all this he took account of the element of will and of its physiological correlates, and although he is remote from evolutionary views (his first important book appeared at the same time as Spencer's *Principles of Psychology*, his second in the same year as Darwin's *Origin of Species*), he adduced in his explanations both physiological and biological factors, and made use more than hitherto had been done of the genetic method. Further elements of importance are his doctrine of attention, in which stress is laid upon the element of activity, and the revival of Hume's theory of 'belief', and his discussion of the problem of the external world in relation to the theory of knowledge. The external object is for Bain not merely the product of firmly associated series of presentations, which we passively accept, but a factor assumed in our practical behaviour, which releases in us tensional energies and upon its side sets itself in opposition to us. In the subjective feeling of such opposition lies, according to Bain, the root of our belief in an

external or transcendent reality. Here also the sensationalist and intellectualist points of view are replaced by the emotional and voluntarist.

Many such details point to the later development of psychology as we have it in Spencer, Wundt, Ward, Stout, and others. Nevertheless, Bain's doctrine remains upon the whole associationist, or at least is always reverting to associationism. With him also as with Mill the fetters of the school show themselves to be stronger than the new insight. It is true that he rattles the fetters, but he cannot break them. For, though he puts the spontaneity of mental life much more in the foreground than anyone before him, it turns out that the source of this spontaneity is to be sought not so much in the soul itself as in such physiological and organic factors as muscular sensations, reflex movements, release of tension, etc., upon which he bases all psychic phenomena. The active character of psychic processes as such or specifically mental energy is never definitely recognized by him.

Bain's service, therefore, consists essentially in the fact that he gave a more modern and progressive turn to the empirical psychology. Compared with this the rest of his work, however serviceable it may have been in his day, is much inferior in historical importance. He is the last considerable representative of the school of Mill who shows a trace of his spirit and more than any other carried that tradition on for a whole generation after Mill's death. For his diligent literary activity extended to the end of the century and his life was prolonged into the new one.

Of Bain's younger contemporaries who still kept up the traditions of the school we may mention Fowler, Croom Robertson, and Sully. The philosophic activity of these successors of great men belongs mainly to the last third of the century and deals with the provinces of logic, theory of knowledge, ethics, and above all psychology. THOMAS FOWLER (1832–1904), president of Corpus Christi College and from 1873 to 1889 Professor of Logic in Oxford, worked Mill's *Logic* into a convenient and much-used textbook (*The Elements*

*of Logic, Deductive and Inductive*, two volumes, 1869), wrote upon the classical empiricism (books on Bacon, Locke, Shaftesbury and Hutcheson) and treated ethical problems both in a popular work (*Progressive Morality*, 1884) and in one of more technical interest (*The Principles of Morals*, first part 1886, second part 1887). In the latter he went back to the ideas of the British moralists of the XVIIIth Century, in trying to distinguish clearly the sanction imposed by moral feeling from those imposed by law, society, and religion. Thereby he sought to establish the autonomy of the ethical sphere, defining that sanction as the feeling of contentment or discontent which we experience when, without any reference to an external authority, we merely reflect upon our own actions. He emphasized the progressive character of morality and ascribed this to the progressive refining and sharpening of moral sensitivity and more to the intellectual than to the emotional elements of the ethical act. Like Mill, he represented a moderate utilitarianism, recognizing the qualitative differences of feelings of pleasure and unpleasure and noticing the incommensurability of higher and lower moral motives. Instead of the coarse principle of utility he put forward the concept of welfare or well-being which he understood precisely in the sense of the Aristotelian *εὐδαιμονία*.

A thinker who was much stronger and less enslaved by tradition was the Scotsman GEORGE CROOM ROBERTSON (1842–92), a pupil and colleague of Bain in Aberdeen, who had studied in Berlin (under Trendelenburg and Du Bois-Reymond), in Göttingen (under Lotze), and in Paris, and who from 1867 to his death held the philosophical professorship at University College London, of which he was the first occupant. Robertson did good service in establishing and encouraging philosophic study at the universities and was one of the chief philosophic forces of his day, a character which he established as co-founder and for many years editor of *Mind*, by far the most important philosophical organ of the English-speaking world, which owed its foundation in 1876 to the initiative of Bain, and, one may say, is still conducted in the spirit of its

first editor. At that time it served the purpose of a meeting-place for the most varied schools of thought. Prepared by his training with Bain, Robertson, who was disinclined to write books,[1] devoted himself mainly to psychology; but undertook not so much an extensive treatment of the whole field of psychic phenomena (as Bain did), as an intensive examination of separate problems. Here he had the advantage of a keen analytic mind and a great gift for criticism, enabling him to produce masterpieces of psychological analysis, such as those on perception, memory, thought-process, volition, etc., which in part went far beyond his teacher. Although he was in general an adherent of empiricism, he did not allow himself to be fettered by school-dogmas, but was always eager to enlarge his mental horizon and to deepen his knowledge of philosophy. He possessed comprehensive and thorough knowledge of the whole field of the history of philosophy and he was well acquainted with the works of the great German thinkers, especially of Kant. He was penetrated with the conviction that the English empirical philosophy needed to be revived with the added deep insight of Kant's *Critique of Reason*, and his own work, especially in regard to theory of knowledge, went mainly in that direction. He had no aversion to metaphysics, and towards the end of his life made an interesting attempt, starting from the basis of empiricism, to reach a cosmology related to Leibniz's monadism though differing from it in many points.

The true continuer of the psychology of Mill and Bain was not Robertson but JAMES SULLY (1842–1923), his successor at University College, London (1892–1903). Sully was not so much a philosopher as a scientific and diligent empirical investigator and observer, and like Bain, whom he closely resembled, he plunged into the full tide of experience, accumulated fresh masses of material or worked over the old in

[1] He himself published only a small but excellent book on Hobbes (1886) and numerous papers and essays in periodicals and collections. After his death most of his articles were published as *Philosophical Remains* (1895), including two volumes of his lectures, the *Elements of General Philosophy* and the *Elements of Psychology*, both in 1896.

accordance with the latest ideas, so widening and extending the old basis without passing beyond it or providing it with a better philosophic foundation. Whatever provinces or objects he dealt with, he always maintained the attitude of the empirical psychologist. Thus, e.g., he discussed the phenomenon of laughter to which he devoted a considerable book (*An Essay on Laughter*, 1902), not like Bergson in a philosophic or metaphysical style, but following it out in the whole breadth of its empirical development, psychological and physiological, anthropological and ethnological, biological and sociological, but unable to produce that "truly philosophic theory" which he regarded as the culmination of all these separate aspects. Much earlier he had dealt in a similar style with the problem of illusion. Here also he contented himself with a "psychological study", handing over the problem for further treatment to the philosophers, to whom the proper solution belonged (*Illusions, a Psychological study*, 1881; German edition 1884). He treated psychology itself according to the principles of Bain physiologically and by the method of association; at first in its outlines (*Outlines of Psychology*, 1884) and then in a comprehensive and exhaustive presentation as the science of the human mind (*The Human Mind*, two volumes, 1892). He regarded it as the foundation of all the knowledge which aims at leading and influencing thought, feeling, and action, and so in imitation of Bain extended it to the theory of education (in the *Outlines* which he wrote "with special reference to the theory of education" and shortly afterwards in the *Teachers' Handbook of Psychology*, 1886, of which a German translation appeared in 1898). Thus also he took up child-psychology (*Studies of Childhood*, 1895) and, in this respect going far beyond Bain and following the tendency of the age, took up also experimental psychology, of the utility of which he was convinced, especially for education. Finally, eager for experience as he was, he turned his attention to aesthetics and thus opened up for empiricism a province which was new or at least much neglected since the XVIIIth Century. But here also he kept to the psychology of aesthetic phenomena and contented him-

self with classifying, analysing, and describing so that he failed to lead the study into a new or philosophic path but merely applied the old method to a new kind of material (in his article on Aesthetics written for the ninth edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1875, and in some separate papers published in periodicals).

The empirical movement in the writers just mentioned issued mainly in special psychological inquiries. But another branch sprung from its stem, and devoted to the *philosophy of history* may also be mentioned briefly here. Interest in the mental sciences and in their methodical and logical character had been awakened by Mill and simultaneously by Comte. By transferring the strict methods of natural law and causation to the world of political and social history represented by these sciences, those thinkers thought that they were able to interpret their meaning and purpose. They tried to test and so far as possible to justify this idea by actual historical inquiry. This involved the introduction of a philosophic element into the conception of history and therefore an approximation to the historical work of the Enlightenment, which was full of philosophic ideas, especially in Voltaire and Hume. The *History of Greece* (six volumes, 1845–56) of George Grote, the pupil of Bentham and friend of Mill (vide supra, pp. 59 seq.) was written in a philosophic spirit, though not obtrusively so. By far the most talented and important attempt of this kind undertaken in England was made by THOMAS HENRY BUCKLE (1821–62), author of the famous *History of Civilization in England* (the whole work was intended to have fourteen volumes, but only the first two appeared as introduction, 1857 and 1861; German edition by Ritter, no date). Although Buckle was not the pupil of any particular master, he was strongly influenced by positivist ideas. Those of Mill and Comte equally and, earlier, those of the Anglo-French Enlightenment, formed the philosophic background of his interpretation of history. This stands in very close relation with the materialist view. For as its basic thesis it teaches the dependence of spiritual life and all cultural progress upon the physical conditions of the environ-

ment; that is, upon the factors of climate, soil, nutrition, etc. This, of course, implies the transference of the methods of natural science to the sciences of history and culture, and Buckle drew the radical conclusions which follow. The world of history is subject to the same strict causal laws as the world of nature. To the uniformity of natural process corresponds the uniformity of human nature, and in the one sphere as in the other everything comes to pass in necessary sequence. What mathematics are for natural sciences, statistics are for history; they are the exact computation of all the factors which produce and determine an historical event or social condition. Buckle was full of a quite fanatical faith in the power of statistics and it is well known what bold conclusions he drew on their evidence. He took less notice of individual personalities and their ostensibly free voluntary actions than of those uniform and general factors which are expressed in the great movements of the masses; the latter and not the former are responsible for the life which is embodied in history and culture. No greater contrast can be imagined than that between Buckle's collectivist and naturalistic way of writing history and the individualist, idealistic, and heroic way of his contemporary Carlyle. In general, Buckle's ideas are drawn from the XVIIIth Century and not without justice was he mocked by his opponents as a child of the Enlightenment a century behind the times. He fought against religion and the Church as the obscurantist forces of history; he had a fanatical belief in progress which he based not upon any hope of a moral improvement in the human race but on the growing extension of knowledge and enlightenment by reason. Although he bound spirit to nature, he believed in the subjection and conquest of nature by spirit, among the peoples by whom, through the increasing rationalization of existence by the exact sciences and by philosophical criticism (to which last he assigned a specially important cultural function) the conditions for development and progress were produced.

Buckle's ambitious, one-sided, and keenly critical interpretation of culture raised a great stir in the intellectual life of

England after the middle of the century and formed one of the strongest ferments in the evolutionist movement which began about that time, though Buckle himself was hardly affected by it. Following him there appeared other attempts at a philosophic interpretation of past epochs, such as W. E. H. LECKY's (1838–1903) *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe* (two volumes, 1865, German edition by Solowicz, second edition 1873), *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne* (two volumes, 1869), and *History of England in the 18th Century* (eight volumes, 1878–90), which are all inspired with the spirit of Buckle. There is also the *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe* (1862) by the scientist John W. Draper, who emigrated to America, and Leslie Stephen's (1832–1904) impressive book *History of English Thought in the 18th Century* (two volumes, 1876–81), which is dominated by Buckle's ideas, though it is also influenced by the idea of evolution.

We may also mention two other thinkers who are loosely connected with the school of Mill, and whose doctrines, though they also have been influenced by other ideas, belong in the main to the utilitarian or empirical school, the moralist Henry Sidgwick and the logician and metaphysician Carveth Read.

HENRY SIDGWICK (1838–1900)[1] came into prominence with his *Methods of Ethics*, his earliest (except for a pamphlet) and his most influential writing. It appeared in 1874, a year after the death of Mill and the year which saw the literary first-fruits of the Oxford idealistic movement, namely, Green's *Introductions* to Hume and Wallace's *Logic of Hegel*. Sidgwick's book, which won a considerable reputation, together with his personal presence and teaching, gave to Cambridge a quickening and intensification of philosophical interest comparable with

[1] 1859 Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; at first Classical Lecturer; in 1869 became Lecturer in Moral Philosophy; 1883, Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge. A founder and first President of the Society for Psychical Research (1882).

the renaissance effected in Oxford by the disciples of Kant and Hegel. He became the leading spirit of a movement which, while not new in essence, represented a new gathering of forces in favour of a development of the native tradition in philosophy. The impulse he transmitted, later reinforced by Ward, did not indeed give rise to a powerful and relatively determinate doctrine such as went forth from Oxford, but it certainly prepared the way for the outburst of thought after the turn of the century which we associate chiefly with the philosophers of Cambridge. It could be said that he did for ethics what Ward did for psychology; with the difference, however, that whereas Ward opened up a new stage, Sidgwick rather summed up and closed an old one.

The great reputation Sidgwick enjoyed in philosophy throughout the last quarter of the XIXth Century and even later rested entirely on his first book, with which all his other writings put together cannot be compared in importance.[1] Among the several distinguished contributions to ethics made in Britain in the second half of the century it takes a high place and ranks in fact as a classic. Its importance, however, has been overrated. To call it, as has often been done, epoch-making, is to use a threadbare word, and if the epithet is to be allowed it must be made to mean far less than it means when applied within this same period to Mill and Spencer on the one hand and to Green and Bradley on the other. For Sidgwick founded neither a new method nor a new system. The service he did consisted in sifting, ordering, revising, and evaluating an already existing stock of ideas, and in his attempt to bring these into fruitful contact with new ones.

Although some of his writings deal with the most general questions of philosophy, his interest lay almost entirely with

[1] *Principles of Political Economy*, 1883; *Outlines of the History of Ethics*, 1886 (often reprinted); *Elements of Politics*, 1891; *Practical Ethics*, 1898; *Philosophy, its Scope and Relations*, 1902; *Lectures on the Ethics of Green, Spencer, and Martineau*, 1902; *The Development of European Polity*, 1903; *Miscellaneous Essays and Addresses*, 1904; *Lectures on the Philosophy of Kant*, etc., 1905. The last five were edited from his remains.