

RECORD OF THE MONTHS.

NEW WORKS.

I.

The Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences, founded upon their History. By the Rev. WILLIAM WHEWELL, B. D., Fellow of Trinity College, and Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Cambridge, Vice-president of the Geological Society of London. London: 1840. 2 vols. 8vo.

THIS work contains the *moral of the tale* that was told in the author's history of the inductive sciences. The author's aim is great and noble—to give the philosophy of inductive science; to inquire what that *organ* or intellectual method is, by which solid truth is to be extracted from the observation of nature." Of course the work must be *critical* in part, and *positive* in part. It contains "A criticism of the fallacies of the ultra-Lockian school." The author does not stop at great names, nor hesitate to dissent from Bacon, Cuvier, and even from Newton himself. He now and then adopts Kant's reasoning, but differs widely from him; and while he acknowledges his great obligations to Schelling, yet ventures to condemn some of his opinions. The book is designed, in some measure, to take the place of Bacon's *Novum Organon*. It is one of the boldest philosophical attempts of the present century. The author measures himself against the greatest of all the sons of science. Shall he stand or fall?

The work opens with a preface containing one hundred and thirteen aphorisms "respecting ideas," fifty-six "concerning science," and seventeen greater aphorisms, respecting the "language of science." The third aphorism, respecting ideas, will show the school of philosophy to which Professor Whewell belongs.

"The *Alphabet*, by means of which we interpret Phenomena, consists of the *Ideas* existing in our own minds; for these give to the phenomena that coherence and significance which is not an object of sense."

Again, Aphorisms vii. and viii. — "Ideas are not *transformed*, but *informed* Sensations, for without ideas sensations have no form."

"The Sensations are the *Objective*, the Ideas the *Subjective* part of every act of perception or knowledge."

And Aphorism iv. concerning science. — "Facts are the materials of Science, but all Facts involve Ideas. Since, in observing Facts, we cannot exclude Ideas, we must, for the purposes

of science, take care that the Ideas are clear, and rigorously applied."

Aphorism xxxiv. — "The process of Induction may be resolved into three steps; the *Selection of the Idea*, the *Construction of the Conception*, and the *Determination of the Magnitudes*."

These aphorisms occupy about a hundred valuable pages. The author then comes to the real work, the "Philosophy of the Inductive Sciences." This is divided into two parts: I. of IDEAS; II. of KNOWLEDGE.

Part I. is distributed into ten books, treating of ideas in general; the philosophy of the pure sciences; that of the mechanical sciences; that of the secondary mechanical sciences; that of the mechanico-chemical sciences; the philosophy of morphology; that of the classificatory sciences; of biology; and of pa-lætiology.

Part II. is divided into three books, which treat of the construction of science; of former opinions upon the nature of knowledge, and the means of seeking it; and of methods employed in the formation of science.

The above hasty sketch shows what a wide field the author enters upon and passes over. We hope in a subsequent number of this Journal to follow him into details, and examine his method; and trust soon to see an American reprint of the book, for at present its price confines it to few hands.

II.

On the Foundation of Morals: four Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. By the Rev. WILLIAM WHEWELL, &c. 2d Edition. Cambridge and London, (no date.) 8vo. pp. xi. and 76.

These four Sermons — which are very respectable discourses, better suited to the pulpit than the press — are designed to recall men to the eternal foundation of our ideas of the good and true, and to the absolute, and therefore immutable Morality, which rests thereon. They are at war, in part, with the system of Paley, of whom he thus speaks in the preface, p. v. "The evils which arise from the countenance thus afforded to the principles of Paley's system, (namely, by making his Moral Philosophy the standard in the University,) are so great, as to make it desirable for us to withdraw our sanction from his doctrines without further delay, although I am not at present aware of any system of ethics constructed on a sounder basis, which I should recommend to the adoption of the University." He refers often to Butler, as the exponent of a system diametrically opposite to that of Paley, and refers chiefly to Butler's first three

Sermons on Human Nature; the fifth and sixth, on Compassion; the eighth and ninth, on Resentment; the eleventh and twelfth, on the Love of our Neighbor; and the thirteenth and fourteenth, on the Love of God, as expressing the sounder view of man's moral nature, and duties which result therefrom. The substance of the Sermons is this: God has written his law eternally on the constitution of man; conscience is man's power to read that law; duty is obedience to it. Of course it follows from such premises and their implications, that man may obey completely, and in that case, both in this world and the next, obtains the highest possible human welfare. But here the author's theology comes in, and mars the work in some measure, and he concludes as follows: "Conscience is His minister; the law of the heart is his writing; the demand for the obedience of thought and will is his word, and yet how small a part is this of that vast dispensation, by which the sting of death, which is sin, was plucked out, and the strength of sin, which is the law, [the law of *Moses*, however, not the law of *God*,] was tamed, and the victory was won for us; and the conqueror, 'having spoiled principalities and powers, made a show of them, triumphing openly,' and Death and Sin, and the law of *Moses*, and the law of Nature, [the law of *God*?] all become only as figures belonging to the triumphal procession." This is eloquent and full of pious feeling, but it is *rhetoric*, not *philosophy*. The book well deserves reprinting with us, and carries the reader back to the times of the "Latitude men about Cambridge," when there were giants in that University, and "immutable morality" was taught by men, wont to

"out-watch the bear
With thrice-great *Hermes*, or unsphere
The spirit of *Plato*;"

men who believed goodness and God were to be loved for their own sake.

III.

Institutes of Ecclesiastical History, Ancient and Modern. By JOHN LAURENCE VON MOSHEIM, D. D., Chancellor of the University of Göttingen. A new and literal translation from the original Latin, with copious additional notes, original and selected, by James Murdock, D. D.; edited, with additions, by Henry Soames, M. A., Rector of Stapleford Tawney, with Thoyden Mount, Essex. London: 1841. 4 vols. 8vo.

Here we have the able translation of Mosheim by our learned and laborious countryman, endorsed by an English scholar, enriched with new additions, and printed in the most elegant style of the times. We ought also to add, that Mr. Soames has dedi-

cated his offspring to "Sir Edward Bowyer Smyth, of Hill Hall, Essex, Baronet." Gentle reader, if thou knowest not Sir Edward, we will add for thy edification the remaining dedicatory words;—"Whose religious habits, anxiety for the spiritual welfare of all within his influence, due sense of obligation as an ecclesiastical patron, and patrician liberality, cast a lustre upon an ancient family, and display the value of an hereditary aristocracy, this volume," &c., &c.

After the valuable labors of Dr. Murdock, the reader might ask, What need of a new editor? The answer is plain. In a field so vast as that of ecclesiastical history, so filled with inquiring spirits, some new treasure is yearly brought to light; some old forgotten jewel or medal, rough with inscriptions, is now and then turned up by the trenchant spade of a scholar or antiquary. Accordingly, if a score of Dr. Murdock's had worked a score of years upon the volume, there would still be work for new editors. The history of local churches is never complete. Besides, the world daily grows older, and new towers and chapels are added to the church, or some turret topples over with slow decay, and falls to the ground. The separation of what is old, and the silent accretion of the new, always affords work for the historian.

Mr. Soames has aimed not only to supply the *desiderata*, incumbent upon him as editor, but also, as a gratuitous work, to correct the "defects of orthography or expression," in Dr. Murdock, and to appear "before the world as a clergyman beneficed in the Church of England, and he would be very sorry to act in any degree as if his convictions did not coincide with his interests." He has also added original matter relating to the history of the English church, "of itself sufficient to form an octavo volume of moderate size." "Thus unquestionably," says he, vol. i. p. xi., "the British Isles have at length, offered to their notice, an ecclesiastical history, comprehensive though not superficial, and arranged with special reference to their own use." Mr. Soames distinguishes his own "original matter" from the notes of his predecessor, by the mark [Ed.]. However, we are left in doubt where he corrected the *orthography or expression* of Dr. Murdock. But we should account him peculiarly well fitted for this task of correction, judging from some remarkable expressions of his own; such as "if men would stop when their leaders mean them," p. xx.; "after the Council of Trent had sitten," p. xxxii; "episcopalian protestants form attached citizens in Ameria," p. xxxiv, &c., &c., &c.

Let us now see what the new editor has added to the labors of Mosheim, McClaine, and Murdock. 1. *A preface to each of the four volumes.* That of the first fills thirty-four pages, and shows

little historical learning or philosophical power on its writer's part. Some of the conclusions he draws from ecclesiastical history are sufficiently striking, however. He says that "Republican opinions did not originate among protestant bodies, adhering to the ancient system of ecclesiastical discipline. They arose among such as took divinity from the Calvinistic schools," &c. p. xxxiv. Again, "From modern ecclesiastical history may be learned the value of liturgies and other well guarded formularies." Ibid. He admits, that among those who eat the bread of the English church, there have always been some *inclined to theology of a Socinian cast*," to use his own felicitous expression; but "the discipline and formularies of the church quickly reduced such innovators to silence."

2. *Notes marked [Ed.]*. Dr. Murdock, with great labor, digested all the most valuable literature of more recent date than Mosheim, and subjoined it in his notes, which represented the state of most questions in ecclesiastical history at the time these notes were published. But since 1832, new works have appeared; various monographs have been written, illustrating particular points of the history of the church or its doctrine, and he would do no small service to the scholar, who should digest all the new contributions and add them to Mosheim's text. But this is what Mr. Soames never dreams of attempting. He is not familiar with the *sources* of ecclesiastical history, nor even with the *recent works* drawn from these sources, or containing them. The works to which he refers are Prideaux's *Connexions*; Burton's attempt to ascertain the chronology, &c.; Burton's *Bampton lectures*; his lectures on the ecclesiastical history, &c.; Waterland's works; Bishop Kaye's *Tertullian*; his *Justin Martyr*; Potter's discourse of church government, and similar "authorities." He shows no acquaintance with the recent contributions to ecclesiastical history, that have been written in Germany within the last ten years. He only once mentions such a work. *Bulla Reformationis Pauli Papæ tertii ad historiam Concilii Trid. Justinæus*, &c., illust. *H. N. Clausen*. Nauniæ, 1830. However, he now and then mentions the works of Ranke and Hürter, but makes little use of either. Prescott's *Ferdinand and Isabella* was in his hands, but Gieseler's works he does not appear to know.

We give the following note, as a fair specimen of the *learning and discrimination* of Mr. Soames. "When Dr. Mosheim wrote, the world had not seen those elaborate works on pagan idolatry, which have since been produced by Bryant and Faber. Those scholars have laboriously and ingeniously traced heathen superstition to a common source, making it appear little else than the canonization of those eight ancestors of the modern

world, whom God mercifully saved in the ark. The Hindoo triad may, therefore, be taken as the three sons of Noah, called in the West, Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto. Friga is evidently the same as Rhea. Let the pagan system, in every age and country, be considered as one, and its prevalence may easily be understood. It will stand forth as a corruption of the patriarchal religion, strictly analogous to the Romish corruption of Christianity." vol. i., pp. 16, 17. But a doctrine very different is taught in a note in the former page, where he follows Cudworth's opinion of the nature of Polytheism. Similar inconsistencies are not rare in his pages.

Some of his notes are childish, designed to guard against mistakes which none but babes could fall into. Thus, vol. ii., p. 160, Mosheim speaks of John of Damascus in the text, and regards him "as the *Thomas* and the *Lombard* of the Greeks," and we find appended thereto the following note: [Thomas Aquinas and Peter Lombard. Ed.] Sometimes, however, his corrections are valuable, though minute. He assures us Dr. Murdock was wrong in calling a certain author a bishop, who in fact was no bishop. Of course he takes his stand in a *partisan* pulpit, and judges all things exclusively from that "bad eminence," as if it were the absolute point of view. However, we have now and then found a valuable hint in his notes, relative to the history of the English church, and especially the biography of English writers. He cautions his readers against the prejudice both of Neal and his opponent, Bishop Madox; yet seems willing to excuse the violence of the latter.

3. *Several original chapters.* In vol. ii., pp. 67–72, he adds a brief chapter on the conversion of England: pp. 399–415, a longer chapter on the religious condition of the Anglo-Saxons. Neither gives indications of much research, as we should judge. There are many manuscript treasures in England, illustrating ecclesiastical affairs, which we hope some clerical scholar will disclose, ere long, to the public. Mr. Soames never goes beyond what is *printed*, and sees but little which is print.

In vol. iii., pp. 171–248, we have three original chapters on the Reformation in England and Scotland; and p. 427–549, three more on the church of England, Scotland, and Ireland. These chapters contain some matters of importance, perhaps, not previously known to the general readers of ecclesiastical history. He draws, however, from the most obvious sources.

In vol. iv., p. 277–315, is a valuable chapter on the church of England, in the 17th century. A second is added, pp. 402–462, a sketch of ecclesiastical affairs during the 18th century, relating chiefly to England; and a third chapter, pp. 463–508, on the "ecclesiastical history of the earlier years of the 19th century."

Both are hasty sketches. He has no conception of the theological problem, which the Christian church is busied with in this age.

4. *Several brief chronological tables*; one at the end of each volume, accompanied with notes; *Vater's tables of Ecclesiastical History*, &c., translated by Francis Cunningham; and an *alphabetical index* at the end of the work. The latter is not so full as Dr. Maclaine's, nor so complete as could be wished.

To sum up the merits and defects of Mr. Soames's edition, it must be said, that he seems to have made no thorough and scientific study of ecclesiastical history; that his notes are in general trifling and of no value, except, for the most part, to refer to the recent and meagre literature of the English church. We would, however, make a single exception. The history of transubstantiation he seems to have studied more thoroughly than any other department of his subject. In respect to the history of the church in England, Scotland, and Ireland, he has collected into a few pages of easy access, what we must otherwise seek for in several volumes. If he has not done all the duty of an editor, we will take thankfully what he gives. His sketch of the ecclesiastical history of the present century, though superficial, and in some respects scarcely accurate, is yet a convenient statement of some of the outward facts. We would only add, that Mr. Soames is likewise the author of "The Anglo-Saxon Church, its History, Revenues, and General Character;" of the Elizabethan religious History; and of a "Bampton Lecture," which we have never seen nor heard of, except through his own references, and the advertisements of booksellers.

IV.

German Anti-Supernaturalism. Six Lectures, on Strauss's "Life of Jesus," delivered at the Chapel in South Place, Finsbury. By Philip Harwood, &c. London. 1841. pp. viii. and 107.

Mr. Harwood's design, as he tells us in the preface, "is to stimulate inquiry into a subject, which he regards as of first-rate importance on historical and moral speculation. Here, then, we have a clergyman, yes, a Unitarian clergyman, favorably known by a few stirring and pious sermons, setting forth, and in great measure accepting, the results of Mr. Strauss! He gives a brief, but fair and able synopsis of the celebrated "Life of Jesus," and adds a few observations of his own. For our own part, we think Mr. Strauss is often mistaken; that he under-rates the historical element, and sometimes comes hastily to his conclusions, which, therefore, cannot be all maintained, though

long ago we believed he was doing a signal service to Christianity itself. Mr. Harwood, we think, accepts the conclusions of his author more entirely than reasonably, and like him is blinded by the myths, so that he does not always see the fact they cover and conceal.

The book may be regarded as the forerunner of a theological controversy, which, if once begun, will not be soon ended. It requires no divination to foresee the final result. It will lead thinking men to ask for the *facts* of the case, before they reason about the facts. But is it well judged to give the results of a book like Strauss's, without the process by which the results were reached? Some will reply, yes; others, no. But the same thing is done in science and history; why not in historical theology? Again, it will be asked, is it wise to bring the case at once before the people? Some men love an historical answer, and here it is. Greater questions have been brought quite as directly before the people. In the day of Moses, the theological problem was to separate religion and morality from the Fetichism and Polytheism of Canaanites and Egyptians. What was his method? He said unto the *people*, Hear, oh Israel, *the Lord your God is ONE LORD*. He left the bull, Apis, and the consecrated cats to take care of themselves.

In the time of Christ, when the problem was to separate religion and morality from the Mosaic ritual, that world-stirring Nazarene addresses himself to the people. He tells a *woman*, "The hour cometh when ye shall neither in *this mountain*, nor yet at *Jerusalem*, worship the Father; but the true worshippers shall worship him in spirit and in truth." Is not salvation for the sick? This question has long enough been known to scholars, perhaps *decided* by scholars. It is the *popular* theology that requires reformation; and how shall this be effected, but by appeal to the people? We apprehend no danger is to be feared, at least no danger to religion and morality, nor to Christianity. When the work is tried by fire, why should not the "wood, hay, and stubble" be burned up, that the precious stones may appear, and the *foundation that is laid* be discerned, that men may build thereon the temple that abideth ever? The old never passes away, till all the good of the thing gets transferred to the new.

We give Mr. Harwood's conclusion in his own words.

"What are we to do with Christianity?—that wonderful faith, which has come so mysteriously into our world, and lived in it eighteen hundred years already, with such a wealth and fulness of life and living power; doing so much, and undoing so much; uprooting an old civilization, and planting a new one upon its ruins; doing so much, and in so many ways, both of good and evil; Christianity, the inspiration of the philanthropist, and the stalking-horse of the tyrant; the word of God in

the heart of the reformer-prophet, and the lie on the lips of the bigot-priest; the endurer and the inflicter of martyrdom for conscience-sake; Christianity, with all its ideas, moralities, and spiritual forces, working in countless ways, and through countless channels, upon literature, art, philosophy, legislation, and all the other interests of our social and moral being:—what are we to do with this great enduring, all-pervading spirit or power of Christianity,—those of us who believe it to be simply a growth of nature and the human heart, with no other divinity, or divine authority, than its own truth, recognised by our own minds, and no other divine right or sanction, than what we infer from what we see of its nature and its history? What are we to do with Christianity?

"Perhaps some will say, 'We have nothing to do with it, we have already done away with it, by discarding its evidences in miracle: the miracles being false, it is without evidence, it is a false thing altogether, a dead thing, and we have nothing to do but bury it out of our sight, without more words.' Hardly so, I think. Miracles do not make a religion, nor does the withdrawal of miracles unmake a religion. Miracles are not religion, but only a particular sort of machinery, by which a particular form of religion may or may not, at a given time and place, get room for itself in the world. The essence of a religion is never in its miracles, true or false; but in its ideas, its moralities, the phases of character, the modes of intellectual and moral being, which it calls into existence. The Jewish religion is not in the plagues of Egypt and the thunders of Sinai, but in the legislation, the ritual, and the morality of the Pentateuch. The Christian religion is not in the changing of water into wine, and feeding five thousand men at a cheap rate; not in violations of the law of gravitation, or of any other law; but in the ideas that were the spirit and power of Christ's mind; in the spiritual impulses and influences that come from Christ's mind to our minds; in the moral inspiration that breathes out from Christ's heart into our hearts. The essence of a religion is in its ideas. Where else should it be? A religion is true or false, according as these are true or false, in accordance or in discordance with the ideal of human truth and good. It is not a question of miracles one way or the other. The presence of miracle could never make a false religion true, nor can the absence of miracle ever make a true religion false. The Christian religion may be a quite true religion,—the religion of brotherhood and immortality, the religion of the sermon on the mount, the religion of the good Samaritan, the religion of the well of Jacob and the lake of Galilee, the religion of the workshop of Nazareth,—may be a true religion, the truest of religions, though the whole of the miracles together come from the limbo of the vanities. The question still remains, then,—miracles or no miracles. What are we to do with Christianity?

"What are we to do with Christianity? What do we do with other religions, other doctrines and moralities, other philosophies of life, man and God? We simply accept them for what they are worth, as expositions, more or less authentic and complete, as a portion of spiritual reality; as parts, sustaining more or less important relations to the whole of humanity's realized and garnered mental wealth; as indicating, by the very fact that here they are, something in human capability, tendency, and destination; as chapters in the volume of God's book; as expressions of moral ideas, utterances of moral wants. We thus accept them all, and we test the worth and amount of the truth that is in

each, by the joint standard of individual feeling, and of the world's general experience; valuing each by the kind and degree of its influences, by its proved capability or incapability of enduring, by the forms of moral life which it expresses or creates. We accept each as true, according to the extent to which it has proved itself true by its works. We accept each and all for what they are severally worth, as emanations, more or less direct and pure, from that spirit of God in man, which is the great eternal soul of our human world,—the well-spring of all our prophesyings, gospels, moralities, religions. And why not Christianity?—Christianity, the divinest of them all; which has worked longer than most of them, worked the most variously, benignly and powerfully of them all; which has done the most for human progress of them all, and which in its connexions with the moral civilization of those nations which stand at the head of the human race, and furnish the best specimens of humanity in its best estate, may be taken as, on the whole, the most significant phenomenon in the history of our world, our truest and most intelligible expositor of what God is doing with our world.

“What shall we do, then, with Christianity? Why, accept it as the expressions of truths, in human nature and human life, to which many ages and many nations have testified that they are truths: accept it, if not any longer as a creed having dogmatical truth, or as a history having historical truth, yet as a poem fraught with truth of a higher order than the dogmatic or historical—a poem, a divine parable: accept its ideal of human character and capability in that wonderful Man of Nazareth, in whom so glorious a strength blends with so gentle a repose,—Son of God and Son of Man, majestic as a prophet and meek as a little child: accept its ideal of human destiny, in the history of that Man of Nazareth, born of God (as we are all born of God, with two natures in us—children we are, like him, of an invisible Father and a visible Mother, God and Nature,) tempted in a wilderness, as we all are tempted, and of the very same devil or devils, struggling, suffering, triumphing, conquered by death, yet conquering over death: accept this Christianity; accept its cross, the symbol of trial; its resurrection, the symbol of history; its millennium, or reign of saints, the symbol of our new moral world, with right and love for its only law; its heaven, the symbol of the blessedness which itself creates; its Father-God, the symbol of the great, mysterious, all-upholding, all-inspiring power, in which, and by which we live, move and have our being. Accept Christianity, and these things in Christianity; that is, if we see them there. If not, so be it; perhaps we may see them more clearly somewhere else. There is no compulsion in the matter; no believing under penalties; no hell-fire.

“What shall we do with Christianity? Nothing artificial, nothing forced, nothing false; nothing that shall hinder the full, free development of mental and moral individuality. Not make a yoke of bondage of it: not make a labor-saving machine of it: not make a preceptive morality of it, to supersede the morality of principle and spirit: not make a creed-theology of it, to supersede thought and philosophy: not make a hierarchical church of it, to supersede God's order of prophets and seers: not make a poor, formal, lip-worship of it to trammel the freedom of the worship, which is in truth only when it is in spirit: do nothing with it that shall narrow the sympathies, enslave the will, enfeeble and sectarianize the intellect, impoverish the humanities, pervert or

hinder our growth up to the fulness of the measure of the stature of perfect men.

“What shall we do with Christianity? Why, take its best principles, and do battle, in the strength of them against its worst perversions. Take its law of love, its revelation of brotherhood and brotherly equality, its ideal of divine purpose and human destiny, its spirituality, its simplicity; and combat, strong in these, with all the frauds, falsehoods, conventionalism, mummies, quackeries, monopolies, tyrannies, sectarianisms, pharisaisms, that are practised in its name, and sanctified with its sanctions,—the disgrace of churches, and the bane of states,—that even make it a question, with not unthinking men, whether on the whole Christianity has done more of good or of mischief in the world,—that make it no question at all, but that if Christ were to come again, he would be crucified again by the Chief Priests.

“What shall we do with Christianity? Why, if we can, improve upon it; improve upon Paul's Christianity, as Paul improved upon Peter's Christianity; develop it further, more widely, and variously, than it has ever been developed yet. Work out its great enduring principles the full length to which they will go as principles, in their varied applications to every department of human thought and life: enshrine its eternal spirit in new forms of beneficence and beauty, as the spirit of humanity itself rises to new heights, and tries its strength in new modes of being and action: work out by the light, and with the resources of our own day and generation, its grand idea of a kingdom of heaven and of God: carry its justice, its freedom, and its faith into our literature, our trade, our politics, and wherever else justice, freedom, and faith can find or make a place for themselves: do all we can with this, and with every other genuine utterance of the spirit of humanity, that shall make us wiser, stronger, truer men,—bring us into nearer intelligence of the laws, and profounder sympathy with the spirit of the great world of God.”—pp. 105 – 107.